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The following dissertation examines the nature of Mormon cohesion by diachronically investigating the interrelationship between Mormon group identity and solidarity and Mormon covenant organization. In order to achieve this end three interrelated issues are explored. First, the nature of Mormon covenant organization is explicated. Second, the relationship between that form of organization and Mormon identity and solidarity is analyzed. And third, modifications that have occurred both in covenant organization per se and in its relationship to Mormon group identity and solidarity are discussed in terms of the Mormon group's changing relationship to larger American society.

The introductory chapter develops a conceptual framework in terms of which this examination is carried out. This framework is then employed in the ensuing chapters to analyze various types of data that in one way or another have bearing on the nature of Mormon covenant organization and its consequences for Mormon group cohesion. These data are drawn from a number of sources, including official Mormon publications, discourses by prominent Mormon leaders, letters, journals, autobiographies, and statements and publications by apostate Mormons and individuals who were never affiliated with Mormonism. Data thus employed were selected on the basis of whether or not they shed light on aspects of Mormon covenant organization and not on the basis of whether or not they placed Mormonism and its leaders in a favorable or unfavorable light.

At various points in the dissertation, tentative hypotheses are set forth regarding the relationship between Mormon covenant organization and Mormon group solidarity as well as associated aspects of Mormon group development. Such hypotheses are deductions derived from an examination of the data in terms of the conceptual framework.
They are consequently not necessarily the same conclusions that an active participant in the Mormon group would draw after examining the same data in terms of the Mormon belief system itself. Although the dissertation has been written by an active participant in the Mormon group, the dissertation should not be regarded as an analysis of Mormonism from an insider's perspective. It should rather be regarded as an analysis of Mormonism from the perspective of an insider who is attempting to examine his belief system in terms of an externally derived framework. As a result, the tentative hypotheses that are put forth in the body of the dissertation do not necessarily correspond with the personal views held by the author of the dissertation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Competent observers have long noted an unusually high degree of group identity and solidarity manifested by the Mormon people. Talcott Parsons (1961:250), for example, has written that "the sect is characterized by commitment to make its religion the unequivocally dominant consideration in its members' lives. . . . Two outstanding examples of this are the Anabaptists in the Reformation period in Europe and the Mormons in nineteenth-century America." Richard Ely (1903:667) found this condition to still be a salient feature of Mormonism in the early years of the twentieth century. In 1903 he thus wrote: "We find in Mormonism, to a larger degree than I have ever seen in any other body of people, an illustration of the individual who is willing to sacrifice himself to the whole." In the 1920s Park and Burgess (1924:872-73) suggested that over the years Mormonism had developed from a sect to a near nationality. During the early 1950s, participants in the Harvard "Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures Project" were struck by the magnitude of group orientation manifest by Mormons living in northern New Mexico when contrasted with the individualism of Texan migrants residing in the same area (Bellah 1978:8-11; ms a; Kluckhohn C. 1956; 1961; Kluckhohn F. and Strodtbeck 1961:259-83; Vogt and Albert 1966: passim; Vogt and O'Dea 1953). A. Leland Jamison (1961:212) has stated that "One may reasonably maintain that no other sizable religious group in this country, not even Roman Catholicism or Orthodox Judaism, has so effectively blended religious and secular elements of life into a coherent ethos." Martin Marty (1970:124) has suggested that the Mormon church has perpetuated an "imperial idea" among its membership. And Thomas O'Dea (1954:292-93; 1957:115-16; 1966a:xxi-iv;
1966b:70; 1968:133; 1972:140-42), who perhaps subjected Mormonism to more careful sociological analysis than any other single individual, concluded that the LDS people might best be characterized as a quasi-ethnic group with a religious organization at its core.

This dissertation examines the nature of Mormon cohesion by diachronically investigating the interrelationship between Mormon group identity and solidarity and Mormon covenant organization. This relationship will be analyzed from the time that the Church was organized in 1830 until the early years of the twentieth century.

"The Mormon Church" is a sobriquet used to refer to the religious organization founded by Joseph Smith. The name became attached to the Church because of its members' belief in the Book of Mormon, a volume of scripture Joseph Smith claimed to have translated from anciently engraved plates. Originally the Church was officially called "The Church of Christ." During the mid-1830s it was commonly referred to as "The Church of the Latter-day Saints" in official Church publications. On 26 April 1838 Joseph Smith dictated a revelation in which the Church was designated as "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." This has been the official name of the Church since that time (HC 1978 III:23-24). Members of the Church generally refer to themselves either as "Mormons," "Saints," "Latter-day Saints," or "the LDS people." These terms will be used interchangeably in this dissertation. The term Saint in Mormon usage does not denote, as it does in Puritanism, an individual that has achieved a state of sanctification. For Mormons a "Saint" is simply a member of "the Lord's church."

In this dissertation when the term Church is capitalized, it has reference exclusively to the Mormon church. There have been various schisms throughout the history of Mormonism, and at the present time there are a number of discrete religious organizations that claim to be valid expressions of the religious system founded by Joseph Smith. This dissertation will be concerned only with the development of the organization that became headed by Brigham Young following the death of Joseph Smith and which since that time has been headed by men who have been drawn from the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles by that body as presidents of the Church.
Theoretical Framework

Overview of Theoretical Issues to be Considered

The church-sect typology

The most common way to analyze the development of identity and solidarity within an American religious organization is through the employment of the church-sect typology. This developmental model is partially grounded in the theoretical work of Max Weber (1958a:302-22; 1958b:144-54, 254 note 173; 1968:passim) and Ernst Troeltsch (1931:328-49, 999-1000). In analytically distinguishing between church and sect, both men were primarily interested in analyzing the differences between dominant state religions (primarily Roman Catholicism) and religious movements that develop independent of state sponsorship. The distinctions that they make between church and sect are diverse and wide ranging. And nowhere in the writings of either man is the assumption that sects necessarily develop into churches or that all churches begin as sects.

In the late 1920s the theologian and sociologist of religion, H. Richard Niebuhr (1957) simplified the distinctions that Weber and Troeltsch had established between church and sect and presented the two types as polar opposites within a unitary development scheme. According to Niebuhr, the typical religious organization begins as a sect and then through a process of routinization is transformed into a church.

Niebuhr holds that the primary basis for the transformation from sect to church is the adoption by the religious organization of the patterns of social inequality prevalent in secular society. He portrays the sect as beginning essentially as a protest movement at odds with conditions in the larger surrounding society. Its fundamental raison d'être is to establish a societal order among its membership based on the ethnical equalitarianism of New Testament Christianity. Over time, however, it will inevitably adopt patterns of interaction found in secular society, and in so doing it will become internally ordered upon the basis of principles consistent with the secular order. By so doing it is transformed into a church. A church consequently is essentially a compromised sect.
While sociologists of religion still tend to accept the basic utility of Niebuhr's model, the numerous attempts to apply it to the development of various religious organizations have demonstrated that religious development is neither as simple nor as undirectional as Niebuhr had envisioned. It is now clear that various outcomes are possible for a developing sect. In attempting to make Niebuhr's model more explanatory, it has been found useful to differentiate between churchlike religious organizations that are state religions and dominate within a given country and those that exist in countries, such as the United States, where no single religious organization predominates and none is an official state religion. In current sociological literature, the term church is generally reserved for the former type of organization and the term denomination given to the latter. And it is now clear that transformation from sect to church or denomination is neither as inevitable nor necessarily as rapid as Niebuhr had supposed. Many sectlike organizations are able to persist for indefinite periods of time. These "established sects," as they are termed, appear to be able to maintain a sectlike organization and an antagonistic relationship to secular society by means of various prohibitions limiting interaction of sect members with the rest of society (O'Dea 1968:131).

Within the context of the currently employed church-sect typology, the ideal-type sect is distinguishable from the ideal-type denomination in terms of a number of divergent traits. Among these are the following: (1) recruitment primarily by conversion versus recruitment primarily by birth; (2) a rigid code of conduct coupled with excommunication of recalcitrant members versus a lax code of conduct and little or no excommunication; (3) a high degree of lay participation versus a professional clergy; (4) an attempt to minimize social distinctions among members versus acceptance of social inequality; (5) hostility or at least indifference toward secular society versus acquiescence to secular society and its values. Some of the most striking differences between sect and denomination, however, are in the areas of group identity and solidarity. In the words of Bryan Wilson (1959:4), the sect's
self-conception is of an elect, a gathered remnant, possessing special enlightenment.

The commitment of the sectarian is always more total and more defined than that of the members of other religious organizations.

[In contrast, the denomination's] self-conception is unclear and its doctrinal position unstressed; it is content to be one movement among others, all of which are thought to be acceptable in the sight of God.

Attempts to analyze the development of the Mormon church in terms of the church-sect typology have proved unsatisfactory. Throughout its history it has evidenced an unusual blend of sectlike and churchlike characteristics. For example, although early in its history it developed an elaborate and unsectlike system of social differentiation, after over 150 years of existence it still places great emphasis on religious conversion, frequently employs excommunication, and has no professional clergy. Most notable, however, is the fact that despite the assimilation of the LDS people into the economic and political systems of general American society, they have continued to maintain a strong sense of exclusive religious identity and group solidarity. Thus while lacking various characteristics that would unequivocally qualify it as a sect, the Mormon church has failed to become a denomination (O'Dea 1954; 1968:133; Wach 1944:194-96). Sidney Alstrom (1972:508) summarizes the difficulties he has encountered when attempting to characterize the nature of Mormon development as follows:

One cannot even be sure if the object of our consideration is a sect, a mystery cult, a new religion, a church, a people, a nation, or an American subculture; indeed, at different times and places it is all of these.

With attractive edifices on Brattle Street in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and in many other cities and suburbs, and with a reputation for conservatism in both personal ethics and social policy, Mormons sometimes appear to have become another white, middle-class denomination with obvious Yankee origins. Yet they remain a people apart, bound to a very distinctive tradition that was brought into the world by a most unusual man.

**Critique of the church-sect typology**

Despite the limitations of the church-sect typology when applied to the Mormon church, some of its assumptions help identify
issues relevant to the development of Mormon group identity and solidarity. The relationship that the typology posits between a religious organization's changing relationship to secular society and that organization's internal development is of particular utility. On the other hand, perhaps the greatest weakness in Niebuhr's approach is his failure to adequately analyze that relationship in terms of the particularistic values and beliefs within the religious system. He merely assumes that a religious organization's particularistic beliefs and values must inevitably dissipate when placed in contact with the pervasive power of secular society. Absent from the formulation is a consideration of the possibility that such beliefs and values can be accommodated to the religious organization's changing relationship to secular society in such a way that the members of the organization preserve a keen sense of group identity and religious exclusiveness. As Benton Johnson (1957:90) has written:

In attempting the structural analysis of a social system it is necessary to focus internally in the first instance upon the nature of its various roles. The Niebuhr formulation has not done this. Attitude toward the secular culture is at best a derivative of other beliefs that provide the actual rallying point for adherents and furnish the basis for the precipitation of a social system. Attitude toward the world refers to outer things not immediately connected with the sacred itself, which is the heart and soul of religion.

An associated issue is the position that sectarian exclusiveness is an all or nothing condition: the devotee must either feel completely apart from the rest of humanity or he will begin to lose his sectarian orientation. Thus in discussing the nature of sectarian organization, Bryan Wilson (1959:13) has written:

The group must persist in the feeling of being a people a part if it is to persist. Status must be status within the sect, and this should be the only group to which the status-conscious individual makes reference.

Wilson has correctly identified particularistic status as a key factor in the perpetuation of sectlike religious exclusiveness. It is difficult to understand, however, why such exclusiveness is predicated upon the condition that the only group status to which the individual makes reference is associated with the religious organization to which
he gives his allegiance. It is at least logically possible that a sectarian might simultaneously maintain a particularistic status within a religious organization and a more general status within the larger society of which the sect is a part. The assumption again seems to be that sectarian beliefs and values are ephemeral and inherently unstable.

Group charisma and sectarian organization

One way to focus upon the nature of religious identity, how a religious group differentiates itself in terms of that identity, and how that identity might change as the group modifies its relationship to secular society is to employ a methodology based upon a factor that Weber regarded as a distinguishing characteristic of sectarian organization but which Niebuhr essentially ignored in his presentation of the church-sect typology. Weber (1968:1164) wrote that "the church is the bearer and trustee of an office charisma, not a community of personally charismatic individuals, like the sect." In discussing religious organizations in terms of charisma, Weber seems to have gotten at the very heart of the concept of religious identity and solidarity.

Charisma, of course, is one of the central and most often referred to concepts in Weberian sociology. For Weber "charisma" essentially is the subjective understanding that an individual, institutional structure, or cultural construct is possessed of an extraordinary power or quality that is unobtainable by natural means. It is generally perceived to be of supernatural or divine origin, and even in situations where it is not understood as an actual deific manifestation, it will still maintain a religious aura (Weber 1968:215, 241, 1120, 1136, 1147).

Weber holds that when associated with individuals, there are two basic forms of charisma: personal and office. An individual imbued with "personal charisma" is understood to possess unusual qualities by virtue of his personal or individual receptiveness to supernatural influence. "Office charisma," on the other hand, adheres
to the position an individual holds and is thus independent of his personal qualifications.

Weber discusses a third form of charisma which he depicts to be a mixture between personal and office charisma. He labels this "hereditary charisma" and regards it as a product of an understanding that extraordinary and supernatural endowments can be biologically transmitted. Charisma in such a situation is seen neither as the result of personal qualities nor of official position but of filiation. Weber holds that hereditary charisma has "everywhere been the basis for the development of royal and aristocratic power" (1968:1135-39). And he regards it as an important element in clan and lineage solidarity.

In sociological literature, considerable interest has been given to the nature of group formation centered upon what might be termed "leadership charisma." In such instances individuals attach themselves to a particular leader because they perceive him to be personally endowed with charismatic qualities. Far less attention has been given to group formation derived from individuals being bound together because they perceive themselves to be mutually endowed with charisma. According to Weber (1968:1204), the perceived basis for this "group charisma" may be diverse. Within the context of sectarian organization the important thing is that it provides a boundary mechanism, separating the charismatic group from the rest of humanity. He thus writes:

The individual may be qualified as a member [of a particular sect] in various ways: by virtue of divine predestination. . . ; by virtue of the "inner light" or the ability to experience ecstatics; by virtue of the "struggle for penitence" and the resulting "breakthrough." . . . The metaphysical reasons for establishing a sect may be most diverse. Sociologically important is the fact that the community functions as a selection apparatus for separating the qualified from the unqualified.

If the charisma that the members of a sect share and in terms of which they regard themselves as distinctive might be regarded as an important basis for their group identity and solidarity, then it should be possible to examine the development of religious group identity and solidarity in terms of modifications that occur in
self-definitions of group charisma. While it might be expected that the group's changing relationship to secular society will impact upon such self-definitions, an empirical study should make no a priori assumptions regarding the nature of that impact. Such an approach would shift attention from external accommodation to internal development and modification.

Edward Shils’s concept of center and periphery

Although not concerned with religious organization per se, Edward Shils’s approach to social order presents one way in which group charisma might be analyzed. While essentially within the Weberian tradition, Edward Shils regards charisma in a somewhat different manner than did Weber. Whereas Weber held that charisma dissipates as the routinization of an institution progresses, Shils (1975:127) maintains that it persists despite the formalization of social forms. Shils indeed regards charisma as the source of social order. He defines it as "the quality which is imputed to persons, actions, roles, institutions, symbols, and material objects because of their presumed connection with 'ultimate,' 'fundamental,' 'vital,' order-determining powers" (Shils 1975:127).

Shils regards man as possessed of a pervasive and inexplicable need for order. To possess and maintain such order, individuals will willfully submit to what they perceive as the charismatic source of order and regulate their lives and social relationships according to its dictates. If a segment of a population attribute charismatic qualities to a revolutionary leader who advocates radical change, then their attachment to him might result in social disruption and conflict. Shils, however, holds that it is most common for people to perceive the entrenched aspects of their society as the source of order and will consequently voluntarily submit to its regulations.

Shils refers to the basic ordering aspects of a society as its "charismatic center." This center consists of a system of values, a supporting institutional structure, and elite personnel who occupy key institutional roles and espouse the central values. Other members of society form charismatic attachments to these central values.
institutions, and personnel. Deference is given or received among the various members of a society in terms of their perceived relative proximity to the charismatic center.

According to Shils, an integrated, well-ordered society exists only to the degree that its members form attachments to the same charismatic center and order their lives accordingly. Various conditions can militate against this. One of the most important of these is the presence of cohesive peripheral "primordial groups." A primordial group develops from connections established upon such perceived commonality as territoriality, kinship, and ethnicity (Shils 1975:20, 272).

While Shils is perhaps not as clear on this point as he might be, it appears to be completely consistent with his thinking to assume that the more cohesive primordial groups possess their own charismatic centers. To the degree that this is the case, it would be expected that members form attachments to values, institutional forms, and elite personnel that are unique to the primordial group. By so doing, they establish an exclusive pattern of deference in terms of which they order themselves in a manner distinctive from the rest of society.

It is fully possible for the members of a primordial group to have much stronger attachment to their own localized center than to the national center. To the degree that this occurs, they might best be understood as consisting of a society separate from the larger society that surrounds them. As Shils (1975:406) has written:

> The nation does not always . . . include most of the members of the state, even to the degree of intermittent citizenship. . . . Ordinary persons living in their tribal villages respond not to the charisma embodied in the national authority but to that which tradition locates in the authority of their kinship groups, in their feudal and royal rulers, and in their priests and magicians.

At the formal level, Shils's primordial group has much in common with Weber's sect. In both instances members understand themselves to be personally imbued with distinctive qualities. From a sociological perspective it seems to make little difference that the charisma embodied in Weber's sect is understood as a God-given endowment while the charisma in Shils's primordial group is grounded
in the perceived sharing of such traits as blood or territory: both provide the basis for group identity and separation from the rest of mankind.

Shils would more likely compare Weber's sect with his own formulation of a "community of believers" rather than with his concept of a primordial group. He writes that a "community of believers is a community in which the members who themselves are possessed by sacredness are attached to each other by virtue of their belief in a common relationship to the sacred (Shils 1975:20). There are two basic reasons why the Weberian sect is being compared with Shils's primordial group rather than with his community of believers. First, it facilitates comparisons with groups discussed in the ethnographic section of the Introduction. And second, one of Mormonism's most notable characteristics is the manner in which it employs what Shils would regard as primordial attachments as a means of achieving group cohesion. In Shils's terminology, Mormonism might be characterized as a community of believers bound together through perceived primordial attachments.

In neither Weber's sect nor Shils's primordial group is there a logical necessity that the sense of separation be absolute. Employing Shils's terminology, an individual may be differentially attached both to the national center and to the peripheral group of which he is a part. Indeed, it should be possible to rank any number of groups in terms of their detachment from or attachment to the national center of the state in whose boundaries they reside.

One advantage that Shils's presentation has over Weber's formulation is the assumption that charisma need not dissipate as a social system persists through time. As a result the continuance of distinctive identity and cohesiveness within a peripheral group is not problematic in his sociological approach. While it would be expected that over time the members of various primordial groups would become increasingly attached to the national center, there is no a priori assumption that this will occur in all cases. The observer is thus left free to examine the manner in which a given group reacts to the national center and the way in which its sense of distinctiveness is either enhanced or diminished.
Elaboration of Shils's approach in light of ethnographic examples

With concepts such as primordial attachment and charismatic center, Shils's approach to social order can appear vague if not mystical. It does, however, appear to have some utility for the general analysis of any group that maintains an internal pattern of social inequality that isn't completely informed by the larger national group of which it is a part. This can be illustrated by analyzing various ethnographic examples in terms of Shils's general framework. Such an examination will also permit Shils's basic model to be modified and elaborated in terms of these examples and the theoretical approaches of the investigators that initially described their various aspects.

Caribbean examples

Canameler. Considerable research has now been done on the consequence of the plantation for the social arrangements of its labor force. Sidney Mintz was one of the first anthropologists to investigate this issue in a systematic manner. In his study of the plantation at Canameler, Puerto Rico, he was interested in the process by which a "rural proletariat" developed among its labor force (Mintz 1953; 1956). He found that manager-worker relationships were highly impersonal, rates of pay were standardized, and tasks were reduced to their "simplest essentials, any job being easily learned, and any laborer therefore easily replaced" (Mintz 1953:142). In the communities that supplied the labor force for the plantation, the vast majority of the population was employed on the plantation and had control of virtually no productive property. In light of these factors, Mintz felt that it was appropriate to regard the inhabitants of these communities as forming a class isolate "in the sense that economic alternatives to wage labor in the sugar cane industry, other than via migration to the United States [were] scarce" (Mintz 1953:139-40). While the inhabitants of these communities were "ethnically heterogeneous," they displayed a high degree of "cultural homogeneity." Mintz attributed this to the fact that they occupied the same rigid class position. He thus concluded that the plantation
acted as a means of resocialization which led to a homogenous culture which was isomorphic with the class structure of the plantation.

Implying Shils's notion of center and periphery, the following tentative conclusions might be drawn about the situation at Canameler: (1) social inequality among the plantation laborers was ordered in terms of one dominate center focused upon the plantation with its distinctive values, institutions, and elite personnel; (2) the economic system was the predominate pattern in terms of which the laborers were related to the center and hierarchically ordered; and (3) the plantation system tended to erode or at least supersede any primordial type groupings that might have existed among the workers prior to their involvement in plantation labor.

Porter's Mountain and Caymanas. The significance of Mintz's work becomes more apparent when compared with other studies dealing with plantation organization. Cumper (1958), for example, made interesting comparisons between the Jamaican village of Porter's Mountain and the nearby sugar estate at Caymanas. Economic maintenance at Porter's Mountain is primarily based on the production of small farms that are owned and operated by household heads. Land is scarce and men must often seek additional wage labor on nearby sugar estates. Before young men are able to establish independent households, they often must spend considerable time engaged in wage labor at plantations and elsewhere. While doing so, however, they remain important members of household groups and periodically return to the village to assist their fathers in the cultivation of family plots. Economic arrangements at Caymanas vary sharply from those found at Porter's Mountain:

Land ownership, instead of being diffused throughout the community, is concentrated in the estate; wage work, instead of being exceptional, is almost universal; whereas the typical inhabitant of Porter's Mountain was born in or near the district and had spent his life there, more than half of the population of the Caymanas area are migrants from other parishes. (Cumper 1958:93)

While at Porter's Mountain social differentiation tends to be structured upon the basis of kinship and familial organization with
household heads occupying the key status positions, at Caymanas the dominate pattern of social inequality is derived primarily from the class structure of the plantation and in only meager ways conforms to any kinship pattern.

In the course of his paper, Cumper attempts to demonstrate that the dominate pattern of inequality at Porter's Mountain is modified at Caymanas as a response to the plantation class structure. He does this by comparing statistical data on domestic organization from the two areas and describing economic factors that might account for observable variations. He finds that at Porter's Mountain the domestic unit tends to be static with males occupying the role of household head. At Caymanas, on the other hand, domestic organization is much more unstable; and there are large numbers of households without male heads. He believes the difference to be based primarily upon the importance in Porter's Mountain of the male household head as manager of the family farm. The wife and children are dependent upon him for economic support, and the allocation of economic resources is primarily under his direction. In contrast, at Caymanas, the male household head has no control of productive property. All adult members of the household tend to be employed on the plantation and receive about the same wages. The household is thus not a unit of economic production. Its members tend to become differentiated, not upon the basis of domestic organization, but in terms of the predominate pattern of inequality centered upon the plantation.

Multiple adaptation. Comparisons between Porter's Mountain and Caymanas not only demonstrate distinctions between a pattern of social inequality based essentially upon domestic organization and one influenced heavily by plantation organization, the situations are also examples of two different forms of what Eric Wolf has referred to as "multiple adaptation" (Wolf 1959b:142-45). Wolf bases his models of multiple adaptive strategy on the position that it is possible for a human group to carry more than one culture, to diversify its approach to life, to widen its field of maneuver through a process of generalization, just as it is possible for a human group to specialize, to restrict itself to one set of cultural forms, and to eschew all possible alternatives. (Wolf 1959b:142)
The independent farmers' part-time wage laborers of Porter's Mountain typify what might be referred to as "static multiple adaptation." This type of adaptation involves the possession of at least two sets of cultural forms and thus two fields of maneuver for a better balance of chance and risk; this is discernible in areas where peasants work on plantations, and step with one foot into the plantation way of life, while keeping the other foot on the peasant holding. (Wolf 1959b:143)

Through the possession of two distinct sociocultural patterns, such individuals are adjusted both to the peasant community with its independent household production units and to the class structure of the plantation. Persons involved in static multiple adaptation are not slowly developing from peasant to rural proletariat; they are, as Sidney Mintz (1959:43) has written, in a "kind of flux equilibrium."

Many migrants that come to reside permanently at Caymanas more closely undergo a process that might appropriately be designated as "dynamic multiple adaptation."

In this kind of adaptation, the individual begins his play with one set of cultural forms. Later, he learns another through a gradual process of acculturation, and attempts--for a period--to operate with two. Gradually, however, he severs his connections with his original cultural possessions, until he finally emerges from the chrysalis of the double adaptation when his newly-won sphere of maneuver is secure. (Wolf 1959b:143)

When this type of adaption occurs within the context of a plantation type organization, it tends to result in the development of a rural proletariat.

In terms of Shils's model, Wolf's views on multiple adaptation provide insight into the manner in which individuals in peripheral groups can adjust to a more pervasive center. Through a process of dynamic multiple adaptation the peripheral group can be readily absorbed into the larger society through adopting their social forms to the predominate pattern of inequality. It is, however, possible for a condition of static multiple adaptation to occur, where members of a peripheral group in different contexts are oriented either to the national center or the localized center within the group.
Social differentiation. Such considerations appear to have application for issues concerning sectarian development. It might be posited that the members of established sects have in some manner developed a type of static multiple adaptation by virtue of which they can in one context participate in the pattern of inequality characteristic of the national system and in another context remain adapted to the localized form of sectarian organization. It is thus important to investigate what factors contribute to the development of static multiple adaptation. One key factor appears to be the maintenance of a stable pattern of hierarchy within the localized group. At Porter's Mountain this was achieved within the context of domestic organization: economic control and management was vested in the male head; other members of the household derived their position within the local community from their relationship to him.

Based upon such considerations it might be easy to adopt Marx's (1970:19-23) position that the economic system is the infrastructure for the development of all other social forms. This could explain Niebuhr's finding that sectarian organization tends to be highly unstable and that sect members readily adopt the patterns of social inequality prevalent in secular society. Thus economic accommodation results in the erosion of all other forms of distinctive group organization together with the accompanying sense of unique identity.

This position, however, should not be uncritically adopted. Although Marx regarded economic arrangements as the basis for all patterns of social inequality, Weber found such an approach unsatisfactory for his own work. As is well known, he analytically decomposed the Marxian concept of class into at least three domains or orders: power, class, and status or social honor. Weber considered power as the ability to influence through the control and potential application of coercive force. In civil societies power theoretically is monopolized by the state and is the ultimate source of both politico-legal authority and of parties developing from disputes over the control and application of that authority (Weber 1968:53-56, 284-88, 641-44). In Weber's terminology, an individual's class position is ultimately his life chances vis-a-vis the market, and all
individuals who share similar life chances are considered to belong to the same class (Weber 1968:302-5, 926-36). Weber regards status or honor as the perceived relative dignity or worth of individuals. When individuals are bound together through the common possession of equal status or honor they form what Weber terms a "status group" (Weber 1968:305-7, 926-36). Each of these three domains can be considered as forming an analytically distinctive pattern of social inequality. Thus from power results the politico-legal system, from class the economic system, and from status the deference system. While holding that there is always a complex and dynamic interrelationship among these systems, Weber maintains that this relationship changes from situation to situation and must consequently always be established by empirical investigation.

There is a general tendency to hold that at least in capitalistic societies, the economic system does indeed form the basis for the general pattern of social inequality. Thus in discussing the changes in social ordering brought about by the industrial revolution, Lloyd Fallers (1973:112) has written:

When work remained essentially embedded within domestic or wider kinship structures, it was but one among a total bundle of features upon which the position of the group in the stratification system depended... The development of distinct occupational structures--and also of extradomestic educational structures with the capacity to train persons for occupational roles--broke up this nexus--set occupational roles free to become the principal focus and determinate of stratificatory position.

East Indians and Negroes in rural Guyana. In view of the centrality generally given to economic class in discussions dealing with social inequality, it becomes particularly important to examine possible instances in capitalistic societies of systems of inequality based upon understandings of status honor essentially independent of economic or political systems. Work done by Raymond T. Smith and Chandra Jayawardena in rural Guyana illustrates one possible pattern of this type. When the work of these two men is considered in union, it provides interesting insight into the differential effects of national economic and political patterns on the domestic organization of East
Indian and Negro households (Jayawardena 1960; 1962; Smith, Raymond T. 1953; 1956; 1957; 1959 passim; 1963 passim; Smith, Raymond T. and Jayawardena 1958; 1959). In rural Guyana Negroes and East Indians belong to the same general economic class. This class has similar economic characteristics to the rural proletariat at Canameler: the large majority of East Indians and Negroes are involved in essentially nondifferentiated wage labor through involvement in work on plantations or in mining enterprises. As a result, in these communities there is little social differentiation among adult males as a consequence of occupation and economic variation. Likewise, within the context of larger Guyanese society, there is little status differentiation among either East Indians or Negroes: both are allocated their status positions essentially upon the basis of race.

It would be expected that such factors would lead to the homogenization of culture such as that observed by Mintz at Canameler and to the instability of domestic organization such as that analyzed by Cumper at Caymanas. In reality, this proves to be the case for the Negroes to a much higher degree than it is for the East Indians. The reason for this difference appears to be that the East Indians are involved in an internal system of hierarchy that is distinct from the national pattern of inequality and which is not immediately reducible to economic factors. This pattern of inequality involves distinctive Hindu values and is maintained by localized institutional systems in which elite personnel occupy central positions and exemplify the values in terms of which East Indian distinctiveness is given expression.

Much of characteristic East Indian culture is centered upon the household head, and he has principal responsibility "for keeping the family within the Indian group by initiating and participating in Indian rituals" (Jayawardena 1960:78). This situation gives prominence to the male head in ways distinct from his class, power, and status positions in wider Guyanese society. Thus, as Raymond T. Smith (1963:42-43) has written:

The role of husband-father among Indians is defined in a quite different way to its definition in the rest of society. A household which does not have a man to represent it in community
affairs, in religious organizations and at rites-de-passage is socially deficient. The authority and status of the husband-father within the family does not depend solely upon his ability to provide for his family and to achieve a certain standard of consumption, nor does it depend upon his ability to participate in activities characteristic of higher class groups; it depends upon his ability to represent his family within the Indian community and its specialized associations.

The specialized role of husband-father among East Indians is to a degree at odds with the economic forces of wider Guyanese society. As Jayawardena (1962:64) views the situation, for East Indians in rural Guyana "economic and cultural influences flow in opposite directions." Yet while this strain contributes to conflict within the household, East Indian domestic organization derives considerable solidarity from the status of the household head. The resulting pattern of inequality within the individual domestic unit, as well as among domestic units that differentially participate in localized patterns of inequality, militates against many of the forces that tend toward the development of a rural proletariat.

Within the context of Shils's model, the East Indians of rural Guyana appear to demonstrate a situation in which a peripheral group has been able to establish a pattern of inequality that centers upon a local charismatic center with its distinctive values, institutions, and elite personnel. That center is in some ways at odds with the pattern of inequality that is centered in the national system. This results in various conflicts, but the localized system appears stable and capable of maintaining itself. It might thus be tentatively concluded that even in a capitalistic society, static multiple adaptation need not be based primarily upon economic factors.

Mesoamerican examples

Indian communities in Guatemala provide other useful examples of forms of adaptation that might occur between the pattern of inequality centered upon a national center and that based upon a localized system of hierarchy. In the early colonial period, numerous communities or "municipios" were established for the settlement of Indian populations in Guatemala's western highlands. Through royal
decree, each community was "granted a legal charter, equipped with a communal treasury and administrative center, and connected with one of the newly established churches" (Wolf 1965:88). Associated with the municipio was a track of ejido land over which the members of the community had joint rights and which its members could cultivate to provide for their economic necessities. Although officers of the crown retained the right to decide major disputes and to try serious criminals, local Indian leaders had authority to settle minor contentions. While their decisions were expected to be in accordance with Spanish law, they were given wide latitude to administer their affairs in accordance with local tradition (Wolf 1959a:212-14). Even though Indians had to pay tribute to the crown and to leave their communities periodically to provide labor for their Spanish overlords, affairs within the communities were mainly under local Indian jurisdiction.

Through the years there developed within the Indian communities local status systems that are generally referred to as civil-religious hierarchies. While there was variation among these localized hierarchies, their basic characteristics remained essentially the same throughout the region. In each community religious and civil tasks were performed by functionaries who held distinct and specific offices. These offices were arranged in an hierarchical order; and the higher the office a man held, the more prestige accrued to him and to the other members of his household. At least part of this prestige resulted from the economic sacrifice entailed in the assumption of office. The incumbents of higher offices often not only had insufficient time to pursue meaningful economic activities, but they also had to make large monetary contributions for the performance of fiestas and for other obligations associated with their particular offices. The operation of this system appears to have resulted in at least as stable and cohesive a pattern of localized inequality as that found among the East Indian villages of Guyana. Manning Nash has thus described how, by means of the localized civil-religious hierarchy, the various households in each community were ranked upon the basis both of importance of current offices that household members were holding and of each
household's total previous service. He feels justified in taking the position that "the civil-religious hierarchy is the means by which the families of the municipio are tied together into a single social structure" (Nash, Manning 1958:68).

Similar to the manner in which Guyanese East Indians retain their distinctive ethnic customs and values through the husband-father's enactment of vital rituals, the peculiar Indian cultures of western Guatemala to a large measure were preserved through the performance of rituals associated with various offices in the civil-religious hierarchies. As has been described by various investigators (La Farge 1947; La Farge and Byers 1931; Nash, June 1968; Oakes 1951; Siegel 1942; Smith, Waldemar Richards 1973; Snyder and Rosales 1972; Tax 1937; 1939; 1941; 1946; Wagely 1949; Wolf 1957), each municipio had a different set of rituals, dances, clothing, and beliefs. In terms of such differences, Indian distinctiveness among the different municipios was conserved. To a large degree it was the holders of office that have enacted the rituals and maintained the distinctive traditions.

The Indian municipios of western Guatemala thus appear to present an excellent example of Shils's notion of peripheral groups. While there is indeed a Guatemalan national center with its values, institutions, and elite, the Indian municipios have developed smaller localized centers with their own systems of deference, values, personnel, and institutions.

Recent political events have greatly facilitated anthropologists' attempts to investigate the consequence of the civil-religious hierarchies for the maintenance of cultural distinctiveness in Indian municipios. Beginning in the colonial period, Indians have periodically left their municipios to work as laborers on large agricultural estates. By the early 1960s some 300,000 to 400,000 Indians were involved in such migratory labor practices (Fletcher et. al. 1970:50): this probably amounts to about one-half of the active labor force in the region (Smith, Carol Ann 1972:42). Through such an extended period of involvement in seasonal plantation labor, a well-developed pattern of static multiple adaptation evidently evolved. Although while away from their
municipios Indians participated in the class structure of the plantations, upon their return to their natal municipios they seem to have readily returned to the localized status system centered in the civil religious hierarchies.

In recent years, however, this pattern has experienced important modifications in some municipios. These alterations were initiated by political changes exerted by the national center. Beginning in the 1930s the national government began exercising more direct control over political affairs in the Indian municipios (Adams, Richard 1972:5). One consequence was that municipio leaders could no longer compel unwilling nominees to hold positions in the civil-religious hierarchy (Nash, Manning 1955:27). The traditional status system was even more seriously undermined after the 1944 revolution. Under the new constitution, higher-level civil offices in all municipios were to be elective, and national backed political parties increased the competitive nature of elections. Men who had gained prestige through advancing through the ranks of the civil religious hierarchies rarely participated in the promotion of these parties. Party leaders were generally younger Ladinoized men who received their support mainly from the dissatisfied element of the community. As a result, men with neither age nor experience came to hold prominent civil offices in many municipios (Adams, Richard 1964:55-56).

Although in more recent years, the central government has been much less eager to politicize the Guatemalan Indians, the political organization has been considerably changed from the form that it had before the 1930s. Such modifications have resulted in important alterations in the localized civil-religious hierarchies. The impact has varied from municipio to municipio. In some Indian communities there has been an almost complete abandonment of the graded offices associated with the civil-religious hierarchy. In other communities these offices have persisted, and they continue to provide the basis for a localized system of status differentiation. As indicated in Waldemar Richards Smith's (1973) doctoral dissertation, Indians in those communities that have abandoned the structure of the civil-religious hierarchy have tended to give up many of their
distinctive customs and practices and have developed many of the characteristics of a rural proletariat. In those communities where the offices of the civil-religious hierarchy have persisted, however, the Indians have held much more tenaciously to their traditional practices and the diacritical markers in terms of which they differentiate themselves as unique and distinct from other Indian communities.

Summary of ethnographic examples

Data from the Caribbean and from western Guatemala seem to isolate certain factors that are important if a peripheral group is to preserve a strong sense of group identity and solidarity. The group must have a distinctive center, with its own values, institutions, and elite personnel. Associated with this center it is vital that there is a pattern of social deference, or status inequality, in terms of which the members of the group are oriented toward the center. While economic inequality and control might be an important basis for the establishment of this pattern, it does not appear to be completely vital. Through a process of multiple adaptation, it is possible for the members of the group to be differentially involved in both the localized pattern of inequality and in a more general national pattern. The group can eventually lose all sense of distinctiveness and become completely absorbed into the national system. It is possible, however, for members of a peripheral group to achieve a type of static multiple adaptation that can result in the preservation of both the localized peripheral group and the larger society. And finally, the national center can exert various degrees of pressure upon the localized center to which it must adapt itself if it is to persist through time. If this adaptation is not successful, the peripheral group will cease to exist as a distinctive entity.

There appears to be no logical reason why the same general framework could not be applied to the investigation of the group development of a religious organization within the context of general American society. Like a village of East Indian plantation laborers in rural Guyana or an Indian municipio in the highlands of western
Guatemala, such an organization might be regarded as a peripheral group embedded in a larger society. The internal system of the organization could be investigated in terms of its distinctive values, institutional structure, elite personnel, together with the resulting pattern of social inequality. The pattern of adaptation adopted by the members of the group could be examined as they attempt to differentially relate themselves to both the national system and the local centers. The various pressures exerted by the national center could be analyzed together with the ways in which the peripheral group accommodates itself to those pressures as it persists through time. Such an approach would require considerable more analysis than does the standard church-sect typology. Its application, however, could provide a more complete analysis of the development of religious organization, bring such an examination more closely in line with more general studies of group formation, and help resolve issues dealing with the relationship between social inequality and group solidarity.

General consideration of Mormon group identity and solidarity in terms of theoretical issues thus far discussed

Group charisma

As is well known, leadership charisma has played a significant role in the development of the Mormon church. Max Weber (1968:242) regards its founder, Joseph Smith, as an important example of charismatic authority. He was perceived by his followers as "a seer, a translator, a prophet, an apostle of Jesus Christ" (DC 21:1) who had received priesthood authority by angelic administration and obtained divine authorization to establish "the only true and living church upon the face of the whole earth" (DC 1:30) and who was in almost constant communication with Deity regarding the management of that organization. Less widely understood is the degree to which his fellow Mormons regarded themselves to be personally endowed with charismatic qualities that differentiated them from the rest of mankind. While Joseph Smith was the Lord's prophet, the Mormon group as a body was the Lord's people. As such their religious qualifications were not understood merely in terms of their association with Joseph Smith.
The emphasis that Mormon ideology has placed on the distinctive qualities of the LDS people adds complexity to any consideration of the routinization of charisma within the LDS church. At issue is not merely how the charismatic attributes that qualified Joseph Smith as a leader were transmitted to his successors and transformed into more stable organizational forms as the Mormon church persisted through time. Of equal importance is the manner in which the perceived charismatic capabilities of the rank and file membership of the Church were adapted to changing circumstances. A discussion of the development of Mormon leadership charisma devoid of any consideration of modifications in Mormon group charisma would result in a distorted and inadequate presentation of the nature of the Mormon church as an institution.

Mormon group charisma appears to be consistent both with the concept of shared charisma which Weber identified as characteristic of sectarian organization and with the notion of order-producing charisma that Shils regards as essential to social cohesion. In line with the Weberian view, members of the Mormon group believe themselves to be individually possessed of God-given qualities not shared by mankind in general. Congruent with Shils's formulation, this charisma appears to be a basic source of order within the Mormon church and is manifest in particularistic values, unique elite personnel, and localized institutional and deference systems. Whether Mormon group charisma has dissipated over the years, as Weber would hypothesize, or has persisted in the routinized mechanisms of the Mormon church, as Shils would suggest, should be resolved through empirical investigation rather than a priori assumption.

Covenant order and social inequality

The distribution of charismatic qualities among members of the LDS church in large measure is given expression in terms of a system of covenantal relationships. Through the establishment of various covenants Mormons perceive themselves to be individually linked to Deity, to the Mormon group as a whole, and to particular and specific fellow Mormons. Although every individual within the Mormon group is
included in the covenant system, not all participate equally. As a consequence, the covenantal system forms the basis for a pattern of social inequality within the Mormon group.

During the course of the history of the Church, the covenantal system has undergone a number of significant and pervasive changes. As a result, the Mormon pattern of inequality has experienced important modifications. From the earliest years of the Church's existence, however, at least one aspect of the covenant system has remained intact: the various members of the Mormon family have been subordinately linked to the husband/father while the husband/father in turn has been linked to the Mormon hierocracy. The position of the husband/father within the Mormon covenant system allows that system to be structurally compared with the patterns of social inequality at Porter's Mountain, Jamaica, among East Indians in rural Guyana, and in traditional Indian municipios in Guatemala's western highlands.

At different points in its development the Church's covenantal system has provided the basis for the distribution of various resources and qualities among the members of the Mormon group. At times it acquired the aspects of an economic system through its employment in the allocation of real property within the Church. At other times it manifest markedly political aspects by being conceptualized as a system of governance that could ensure the existence of the Mormon group independent of the political system of the United States. Throughout the history of the Church, however, the covenant system has been central to the distribution of social honor within the Mormon group. In terms of Weber's tripartite division of social stratification, therefore, it might best be regarded predominately as a status system. As such it provides an interesting example of the interplay between a localized status system and more general economic and political forces.

The Mormon church as a peripheral group within American society

In important respects early Mormonism fits Shils's notion of a peripheral group. Organized in upstate New York and with a membership initially consisting almost exclusively of native-born United States
citizens, the Church was clearly a feature of American society. Throughout the early decades of its existence, however, its membership sought repeatedly to isolate themselves from their fellow Americans and to create a discrete society centered upon Mormon particularistic values and institutions. Nineteenth-century Mormonism did not represent the type of peripheral group with which Shils generally deals: a primordial group who has become encompassed by an expanding state. Rather (consistent with one standard definition of the religious sect) it was an association of individuals who by conscious choice were attempting to withdraw from the larger society in which they were born. Despite this difference, the basic tension within the Mormon community was identical to that described by Shils for the peripheral groups that he has examined: the difficulty arising from attempting simultaneously to relate oneself both to a localized group and to a national society that encompasses that group but does not completely inform its values and institutions.

While Mormon group identity and solidarity were given expression in terms of the Church's covenantal system, attempts by Mormons actually to separate themselves from the rest of American society took a number of forms. These strategies, involving varying combinations of economic, political, and geographic isolation, shared a common fate; conflict followed by capitulation of the Mormon group to the national system.

Mormon attempts at economic, political, and geographic isolation now appear to be things of the past. And by almost any conceivable measure the Mormon church of today is much less of a peripheral group than it was a century ago. It might thus be argued that the overall development of the Mormon church has followed a course of "dynamic multiple adaptation" in terms of which it has increasingly been assimilated into general American society. One feature of contemporary Mormonism that prevents an unequivocal acceptance of this position is the persistence of a strong sense of distinctive identity and group solidarity: despite evidence to the contrary, Mormons continue to perceive themselves to be unique and distinctive from the other members of American society.
When the basic focus of analysis is shifted from Mormon attempts at achieving isolation to the nature and development of the Mormon covenant system, a rather different interpretation of the evolution of Mormon group organization becomes possible. Consistent with Niebuhr's formulation, during the course of its development the Mormon church has accommodated itself to various forms of social inequality prevalent in secular society. The external conflicts and internal disruptions that generated and accompanied these accommodations, however, also resulted in modifications in the group's covenant system. It might be argued that such modifications facilitated the perpetuation of Mormon group identity and solidarity within a context of flux and rapid change. In terms of Mormon self-definitions and internal cohesion, Mormon group development appears to have been characterized more by static multiple adaptation than by dynamic multiple adaptation.

A close analogy is the case of East Indians in rural Guyana. Both Mormons and East Indians are currently politically, economically, and geographically integrated into the national societies in which they reside. Despite this, both groups have perpetuated a well-defined localized status system focused upon particularistic values and institutions. In both instances this localized status system has had important consequences for the preservation of distinctive group identity and solidarity. It is in terms of this system that the Mormons, as Sidney Ahlstrom (1972:508) has termed it, "remain a people apart."

Basic Theoretical Approach

Basic Assumptions

In this dissertation the position will be taken that the best perspective from which to analyze the apparent incongruity that existed between nineteenth-century Mormonism and general American society is through focusing upon the covenantal system in terms of which Mormon identity and solidarity were given concrete expression. Mormon struggles to achieve economic, political, and geographic isolation might be understood as attempts to establish conditions
consistent with the ideological underpinnings of the covenant system. While Mormon efforts to establish isolation were critical in the development of Mormonism, they did not represent for the LDS people the fundamental raison d'être of the Church. Mormon identity and solidarity could thus persist despite abandonment of such plans and the consequent radical changes in the Church's position vis-a-vis general American society. To again cite Benton Johnson (1957:90): "Attitude toward the secular culture is at best a derivative of other beliefs that provide the actual rallying point for adherents and furnish the basis for the precipitation of a social system."

The investigation of this issue will entail a diachronic analysis of the interrelationship among Mormon covenant organization, Mormon group identity and solidarity, and Mormon interaction with general American society. In order to facilitate such an analysis, several assumptions will be made: first, that the Mormon church is a peripheral group within American society, characterized by localized values, elite personnel, and institutional arrangements that are not completely informed by more general American society; second, that identity and solidarity within the Mormon group in large measure are achieved through the Church's covenant system, which is centered upon the Mormon group's particularistic values, institutions, and elite personnel, which provides the basis for a localized pattern of deference and which establishes a mechanism in terms of which Mormons can relate themselves to the Mormon church in contrast to the national society in which they also participate; third, that modifications which have occurred in the covenant system might be characterized as adjustments necessitated by the Mormon group's changing relationship to secular society; and fourth, that the Church's covenantal system has facilitated the preservation of Mormon group cohesion within a context of flux and change.

The body of the dissertation will be involved with the analysis of a large body of data in terms of these assumptions. Except for information on historical background, most material to be examined will be from primary sources. Data will be drawn from a number of different types of texts. Among these will be the following: Mormon scriptures; discourses and authoritative statements
by prominent Mormon leaders; Mormon periodicals; various publications by believing Mormons, apostates, and non-Mormons; diaries; autobiographies; and letters. One reason for such a diversity of sources is that statements dealing with Mormon covenant organization are widely scattered and have never been systematically presented in a single type of text. It is therefore necessary to consult a number of different types of material to gain an adequate understanding of the full scope of Mormon covenant organization. Once this detailed analysis has been completed, the concluding chapter will examine the consistency between the assumptions and the nature of covenant organization as examined in the body of the dissertation. If the assumptions are substantiated then there should be good reason to suppose both that the conceptual framework provides a valid method in terms of which to examine Mormon group identity and solidarity and that covenant organization has had considerable importance for the development and maintenance of cohesion within the Mormon group.

Method for analyzing Mormon covenant organization

One of the most difficult methodological issues that this approach entails centers upon the proper way in which to describe the structure of Mormon covenant organization. There are various reasons for this difficulty. First, as the focal point of analysis, Mormon covenant organization must be described in such a way that its relationship both to Mormon-Gentile interactions and to Mormon group identity and solidarity are readily apparent. Second, Mormon covenant making is intimately related to a wide range of Mormon beliefs and practices. The consequences of Mormon covenant making for Mormon group identity and solidarity become fully intelligible only when examined within the context of these beliefs and practices. Third, although covenant making pervades Mormon thought and practice, covenant relationships are not discussed by Mormons as components in a discrete unitary system. In order to examine the Mormon covenant system per se, it is necessary to devise a method to describe a number of seemingly diverse covenantal beliefs and practices in terms of shared structural properties. And fourth, since Mormon covenantal
belief and practices have been modified in important ways during the course of the Church's existence, the covenantal system must be analyzed in such a way that its similarities and differences in various historical periods become readily apparent.

These difficulties will be resolved by analyzing Mormon covenant organization in terms of two different but compatible approaches. First, within various specific contexts and historical periods, all Mormon covenant beliefs and practices will be described in terms of a small number of interrelated elements. And second, the Mormon covenant system will be compared and contrasted with the New England Puritan system in terms of these same elements.

Elements to be analyzed in the Mormon covenant system

The elements in terms of which Mormon covenant organization will be analyzed have been selected because of their relevance to the specific theoretical concerns of this dissertation. Although generally based on rather simple and straightforward considerations, they should not be regarded as having any necessary application for the analysis of social inequality in general or the development of religious systems in particular. Each of the elements fits the following criteria. First, it both was an aspect of Puritan covenant structure and has persisted as a feature of Mormon covenant organization throughout the development of the Church. Second, it provides the means for discussing aspects of Mormon covenant organization in terms of other Mormon beliefs and practices. Third, it facilitates an analysis of the contribution that covenant making has had for Mormon group identity and solidarity. Fourth, when considered in consort with the other basic elements in terms of which Mormon covenant making will be analyzed, it allows Mormon covenant organization to be regarded as a unitary system. And fifth, it provides a basis for discussing changes that have occurred in that system during the course of the Church's changing relationship to general American society.

The basic elements in terms of which Mormon covenant organization will be analyzed are as follows: (1) mythological
underpinnings; (2) distribution or power; (3) bases of covenantal relationships; (4) ordering of covenantal relationships; (5) and encompassment.

Mythological underpinnings. The term myth as employed in this dissertation will have essentially the same meaning as that proposed by Bronislaw Malinowski. As is well known Malinowski (1954:148) regarded as myth any sacred narrative that imbues a social institution or ritual with cosmic significance by identifying it with events that putatively occurred in a primordial or other-worldly existence. The myths with which this dissertation will be primarily concerned are those associated with Mormon covenantal practice. Unlike myths in preliterate societies that appear to have slowly developed during an indefinite past, Mormon covenantal myths are grounded in sacred texts and other authoritative statements that Mormons believe were revealed to Joseph Smith.

Mormonism’s initial covenantal myth was contained in the pages of the Book of Mormon. Consistent with this text, Mormon identity became that of Israel who was gathering in the latter-days to qualify for the blessings promised to the righteous descendants of the biblical patriarch Abraham. As Mormonism developed, its covenantal myths became more elaborate. To the Abrahamic myth was added both the notion of an organizing council among the spirits of men prior to the creation of the world and the instigation of a patriarchal order in the days of Adam. Reflective of these elaborations, the Mormon covenantal system became viewed as the embodiment of these primordial patterns as well as the establishment of a societal order that would exist among the righteous in heaven.

The distribution of power. Within the context of Mormon covenantal organization, power will be regarded as the ability to establish and regulate covenant relationships. Such power is understood as an aspect of priesthood, a charismatic quality possessed exclusively by properly ordained Mormon males. Those who have received priesthood power constitute a hierarchically ordered hierocracy that is centered upon the person of the president of the
Church. Through the reception of proper priesthood "keys," members of the hierocracy are empowered either to perform particular covenantal rituals or to regulate the conduct of given individuals who have participated in these rituals. Much of Mormon group solidarity can be understood in terms of the interrelationship between hierocratic organization and the network of covenantal ties.

**Bases of covenantal relationships.** The term "bases of covenantal relationships" has reference to the attributes shared by individuals linked through covenantal ties. It has long been commonplace in anthropological investigation to assume that an important basis for group solidarity is derived from the perceived sharing of attributes. When analyzing Semitic social organization in the late 1800s, William Robertson Smith (1897; 1903) distinguished between natural relationships based on the perceived sharing of blood and covenant relationships based on legally defined rights and duties. About the same time, Emile Durkheim (1964) differentiated between the condition of mechanical solidarity grounded in the similarity among members of a group and organic solidarity grounded in the members' complementary dissimilarity. As already discussed, a short time later Max Weber (1969:1164, 1204) was to regard a fundamental aspect of the religious sect as the common possession of personal charisma.

After careful consideration it has been decided that the dichotomization between the orders of law and nature that David Schneider (1968; 1969; 1972) contends permeates American culture will provide the most useful model in terms of which to analyze the bases of relationships within the Mormon covenantal system. Perhaps the most obvious reason for this is that Mormon covenant organization is presented in an essentially kinshiplike idiom, while its basic relationships appear familylike in nature. It thus becomes possible to discuss normative and substantive aspects of those relationships in much the same way that Schneider has analyzed American kinship and family structure.

Although aspects of Schneider's model will be employed in this dissertation, it should not be assumed either that all qualities
believed to be shared by participants in the covenant system can be neatly classified as aspects either of the order of nature or the order of law or that the pattern of relationships within the Mormon covenant system is completely isomorphic with American kinship and familial structure. Pertinent to the issue of Mormon group identity and solidarity are the ways in which Mormon covenant relationships are both similar to and deviant from American kinship ties. One way to approach this subject is by first analyzing such relationships in terms of categories that have already been employed to describe American kinship and then comparing and contrasting these relationships with American kinship bonds as indicated by such categories.

The ordering of covenantal relationships. The ordering of covenantal relationships refers to the differential positioning of individuals who are linked together within the covenantal system. Most such relationships have two basic characteristics: inequality and affirmative opposition. By inequality is simply meant that when two individuals are linked through covenantal ties, one occupies a superordinate position and the other a subordinate position. Affirmative opposition denotes the condition that each of the two positions thus conjoined derives its significance within the system from its relationship to the other.

The nature of these two characteristics becomes more apparent when it is realized that the basic relationships within the covenantal system are husband-wife and parent-child. Thus husband is superordinate to wife and parent to child. Likewise, the significance of a husband within the system is derived from his relationship to his wife, and parents from their relationship to their children.

One thing that prevents such linkages from being simply expressions of the American familial order is the manner in which this pattern is employed to integrate individuals into the Mormon group. To be a fully participating member of the Mormon community, both husband and wife and parents and children must be linked through covenantal rituals unique to the Mormon church. Furthermore, no fully qualified individual within the community can be a member at large.
It is essential that he or she be linked by covenantal rituals to particular parents, to a particular spouse, and to particular children. The instigation of such procedures establishes a well-defined pattern of social inequality within the Mormon group.

**Encompassment.** As employed in this dissertation, the term encompassment denotes the process by which one system is subsumed by another. In terms of Mormon group solidarity, the most important issues of encompassment involve the subordination of the covenant system to the ecclesiastical system. In the early days of Mormonism the principal basis for such encompassment was the covenantal tie between the male household head and the bishop as representative of the hierocracy. In later years it became focused more upon the manner in which Mormon men simultaneously operated both as family heads and as members of the hierocracy. Both methods of encompassment resulted in the integration of the Mormon family into the Church's covenantal system and the establishment of the position of husband/father as fundamental to Mormon group integration.

**Puritanism and Mormonism**

Comparative analysis is one of the most long established approaches in anthropological research. In this dissertation various comparisons will be made between New England Puritanism and Mormonism as a way of elucidating aspects of Mormon covenant organization. Besides the possible light that such an approach might shed on the historical relationship between Puritanism and Mormonism, there are two basic reasons why such analysis should be valuable: (1) the comparability between the two covenant systems; and (2) the comparability between the historical development of the two movements.

In chapter 3 the basic historical relationship between Puritanism and Mormonism will be briefly mentioned. In comparing specific aspects of Puritan and Mormon covenant organization in the body of the dissertation, however, no attempt will be made to demonstrate any actual historical continuity between these two systems in respect to these or other specific conditions. Such comparisons
will rather be made to point out formal similarities between the two systems. Such an approach will be employed as a way to provide additional insight into the nature of Mormon covenant organization by discussing it from the perspective of another somewhat similar covenantal system. As a matter of course, such comparative analysis will suggest specific areas in which actual historical connections might be demonstrated. Such an examination, however, lies outside the scope of this dissertation.

Compatibility of the covenantal system. The Puritan system of religious beliefs is most commonly referred to as federal or covenant theology, and the concept of covenant making pervaded Puritan social organization. When Puritan and Mormon covenant beliefs and practices are discussed in tandem there are ample areas for comparison and contrast.

As in Mormonism, putative events associated with the establishment of the Abrahamic covenant provide much of the mythological underpinnings for Puritan covenant organization. There are, however, a number of important differences in how the myth is understood and employed. Puritan identification with Israel is comparative: they believe that God has established the same covenant with them as he did with ancient Israel. Mormon identification with Israel is biological: they regard themselves as the literal descendants of Abraham. For Puritans the Abrahamic covenant is one of personal sanctification and salvation. For Mormons, on the other hand, it is more birthright qualification for inclusion in the Mormon covenant community.

In the Puritan system there is authoritative power for the establishment of various covenant ties. Devoid of the Mormon concept of particularistic priesthood, however, such power resides in the local church covenant community on the one hand, and in the state on the other.

Consistent with the Mormon system, familial organization is an integral part of Puritan covenant organization. It is likewise possible to describe various aspects of Puritan covenant structure in terms of a dichotomization between the orders of nature and law.
Basic to both systems is the belief that spiritual qualities and religious qualifications are in some sense genetically transferable. While the understanding of what is thus transmitted differs in the two systems, both provide examples of what Weber refers to as "hereditary charisma."

Covenant relationships within Puritanism are likewise ordered in terms of inequality and affirmative opposition. The first concept has been traced to the medieval understanding of hierarchy, and the second to the logic of Peter Ramus. As in Mormonism such concepts result in the establishment of a hierarchically ordered status system in which ideally there are no members at large and in which each individual's position is established in terms of existent ties to other individuals to which he stands in affirmative opposition.

Finally, encompassment plays a highly significant role in the integration of the total Puritan covenant system. But whereas in Mormonism there is one basic element of encompassment that centers on the relationship between the husband/father and the hierocracy, in Puritanism there are two: the family is encompassed by the church congregation through the parents' membership in that group, while the church congregation in turn is encompassed by the state through the designation of male members of church covenant groups as freemen. As in Mormonism, however, the focal point of the process is the adult male who is simultaneously a husband/father, a member of a church covenant group, and a freeman.

Compatibility of historical development. Although the particular circumstances in which Puritanism and Mormonism evolved varied widely, there are a number of important similarities in the course of their development. They both began as unpopular religious movements that were the object of considerable persecution. They both then enjoyed a period in which they flourished amid comparative geographic and political isolation. Finally state control of the larger society was reinstated to the degree that they were forced to modify various unpopular practices. Throughout the development of both groups, modifications in the covenant systems can be interpreted as adjustments to the changing nature of the group's relationship to
the larger society of which they were a part. While it is not advisable to carry historical comparisons too far, an examination of the differences and similarities in the two covenant systems to changing historical circumstances can provide insight into the consequences of varying forms of covenant organization for group cohesion.

Conclusion

The principal subject to be investigated in this dissertation is the consequence of covenant organization for the development of Mormon group identity and solidarity. The basic approach to this problem will be to regard the Mormon church as a peripheral group within general American society and the Church's covenant organization as a status system within that group, and to analyze modifications within the covenant organization in terms of the Church's changing relationship to general American society.

Discussions dealing with the covenant system's mythological underpinnings, its distribution of power, bases of relationships, ordering of relationships, and pattern of encompassment, and the comparisons and contrasts that will be made between Mormon and Puritan covenant organization are to explicate this basic problem. While important as focal points of analysis, these elements should not be regarded in themselves as primary subjects of investigation. Although mention will be made of these elements in the dissertation and they will often be incorporated in chapter subheadings, the basic theoretical concerns of the dissertation necessitate that at various stages in the analysis they receive unequal attention and are presented in differing order, and that at times the dissertation deal with issues that are not immediately related to any one of them.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 2

Chapter 2 consists in a general examination of Massachusetts Puritan covenant organization in terms of the categories that will subsequently be employed to examine Mormon covenant organization.
After presenting an overview of Puritan covenantal myth, the Puritan household is analyzed in terms of the bases and ordering of its relationships. It is demonstrated that the husband-wife relationship is an aspect of the order of law, and the parent-child relationship that of nature. The significance of the parent-child relationship is then explored from the perspective of the belief that a form of religious qualification in the guise of federal holiness can be transmitted from parents to children. The next section analyzes the Puritan church congregation and demonstrates that the household is encompassed by the church congregation primarily through the belief that children of church members are qualified to become baptized members of the congregation by virtue of the federal holiness that they have inherited. The nature of the political community is next examined and the point is made that the church congregation is encompassed by the state in part because of the policy that only fully qualified members of church covenant groups can become freemen and hold political office. The nature of power within New England Puritanism is then analyzed and found to be primarily centered in the state. In the final section the erosion of Massachusetts covenant organization as a unified system is attributed to the loss of ability by members of church covenant groups to monopolize political power.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 is an overview of the socioreligious milieu in which Mormonism originated. There is first a discussion of the emergence of voluntaristic pluralism within American religion and of its consequences for religious group development. This is followed by a presentation of the socioreligious conditions specific to the environment of Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism. His links with both the Puritan tradition and the gospel primitivist movement are considered; and conditions in western New York, where he grew to maturity, are discussed. Finally, suggestions are made regarding the possible impact of these various factors on the emergence of Mormonism. Two basic hypotheses are set forth: (1) that a fundamental raison d'être of early Mormonism was the quest for order
amid the social and religious flux of the Second Great Awakening; and
(2) that covenant organization provided a device for the attempted
creation of that order and cohesion.

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 examines the consequences of covenant organization for
the development of Mormon group identity and solidarity between the
organization of the Church in 1830 and the expulsion of the Mormons
from the state of Missouri in the Winter of 1838-39. The chapter is
divided into two basic parts.

Part one analyzes early Mormon covenant organization as a unified
system and compares and contrasts various of its aspects with similar
elements in Puritan covenant organization. The Mormon concept of
religious power is first examined. This entails an analysis of the
Mormon notion of priesthood, including the understanding that it is
monopolized by the president of the Church and delegated by him
exclusively to properly ordained Mormon males. Next, Mormon
covenantal myth as presented in the Book of Mormon and elaborated in
early Mormon ideology is discussed. Attention is focused on the
Abrahamic covenant, the transmission of hereditary promises, and the
categorization of persons on the basis of putative descent. The bases
of covenantal relationships within early Mormonism are then analyzed.
Particular emphasis is given to the interrelationship between the
baptismal covenant as an aspect of the order of law and the concept of
putative Abrahamic descent as an aspect of the order of nature.
Central to this interrelationship is the development of the
understanding by Mormons that they are the literal descendants of
Abraham and thus entitled by hereditary right to the promises entailed
in the Abrahamic covenant. Finally, an examination is made of the
ordering of relationships and the pattern of encompassment in early
Mormon covenant organization. It is demonstrated that these aspects
of covenantal organization are primarily grounded in the concept of
territoriality manifest in the attempt to establish the New Jerusalem
in Jackson County, Missouri, and in the system of economic inequality
associated with the law of consecration and stewardship. In terms of
this system, the individual Mormon household was formally ordered in
terms of the ability of the household head to control and manage the
economic stewardship that he had received as a fully qualified member
of the Mormon group, while the household in turn was encompassed by
the hierocracy by virtue of the covenantal relationship that was
established at the time that the stewardship was granted between the
household head and the bishop of the Church.

Part two examines early Mormon covenant organization from the
perspective of the Mormon group's relationship to general American
society. It is hypothesized that fundamental both to dissension
within the Mormon group and to the Gentile-Mormon conflict was the
opposition between the individualism that characterized general
Jacksonian America and the Mormon quest for group cohesion. The
impact of this conflict upon early Mormon covenant organization is
explored. It is demonstrated how it resulted first in radical
modifications within the law of consecration and stewardship, then in
the removal of the Mormons from Jackson County, and finally in the
expulsion of the Mormons from the entire state of Missouri and in
their abandonment of the law of consecration and stewardship together
with its economic covenant as a mechanism for ordering relationships
within the Mormon group.

Chapter 5

Chapter 5 begins with an examination of the hypothesis that the
expulsion from Missouri and the abandonment of the law of consecration
and stewardship resulted in a fundamental crisis for Mormon group
cohesion. The patriarchal order, the form of covenantal organization
that emerged after the Mormons began settling in Nauvoo, Illinois, is
regarded as a response to this crisis. The body of the chapter is
essentially a synchronic analysis of the patriarchal order. It
compares and contrasts this form of covenantal organization with that
which existed prior to the Missouri expulsion.

The patriarchal order preserves the basic encompassing
relationship between hierocracy and family. The economic
relationships associated with the law of consecration and stewardship,
however, are replaced by sealing ties, while the temple together with its esoteric rituals replaces territoriality as a focal point for unity.

Sealing ties are based in explicit covenants and are believed to establish potentially eternally enduring relationships between husbands and wives and parents and children. They replicate the form of inequality associated with nineteenth-century American familial organization. They manifest various particularistic characteristics, however, not common to general American family and kinship ties.

They can only be established by especially commissioned hierocrats, are only performed for individuals who are deemed to be in compliance with the regulations of the Church, and are suspended if and when an individual is excommunicated from the Church. They thus do not manifest the fundamental enduring quality of American kinship, but as a result acquire increased capability as a mechanism for integrating the individual family into the Mormon group.

In addition, the sealing tie between husband and wife does not presuppose sexual intercourse, nor does the sealing tie between father and child presuppose the sharing of biological substance. Sealing can consequently be employed in a number of ways that would otherwise not be possible. These issues are explored in terms of the bases and ordering of relationships entailed in sealing ties.

Chapter 6

Chapter 6 begins a diachronic examination of the patriarchal order from the perspective of the internal development of the Mormon group and its changing relationship to general American society. It is divided into two basic parts.

The first part deals with the patriarchal order prior to the murder of Joseph Smith in June of 1844. The mounting insecurity that characterized the Mormon group experience during the last years of Joseph Smith's life is first examined. Within this context the patriarchal order is then interpreted as an attempt to maintain Mormon group cohesion and provide for Mormon salvation despite any eventuality. Special attention is given to the manner in which
hierocrats were ritually endowed with charismatic saving power and then became the center of salvation for other individuals by having them linked to them through the establishment of sealing ties. The introduction of polygyny during this period is interpreted in part as a means to extend the scope of such sealing networks. Women thus become intermediating links in the diffusion of salvation through sealing ties. This practice is here regarded as a mechanism to ensure the perpetuation of the Mormon group despite the possible dispersion of the Mormon people.

The second part of the chapter involves an analysis of the patriarchal order from the death of Joseph Smith until the abandonment of Nauvoo during the early months of 1846. Attention is first given to the manner in which the patriarchal order facilitated the consolidation of power in the hands of Brigham Young and his fellow apostles. Consideration is then given to the manner in which this same covenantal system was used to prepare the Mormon group for their exodus from Nauvoo and potential abandonment of the United States. Emphasis is given to the central importance of the Nauvoo temple in these developments as the location where rituals associated with the establishment of sealing ties were performed.

Chapter 7

Chapter 7 examines the development of the patriarchal order from the abandonment of Nauvoo until the early years of the twentieth century. It is divided into four parts.

Part one is a consideration of the patriarchal order between the abandonment of Nauvoo and Brigham Young's arrival in the Salt Lake Valley in the fall of 1848. Special attention is given to the practice of adoptive sealing in terms of which adult men and women became regarded as the children of hierocrats to whom they looked for economic and spiritual assistance. This practice did away with the necessity of employing women as intermediate links in the establishment of covenantal relationships between men. Adoptive sealing is interpreted both as a means of establishing solidarity within relatively small groups of individuals involved in intensive
cooperation and of integrating those groups into the larger Mormon community. It is analyzed in terms of the particular problems that the Mormon group faced during this period as a result of the migration that they were then attempting.

Part two examines the patriarchal order as it existed in Utah prior to the coming of the railroad in 1869. The geographic, economic, and political characteristics of the Mormon people during this period are first outlined. The manner in which the patriarchal order appears to have responded to these factors is then explored. Particular attention is given to the abandonment of large adoptive families and the emergence of smaller family kingdoms.

Part three is an analysis of the patriarchal order between the coming of the railroad and the abandonment of plural marriage in the early 1890s. Attention is first given to the Gentile-Mormon conflict that characterized this period of Mormon history. Responses within Mormon covenantal organization are then examined. During this period there were attempts both to revise the law of consecration and stewardship and to intensify practices associated with sealing. The first implied a renewed retreat by the Mormon people from secular society. The second at least provided the possibility of some sort of accommodation with that society. Within a short time the economic practices associated with the law of consecration and stewardship were once more abandoned and the patriarchal order remained the basic form of covenantal organization within the Church. The section ends with a discussion of the events associated with the 1890 Manifesto proscribing the practice of plural marriage and the accommodation with secular society that this entailed. Particular attention is given to the 1894 revelation directing the establishment of in-depth cross-generational sealing chains. This practice is seen as an important element in the later patriarchal order's ability to provide a symbolic basis for Mormon group cohesion while permitting Mormon families to be separately linked to the hierocracy and individually involved in the economic and political systems of American society. This is seen as expediting the integration of Mormons into general American society while still allowing them to maintain a distinctive identity and a high degree of group solidarity.
Part four presents a brief overview of the development of the patriarchal order during the twentieth century. Attention is focussed on events during the early decades of this period, although some mention is made of the significance of the patriarchal order to contemporary Mormonism.

Chapter 8

Chapter 8 examines the four assumptions that were presented in the Introduction. While so doing it summarizes the more important issues that were presented in the body of the dissertation by analyzing them in terms of the theoretical framework and categories that were identified in the Introduction. The Puritan and Mormon groups are compared and contrasted in terms of the changing relationship of each to the larger society of which it is a part. The similarities and differences between the two groups' covenant systems are discussed in terms of mythological underpinnings, the distribution of power, the bases of covenantal relationships, the ordering of covenantal relationships, and the pattern of encompassment. And finally, change and continuity within each group's covenant system are examined in terms of modifications that have occurred in each group's relationship to secular society. As a final dissertation summation, the concluding paragraphs of the chapter discuss some of the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology that has been employed in the investigation.

Literature Survey and Contributions of the Dissertation to Mormon Studies

Studies Dealing with Aspects of Mormon Covenant Organization

Despite an ever increasing body of literature concerned with the nature and evolution of Mormonism, there has been no previous attempt systematically to deal with the contribution of covenant organization for the development of Mormon group cohesion. The most obvious reason for the absence of such an examination appears to be the failure of investigators to analyze Mormon covenant organization as a unified and integrated system. This is not to say that there has
been no recognition that aspects of Mormon covenant organization contribute to Mormon group identity and solidarity. To cite but a few examples Lawrence Foster (1981:185) has written that during the Nauvoo period "Plural and celestial marriage was integrally related to other doctrines, ceremonies, and practices, including baptism for the dead and the law of adoption, which sought to irrevocably seal the loyalty of the Mormons to one another and to their Church as a literal extension of the family of God." Mark Leone (1979:39) holds that Mormon lay priesthood, "along with the idea of the family and mystical blood tie of every Mormon to ancient Israel, conceptually unifies the whole body of believers." And Bryan Wilson (1974:442) observes that "the distinctive Mormon way of life characterized by order, activism, in-group orientation, and vigorous proselyting . . . [is] re-enacted in collective and familial ritual." But despite such recognition, there is not sufficient attempt to examine how these elements interrelate. The result is a large number of studies that deal with aspects of Mormon covenant organization in isolation, but none that attempts to focus on covenant organization per se.

Most studies that have bearing on Mormon covenant organization deal with one or another of the following five topics: (1) Mormon kinship and family life; (2) beliefs and practices associated with Mormon ethnic and racial categories; (3) priesthood and Church administration; (4) Mormon communitarianism and the law of consecration and stewardship; and (5) Mormon ritual practices. While failing to deal with Mormon covenant organization in its totality, many provide important information on some of its most important features.

Kinship and family studies

By far the largest body of literature of this type is concerned with Mormon kinship and family life. Such material can be roughly subdivided between that dealing with the nineteenth-century Mormon family, and that concerned with contemporary kinship-related beliefs and practices.
Not surprisingly, studies dealing with nineteenth-century Mormon kinship and family issues (e.g. Anderson, Nels 1937; 1966: passim; Arrington 1955; 1970; 1971; Arrington and Bitton 1979:185-205; Beecher, Maureen 1983; Bishop 1981; 1982; Bitton 1977; Burgess-Olsen 1975; Cannon, C. 1974; Foster 1976; 1981; Hansen, K. 1976; 1981:147-78; Hartwig 1950; Hulett 1939; 1940; 1943; Ivins, S. 1967; ms a; Larsen H. 1954; Waspe 1942; Young, K. 1947; 1954) tend to focus on aspects of Mormon polygyny. Most are concerned with such questions as how plural marriage became established as a feature of nineteenth-century Mormonism, how Mormon polygynous households were organized; how Mormons attempted to justify the practice of plural marriage, and the relationship between plural marriage and various Mormon-Gentile conflicts.

Most studies dealing with contemporary Mormon kinship and family beliefs and practices (e.g. Anderson, C. 1967; Christensen, H. 1958; 1960; 1963; 1966; 1976; Christensen, H. and Cannon 1964; Christensen H. and Carpenter 1962; Christopherson 1953; 1956; Dehart 1941; Kunz 1963; 1964; Mauss 1976; Nelson 1952; Pitcher 1974; Smith, Wilford 1976; Strodtbeck 1950; 1951; Veron 1965; Wise and Carter 1965) are attempts to compare and contrast Mormon domestic-related behavior with that which exists in general American society or in other specified groups. Each study tends to focus on a particular issue; and such topics as sex role differentiation, fertility rates, generational relationships, and premarital and extramarital sexual practices are explored.

From the perspective of this dissertation, the greatest limitation of such investigations might be clarified by briefly examining a recent study by Lawrence Foster (1981). Foster is concerned with the origins and early development of Mormon plural marriage. He has probably produced the best study dealing with this topic. He has carefully analyzed primary source material. He has compared and contrasted Mormon beliefs and practices with those of the Shakers and Oneida Perfectionists. He has discussed the three groups in terms of the general American sociocultural milieu of the period, and he has analyzed his findings in terms of a general developmental model based on Victor Turner's concept of liminality. His emphasis,
however, is on the family rather than on the Mormon group. Therefore, although the study provides interesting insights into such issues as sex roles and the control of sexuality, it has little to say about the ways in which plural marriage was an aspect of a larger system in terms of which Mormon group cohesion was maintained.

**Ethnic and racial categories**

Among the studies that in one way or another touch upon Mormon ethnic and racial categorization (e.g. Brewer, D. 1966; 1968; 1970; Bush, L. 1973; Dolgin 1974; Glanz 1963; Mauss 1966; 1968; 1981; Taggart 1970), by far the most vigorously pursued topic is the nature of Mormon beliefs and practices relative to blacks. Some work has also been done, however, on Mormon relations to Jews, Amerindians, and Polynesians. In terms of the theoretical interests of this dissertation, the greatest weakness with these studies is the tendency to deal exclusively with Mormon behavior towards a single group rather than analyze the general principles underlying Mormon ethnic and racial categorization per se.

One exception to this general tendency is Janet Dolgin's (1974) approach to Mormon identity. Employing methods developed by David Schneider for the analysis of American kinship, she attempts to examine Mormon identity in terms of the manner in which Mormons classify Negroes, Amerindians, and individuals of European descent. While the article suffers from a lack of historical depth as well as from Dolgin's inadequate grasp of Mormon ideology, it does demonstrate the value that can be gained from considering Mormon beliefs and practices toward one particular racial or ethnic grouping in terms of a general Mormon system of categorization.

**Priesthood and Church administration**

For the purposes of this dissertation, the most useful studies dealing with the subject of Mormon priesthood organization are D. Michael Quinn's (1973, 1974, 1976a; 1976b; 1984) painstaking investigations regarding the development of the presiding quorums of
the Church and of the interrelationships among the men who have occupied positions in these quorums. One weakness in these studies is Quinn's failure to place more emphasis on the relationship between developments within the presiding quorums of the Church and the evolution of the Mormon group as a whole. A reading of Quinn's work could leave one with the impression that conditions such as the tendency toward "dynasticism" were peculiar to the presiding officers of the Church and not general throughout the Mormon population as aspects of patriarchal authority per se.

Mormon communitarianism and the law of consecration and stewardship

The most important works dealing with Mormon communal activity are a series of studies written by Leonard Arrington either singly or in collaboration with others (Arrington 1951; 1953; 1958; Arrington, Fox and May 1976). While providing excellent information on Mormon economic organization, for the purposes of this dissertation, a shortcoming in these studies is their failure to analyze the structural consistency between the covenantal arrangements associated with the law of consecration and stewardship and those established in relations with the patriarchal order. As a result there appears to be a greater dissimilarity between early and later Mormon forms of association than is actually the case.

Mormon ritual practices

In recent years three excellent studies have been produced on Mormon ritual practices. Gordon Irving (1974) links the ritual of adoptive sealing with earlier Mormon beliefs and practices and concisely traces its development through the 1894 Woodruff revelation. David Buerger (1983) links the ritual of second anointing to various Puritan beliefs and practices and traces its development to the present time. And Andrew Ehat (1982) discusses various aspects of the Nauvoo temple ritual complex within the context of historical developments of the Nauvoo period. Each of these studies might be faulted in certain details. From the perspective of this
dissertation, however, the major limitation is their failure to adequately discuss these rituals in terms of their consequence for Mormon group identity.

Interpretations of Mormon Group Development

There has been little attempt to deal with Mormon group development in a systematic matter. The most commonly occurring forms of Mormon history are (1) general presentations with little attempt at interpretation, (2) biographies of prominent Mormon leaders, and (3) analyses of particular institutions and practices. Perhaps the two most widely accepted ideas about Mormon group development are (1) that over the years the Mormon group has become increasingly absorbed into mainstream American society, and (2) that the two most radical changes in the nature of the Mormon group were associated with expulsion from Missouri and the 1890 manifesto proscribing the practice of plural marriage.

Probably the two most concerted efforts to analyze the development of the Mormon group have been Thomas O'Dea's (1957) *The Mormons* and Mark Leone's (1979) *The Roots of Modern Mormonism*. They differ widely in their approach.

O'Dea

O'Dea was highly influenced by the theoretical concerns of the Harvard Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures Project. Consistent with the guiding methodological approach of this project, he tends to analyze Mormonism in terms of core values and institutional arrangements associated with these values. Historical development is discussed in terms of the resolution of dilemmas generated by conflicting values and institutional arrangements either within Mormonism itself or between Mormonism and general American society. While this approach identifies key sources of stress and strain in the Mormon group experience, there is little or no effort to examine relationships among the dilemmas discussed. The result is a rather fragmented analysis.
Mark Leone's work on the development of the Mormon group has been highly influenced by Robert Bellah's (1970:20-45) typology of religious evolution and by Roy Rappaport's (1968) work on the relationship between religion and economics in New Guinea social organization. His main interest lies in analyzing how Mormon group cohesion has persisted despite the changing economic context in which the Church has existed. Explicitly employing a materialistic perspective, he holds that actual group distinctiveness must be grounded in economic separation and in the ability of the group to monopolize and successfully manage material resources. He maintains that these conditions characterized the Mormon group during the years in which it was colonizing the Great Basin. According to his view, however, the Mormons subsequently lost economic self-sufficiency and were reduced to a "colonial" status vis-a-vis American society at large. With the erosion of economic boundaries it would be expected that the Mormons would cease to regard themselves as a distinctive people. He holds that this has not occurred because they have been able to replace the economic boundaries with pseudo or physical boundaries that are not grounded in material reality.

Leone's book suffers from at least two major weaknesses, both of which appear to be products of his materialistic orientation. The first stems from his insistence that the only actual reality is material reality. He thus holds that the nineteenth-century Mormon sense of distinctiveness was valid because it was expressive of a material reality, while the twentieth-century Mormon sense of distinctiveness is both invalid and pathological because it is not grounded in material reality and is consequently unreal. Thus Leone's own view of reality becomes the standard for judging the Mormon view of reality. Second, he analyzes nineteenth- and twentieth-century Mormon cohesion in terms of different categories. Nineteenth-century Mormon cohesion is thus analyzed in terms of such things as economic cooperation and the distribution of goods and services, while twentieth-century Mormon cohesion is analyzed in terms of such things as ritual observances and beliefs and practices vis-a-vis blacks. The
differences in the two forms of cohesion that are analyzed lead him to conclude that a fundamental transformation has occurred in Mormonism. Before such a conclusion can be properly made, however, it is essential that he consider the degree to which factors that have contributed to Mormon cohesion in the twentieth century also contributed to Mormon solidarity in the nineteenth century. If such factors have been so significant for Mormon cohesion in the twentieth century, it should not be assumed a priori that they were not likewise highly significant for Mormon cohesion in the nineteenth century. To consider this possibility, however, would undermine the materialistic premises upon which Leone's theoretical model is constructed.

Contribution of this Dissertation to Mormon Studies

This dissertation will investigate Mormon history from a somewhat novel perspective. Like Leone's study, it will regard Mormonism's changing relationship to American society as fundamental to the development of the Mormon group. Unlike Leone's study, however, it will analyze all historical manifestations of Mormon group cohesion in terms of the same basic categories. This will be done through a diachronic investigation of the interrelationship between covenant organization and Mormon group identity and solidarity.

By employing covenant organization as the basic unit of analysis, the interrelationship will be explored among a number of elements that heretofore have been regarded as disparate. This will result in a more parsimonious presentation of Mormon belief and practice.

Through comparing and contrasting Mormon covenant organization with that of Puritan New England, its relationship to a larger religious tradition will be better understood. This will lead to a better understanding of Mormonism's connection with general American religious development.

And finally it will provide insight into what has been regarded as one of Mormonism's most problematic aspects--the basis for the LDS people's well-developed sense of group cohesion.
CHAPTEII

THE HOLY COMMONWEALTH: THE COVENANT SYSTEM
OF NEW ENGLAND PURITANISM

The Believing Gentiles are now the Children of God, the Surrogate Israel. --Cotton Mather (1705:22)

The religious beliefs and practices of New England Puritans were based upon an ideological system that is commonly referred to as federal (from the Latin 'foeder' meaning compact or covenant) or covenant theology. This ideological system provided the basis for a complex organizational structure from which Puritan society derived much of its identity and solidarity. This chapter will not attempt a complete analysis of this form of social organization: only those aspects of the Puritan covenant system that have relevance for an understanding of Mormon covenant organization will be dealt with. Consequently various limitations will be imposed upon the analysis.

First, covenant theology was the product of a broader movement within reformed Christianity and had a complex development in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, and England prior to the establishment of the Puritan Holy Commonwealth in the wilds of North America (Brown, W. Adams 1914; Burrage 1967a; 1967b; Clark, Henry W. 1965; Haller 1972; Holifield 1974; Kappen 1966; Miller, Perry 1961, 1964:480-98; Morgan 1965:1-80, 1966:1-28; Walker, Williston 1914). Although a detailed examination of the European evolution of covenant theology would provide interesting insight into the consequences that covenant organization can have for the development of group identity and solidarity, such an endeavor lies outside the scope of this dissertation. Consequently, the historical development of covenant theology before the Puritan settlement of North America will only be referred to when such information is essential for an understanding of...
those aspects of New England covenant organization that might elucidate Mormon beliefs and practices.

Second, during the early years of settlement there were four separate Puritan colonies in North America: Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven. There were some differences in covenant organization from colony to colony. None of these variations, however, appears to have important consequences for the understanding of Mormon covenant organization. This dissertation will therefore deal specifically only with the Massachusetts covenant system. With only slight modifications, this same pattern was found elsewhere in Puritan New England.

Third, the Massachusetts covenant system will be analyzed as it existed from the instigation of the half-way covenant in 1661 until the annulment of the colony's first charter in 1684. Although important developments occurred in Massachusetts covenant organization after this period, the elements of the Puritan covenant system that are important for an understanding of the Mormon sealing complex can be meaningfully discussed within this time frame.

And fourth, the analysis will be based mainly on statements made by prominent religious and political leaders. Although these formal statements might have differed from the understanding of rank and file members of the Holy Commonwealth, they were made by the men who were most instrumental in establishing the colony's covenant structure. And it appears to be that structure and the formal ideological statements regarding its nature which are most important for an understanding of the Mormon covenant system. As a result, the analysis of the Puritan cultural system will appear more theological than cultural in nature.

Historical Background to Covenant Theology

The Conflict between Calvinism and Arminianism

Covenant theology might be interpreted as a product of the tension between Calvinism and Arminianism. The contention between these two theological persuasions centered upon the relationship between divine and human endeavor in the achievement of salvation.
Central to the theology of John Calvin (1509-64) was the concept of the sovereignty of God. The Calvinist God was an all-powerful and absolute monarch who saved or damned his subjects according to his arbitrary will. As a correlate to this position, Calvin held that man lacked ability both to will himself to be good and to perform actions that would help him achieve salvation (Calvin 1957; Orr 1913). Arminianism was essentially an opposition movement to strict Calvinism. Taking their name from the Dutch theologian Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609), Arminians held that in some sense the individual has the ability both to act independent of God and to initiate behavior that can affect his salvation (Platt 1913). The controversy that developed from the differing opinions of Calvinists and Arminians generated an atmosphere in which various concepts from the competing camps found synthesis. Covenant theology was one result of this interaction. Although essentially Calvinist in orientation, it was the creation of Calvinists who were responding to Arminian attack.

John Calvin had paid scant attention to the difficulties that his theological system possessed for individuals attempting to achieve a sense of religious assurance. If salvation was indeed only the result of God's arbitrary power and thus independent of human volition, then an individual had no way of knowing whether he would be among the elect or the damned. Much of the appeal of Arminianism resulted from its position that if an individual performed righteous acts, he could increase his chances of achieving a place among the saved. Max Weber's Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1958b) is essentially an attempt to investigate the consequences of this Arminian understanding for value-rational behavior and economic activity. Although it is questionable that this religious conception contributed to the development of capitalism to the degree that Weber's work indicates, there is little doubt that it had profound influence on the development of covenant theology.

Covenant theologians accepted Calvin's position that God had the power to act in a completely arbitrary fashion. They held, however, that in his dealings with men, he voluntarily restricted his activities in such a way that they corresponded to an orderly pattern. Consequently, if the principles governing this pattern could
be comprehended, it would be possible to understand God's relationship to men and the standing that individuals had before him. Covenant theologians came to feel that this pattern could be laid bare through a process of investigation that combined scriptural passages with the logic of Petrus Ramus.

The Logic of Petrus Ramus

Ramus (1515-72), a French Huguenot, attempted to develop a logic to supersede the Aristotelian logic that was taught in the universities of his day (Miller, Perry 1961:110-80; Morgan 1966:21-28; Richardson, Alexander 1629; Wotton 1626).

Ramus held that relationships among concepts and beings in the universe could be explained in terms of a finite set of formal principles. His logic was essentially an attempt to explicate those principles and demonstrate how they might be employed to investigate relationships. Ramus firmly believed that his system of logic provided a fundamental insight into the actual structure of the universe and consequently into the pattern of the divine order. Thus in the preface to his Art of Logick, he states that the methods it outlines will "make clear the mysteries and celestial secrets of the sacred and divine doctrine" (Miller, Perry 1961:117).

As Perry Miller (1961:passim) has convincingly demonstrated, Ramus's logic had decisive influence on the development of covenant theology. Covenant theologians held that through its employment, one might come to understand the nature of God, of nature, and of man. It was thus taught that there were three basic manifestations of the divine order. The first, or "archetypal," was the pattern or "preexistent platform" devised by God previous to the creation of the universe. The second, or "entypal," was that pattern as it was manifested in the visible creation. And the third, or "ectypal," corresponded to the human mind. A condition of isomorphism existed among the three patterns. A man might consequently move from an understanding of the logical processes in his own mind, to a comprehension of the pattern of relationships within the universe, to insight into the "divine eupraxia" of God. To achieve such an end,
however, the various stages in this endeavor should be guided by the principles of logic developed by Petrus Ramus, for they explained the actual and existent patterns of relationship (Miller 1961:164-71).

The Centrality of the Covenant Concept in Puritan Thought

Having established that a logical pattern of relationships existed among concepts, beings, and objects in the universe, the task of the covenant theologians became to determine the type of relationship that existed between God and the individual who was destined for salvation. For this they turned to the Bible for guidance. The relationship between God and Abraham became regarded as the prototype of the relationship between God and his elect. And as the Bible taught that the relationship between God and Abraham was established by covenant (Genesis 17:1-7), it was concluded that there is a covenant relationship between God and his elect. Thus if an individual could know that he was in a covenant relationship with God, then he could have assurance that he would be saved.

As covenant theology developed, the importance of the covenant loomed ever larger. The covenant became regarded not only as basic to the relationship between God and the elect, but as the ideal form of human association. Thus as human associations were contemplated by God as he formulated the preexisting platform, such relationships were to be based on covenant. After the Fall had corrupted human nature, most human relationships ceased to correspond to God's eupraxia. The righteous, however, should endeavor to reestablish human relationships so that they more closely correspond with archetypal forms. The way to achieve that end was to order them upon the basis of covenant.

The Puritan founders of New England were highly influenced by covenant theology. Their ostensive purpose in coming to the New World was to found a "Holy Commonwealth" where human relationships would be established and maintained according to the eupraxia of God. To achieve this end, relationships were to be ordered upon the basis of covenant. Thus as Governor Winthrop had indicated while still aboard the Arabella, "It is the nature and essence of every society to be knit together by some covenant" (Ahlstrom 1972:146).
The Structure of New England Puritan Covenant Organization

Perry Miller (1961:447) has written:

That which made New Englanders unique in all seventeenth-century Christendom, which cut them off from all reformed churches and constituted them in truth a peculiar people was their axiom: "The Covenant of Grace is clothed with Church-Covenant in a Politicall visible Church-way." They held that the love of God reached not merely into their souls, but that it pervaded their community. "God delights in us, when we are in his Covenant, his Covenant reacheth to his Church, and wee being members of that Church: Hence it comes to passe that we partake of all the pleasant springs of God's love."

The Puritans regarded themselves to be a distinct people because of their peculiar holiness and sanctity. It was by means of covenantal ties that they sought to organize themselves upon the basis of that holiness. We shall now turn to a consideration of the structure of that covenantal association.

Mythological Underpinnings

As has already been indicated, covenant theologians regarded the biblical covenant that Jehovah established with Abraham as the prototypical relationship between God and the elect. This basic idea was expanded and developed so that Puritan interpretation of biblical narrative provided a mythological context that imbued covenant concepts with meaning and cosmic significance. Among New England Puritans this covenantal myth was essentially as follows.

Adam and the covenant of works

Adam was created by God with properties similar to His own divine essence (Calvin 1957 I:159-70; W.A. 1967:136). He was placed in the Garden of Eden as Lord over the earth and the intermediary between God and the rest of the physical order (Morgan 1966:12-13). This position was established and maintained by a covenant relationship between God and Adam referred to as "the covenant of works" (W.A. 1967:42, 138; Forell 1975:263). This covenant was essentially that God would preserve Adam in his current position in
return for Adam's absolute obedience to His commandments. When Adam ate the forbidden fruit he broke the covenant. As a result he lost his favored relationship with God. His essence was changed and corrupted so that he no longer possessed many of the divine attributes that previously were his: in particular he no longer had the intellect or the will to do good. In this depraved condition he was in a state of alienation from God and a fit subject for eternal damnation (Calvin 1957 I:209-247; W.A. 137-41).

Adam's action affected not only him but also his posterity. This was due to the fact that Adam entered the covenant of works with God as an agent for the human race. He was "federal" or "parliamentary" man. As Adam's posterity could have participated with him in the special privileges that were his through the covenant of works, so they suffered with him the consequences of breaking that covenant. All men are consequently born in a corrupt state and lack the ability to do that which is right in the sight of God. This condition affects not only individuals but the entire social order. Hence, human relationships in large measure are contrary to God's eupraxia and inconsistent with their archetypal counterparts in the preexisting platform (Calvin I:209-220; Smith, H. Shelton 1955:1-9; Miller, Perry 1961:400-402; W.A. 42, 139).

Abraham and the covenant of grace

After Adam broke the covenant of works, God instituted a different covenantal relationship between himself and man. Although some theologians maintained that God had established such a relationship with Adam after he had violated the first covenant (Brown, W. Adams 1914:321), its operations and implications appeared to be most clearly revealed in the biblical narrative dealing with Abraham. This second covenant was based, not on works, but on grace. To distinguish it from the previous covenant of works, it was often referred to as "the New Covenant" (Miller, Perry 1964:61). Puritan understanding of this covenant relied heavily on contemporary legal concepts and vocabulary. It was believed to operate essentially as follows. God "elected" Abraham to be saved independent of his works
and unilaterally established a covenant relationship with him. Circumcision was established as the "seal" or visible and legally binding sign that this covenant had been entered into (Calvin 1957 II:528-32; Holifield 1974:5-26).

A series of consequences followed from having received the covenant of grace. First, Abraham became an "adopted" child of God. This meant that the Lord agreed to manifest all the care, compassion, and concern toward Abraham that an ideal earthly father showed toward his offspring. Abraham thus became a child of God. Second, as a result of this fatherly love, Abraham was declared "just." Based on the legal terminology of seventeenth-century England, this meant that the guilt of his transgressions would no longer be imputed to him. He could therefore forgo the penalties that would otherwise have been meted out as a consequence of his transgressions. Third, having been justified, he began to undergo "sanctification." This meant that the depraved nature he had inherited as a descendant of Adam would be slowly transformed into an essence more similar to that of God, his adopted father. In other words, over time his reasoning and will would come ever more closely to approximate those possessed by primordial man before the Fall. He was thus regarded as having become "regenerated." Finally, after having been adopted, justified, and sanctified, Abraham would be assured of an eternal and heavenly relationship with God after his departure from this life. Because reception of the covenant of grace resulted in this endless relationship, Puritans referred to it as an "everlasting covenant." The covenant of grace was thus a "new and everlasting covenant" (Calvin 1957 II:1-276; Morgan 1963:103; Walker, Williston 1969:155; W.A. 53-100, 161-73).

Abraham was, in a sense, like Adam, a "federal man." Thus when God established the covenant of grace with Abraham, the covenant in some way also included Abraham's posterity. Puritan theologians placed considerable weight on the biblical passage in which Jehovah declared to Abraham, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant" (Genesis 17:7). Thus the Israelites, as the seed of Abraham, were "born in the covenant." As such they had legal rights
to the promises that had been made to Abraham. Because of this, infant Israelite males were circumcised, like Abraham their ancestor, as a "seal" or "outward witness" that they were included in the group with which the Lord had established a special covenant relationship (Calvin II:532).

Once the covenant of grace had been established with Abraham, its essential provisions were not changed. Modifications, however, did occur in the internal ordering of relationships among those included in the covenant. Thus, in the time of Abraham, the covenant community was "oeconomical" or familial in form; when Israel was camped at Sinai, it became "national"; and with the coming of Christ, it was changed to a "congregational" pattern (Walker, Williston 1969:205). During Christ's time, baptism also replaced circumcision as the "seal of the covenant" (Calvin II 530-32).

The Puritan founders of the New England Holy Commonwealth believed that God had established with them the same new and everlasting covenant of grace that had existed between him and Abraham. This resulted in a strong identification between themselves and ancient Israel. They thus conceptualized themselves as the "spiritual" children of Abraham and as a new or "surrogate" Israel. As Calvin (1957 II:536-38) wrote in the 1550s,

The children of Abraham, under the old dispensation, were those who derived their origin from his seed, but that appellation is now given to those who imitate his faith. . . . [Thus] we are called his sons, though we have no natural relationship with him. . . . [And] we, in comparison of them, are termed posthumous, or abortive children of Abraham, and that not by nature, but by adoption, just as if a twig were broken from its tree and ingrafted on another stock.

And Cotton Mather (1705:23), echoing this same concept, some 150 years later declared, "Believing Gentiles are Israelites indeed. . . . [They] are grafted in the same Olive-Tree from which the Jews for unbelief were broken off."

The Covenantal Subsystems

Puritan covenant organization might be visualized as consisting of three covenantal subsystems united through the covenant.
of grace into a single totality. These subsystems were the household, the church, and the state. In the following section each of these subsystems will be examined as a distinct entity. The basis and ordering of relationships within each subsystem will be explored.

**The household**

**Bases of relationships**

**Nature and covenant.** As indicated in the Introduction, David Schneider (1969:118; 1972:41) has argued that there are two general categories in American culture: the order of nature, which includes things as they are perceived to exist in nature; and the order of law, which consists of the rules, regulations, and traditions established by man. Whether or not such a dichotomization is as general as Schneider contends, it does appear to be at least partially consistent with Puritan understanding.

In Puritan thought there were only three bases upon which relationships could be established: natural law, force, and covenant or mutual agreement. Thus, as Increase Mather explained, "All Relations which are neither naturall nor violent . . . are by vertue of some covenant" (Morgan 1966:26). In order to comprehend this statement, it is necessary to know something about the Puritan conception of nature. According to Puritan understanding, there are actually two orders of nature: the primeval order that came into existence at the time of creation; and the contemporary order that began after Adam and Eve partook of the forbidden fruit. Everything within the primeval order was governed by "natural law." This law had been established by God as the directing power through which the entypal relationships among created objects and beings were made to correspond with the archetypal pattern of the preexisting platform. As John Davenport affirmed, "the Law of Nature is God's Law" (Miller, Perry 1964:150). While natural law originated with God, it operated in terms of what today might be referred to as instinct and the laws of physics. Thus wrote Alsted, "Nature is order and the connection of causes with effects in the world, which is perfect, made by the perfect, best and most wise" (Miller, Perry 1961:207). And writing
subsequent to the annulment of the first Massachusetts Bay Charter, Jonathan Edwards (1963:236-37, 257) presented in somewhat more elaborated terms the earlier Puritan understanding regarding natural law:

By a principle of nature . . . I mean that foundation which is laid in nature, either old or new, for any particular manner or kind of exercise of the faculties of the soul; or a natural habit or foundation for action, giving a personal ability and disposition to exert the faculties in exercises of such a certain kind; so that to exert the faculties in that kind of exercises may be said to be his nature . . .

. . . Nature is a more powerful principle of action, than anything that opposes it; though it may be violently restrained for a while, it will finally overcome that which restrains it: it is like a stream of a river, it may be stopped a while with a dam, but if nothing be done to dry the fountain, it will not be stopped always; it will have a course, either in its old channel, or a new one.

As a consequence of Adam and Eve's transgression, aspects of the natural order lost the ability to be regulated by primeval, God-established natural law. This resulted in the emergence of the contemporary natural order. Puritans were most interested in the position of man within that order. They held that the Fall had changed man's "essence." They described this transformation in terms of modifications occurring in Adam's physical characteristics that caused him to cease to be susceptible to many aspects of natural law. Paradoxically, fallen man was by "nature" incapable of obeying "natural law" (Calvin 1957 I:159-70, 209-20; Miller, Perry 1961:239-79).

Unless one realizes that Puritans had a dual concept of the order of nature, various statements regarding nature and natural law can appear confusing. Thus John Winthrop had in mind the primeval order of nature when he wrote:

There is . . . a double Lawe by which wee are regulated in our conversacion one towards another: . . . the lawe of nature and the lawe of grace, or the morrall lawe or the lawe of the gospell . . . the lawe of nature was giuen to man in the estate of innocency; this of the gospell in the estate of regeneracy. (Miller and Johnson 1963:196)
He was dealing with the contemporary order of nature, however, when he stated:

There is a twofold liberty, natural (I mean as our nature is now corrupt) and civil or federal. The first is common to man with beasts and other creatures. By this, man, as he stands in relation to man simply, hath liberty to do what he lists; it is a liberty to evil as well as to good. This liberty is incompatible and inconsistent with authority, and cannot endure the least restraint of the most just authority. The exercise and maintaining of this liberty makes men grow more evil, and in time to be worse than brute beasts. (Miller and Johnson 1963:206)

When Increase Mather distinguished among natural, violent, and covenantal relationships, he regarded as natural relations those that were established by primeval natural law. He and other Puritans reasoned that independent of the directing power of natural law, there were only two conditions upon which relationships could be established: force and mutual agreement. The second was by definition a covenantal relationship. For, as Samuel Willard explained, "A covenant . . . is a mutual Engagement between two Parties" (Morgan 1966:26).

The manifest Puritan objective in founding the New England Commonwealth was to establish a social order that was acceptable to God. This entailed arranging social relationships according to his will. In order to achieve this end, it was believed that virtually all human relationships that were not based in natural law should be established by covenant. Thus, as Thomas Hooker wrote:

Amongst such who by no impression of nature, no rule of providence, or appointment from God, or reason, have power each over other, there must of necessity be a mutual engagement, each of the other by their free consent, before by any rule of God they have any right or power, or can exercise, each towards the other. (Morgan 1966:26)

According to Puritan thought one had "appointment from God" to employ force only as a punishment for misdeeds. Under such circumstances involuntary servitude was viewed as acceptable. This punishment was inflicted upon prisoners captured during just wars. Having attempted to take the lives of others, it was held that they had fortified rights over their own lives. Their just punishment was consequently either death or slavery. In addition such misdeeds as
thievery and the nonpayment of debts could result in varying periods of involuntary servitude (Morgan 1966:110-12). But while viewed as a consequence of the "rule of providence," such situations were regarded as exceptional and not integral to the normal social order.

Puritans thus held that in the ideal social order there were essentially two bases for social relationships: natural law and covenant. And, with the exception of involuntary servitude, all relationships within their Holy Commonwealth can by analyzed in terms of these two categories.

The parent-child relationship. The interrelationship between natural law and covenant in the Puritan social order is most readily apparent within the household. The family was regarded as the basic unit of society from which both church and state developed. Had he so desired, God might have instantaneously created "millions of people, who might presently have constituted civill states and Churches also: but he chose rather, to lay the foundation both of State and Church, in a family, making that the Mother Hive, out of which both those swarms of State and Church, issued forth" (Morgan 1966:133-34).

The household was essentially the interaction of a natural bond with covenantal relationships. The Puritans held the parent-child tie to be the only human relationship that was preserved by the directing power of natural law (Morgan 1966:25). This natural bond was conceptualized in terms of the understanding that offspring were generated from the "carnal seed" of their parents (Calvin 1957 II: 536-37; Mather, Cotton 1705:64). Thus by synecdochic reduction, children were referred to as their parents' "seed." Consistent with their view that natural relationships were preserved through natural law, Puritans held that both animal and human parents were bonded to their offspring by instinctual solidarity.

As Joseph Belcher explained, "Even the bruti Creatures and those that are most Savage are carryed by a natural instinct towards those that issue and proceed from them. They Feed and Nourish, and take care of, and protect their young Ones" (Morgan 1966:65). Puritans apparently believed much of the affect within the family centered upon this natural parent-child bond. The parent-child
relationship was regarded to be so strong that it had the potential of interfering with an individual's duty toward God. Edmund Morgan (1966:77) even suggests that one reason so many children were raised by other individuals was that "Puritan parents did not trust themselves with their own children, that they were afraid of spoiling them by too great affection." And as has already been seen, Puritans did not even believe that God would love them and be concerned about their well-being until they became his adoptive children.

The husband-wife relationship. Marriage was the preeminent covenantal relationship within the household. It was held to have been instituted by God when he joined together Adam and Eve and thus "Solemnized the First Marriage that ever was" (Morgan 1966:29). The New England marriage ceremony was under state, not religious, supervision. It was essentially a performative that resulted in the establishment of a covenantal compact: man and woman first agreed to abide by the rules and obligations which God had declared to be appropriate to the marital union, and they were then declared by a civil magistrate to be husband and wife. Of central importance to the marriage covenant was the obligation to love. Wrote Benjamin Wadsworth:

This duty of love is mutual, it should be performed by each, to each of them. They should endeavour to have their affections really, cordially and closely knit, to each other. . . . The indisputable Authority, the plain Command of the Great God, required Husbands and Wives, to have and manifest very great affection, love and kindness to one another. (Morgan 1966:47-48)

There appears to have been little expectation that the act of marriage itself would generate such love, and New England courts "granted divorce (giving the right to remarry) when either party to a marriage could prove that the other had neglected a fundamental duty" (Morgan 1966:34). Conceptualized thus as a covenantal imperative, marital love was apparently regarded as fundamentally distinctive from the natural bond of affection that was basic to the parent-child relationship.
The master-servant relationship. In addition to creating the husband-wife relationship, covenants were used to attach indentured servants, hired servants, and indentured apprentices to the household. Such covenants established reciprocal rights and duties between the household head and these individuals. In certain limited ways, aspects of the familial order were extended to include them. For example, the household head was to see after their spiritual needs; and if he was a covenant member of a church, they had the right to join if they could demonstrate that they were otherwise religiously qualified. It was not expected, however, that the affection the household head felt toward his offspring would be extended to them (Morgan 1966:109-32).

The interrelationship between nature and covenant in the Puritan household. The Puritan household can be examined in terms of David Schneider's American kinship categories. Schneider (1968; 1969) regards American kinship as a condition of "diffuse enduring solidarity" based on the interplay of two elements: biological substance and code of conduct. Biological substance is an aspect of the order of nature. Americans perceive the sharing of biological substance in and of itself to create a bond of solidarity. Code of conduct, on the other hand, pertains to the order of law. Within the context of kinship, it consists in the rules of action that should characterize those who share biological substance. There is not, however, a complete fit between solidarity by shared biological substance and solidarity by code of conduct. There are consequently three basic categories of "relatives." It is possible for individuals to be relatives if they share biological substance but not code of conduct: a man and his illegitimate offspring are thus regarded as related. A kinship relationship can also exist between those who share code of conduct but not biological substance: in-laws are relatives of this sort. Diffuse enduring solidarity, however, tends to be most intense among those who share both biological substance and code of conduct. In such instances there is overplay between the order of law and the order of nature.
Puritan conceptions regarding the bases of household solidarity share the following characteristics with David Schneider's analysis of American kinship: First, there are two basic orders: an order of nature and an order of law. Second, relationships within the natural order are perceived as a consequence of factors that exist independently of human conventions and social forms. Third, among humans, natural relationships are created by the sharing of biological substance. Fourth, the order of law is regarded as a creation of socially established rules and regulations: Schneider refers to these rules and regulations as "codes of conduct"; Puritans deal with them as "covenants." Fifth, patterns of behavior that are regarded as characteristic of interaction among individuals who are naturally related can be adopted by others between whom no natural bonds exist. And sixth, solidarity between individuals who are not naturally related is regarded as more tenuous and difficult to preserve than that which exists among those who share biological substance.

Ordering of relationships

Inequality in the household. As Edmund Morgan (1966:12-18) has demonstrated, the logical basis for ordering relationships within the Puritan household was derived in large measure from a synthesis of the scholastic concept of hierarchy and the Ramist category of "relative." Puritans accepted the medieval view that inequality was basic to order. The preexistent platform was regarded as a hierarchical pattern in which archetypical categories were arranged according to their relative superordinate and subordinate positions. Although the current social order was not fully consistent with the preexistent platform, social inequality per se was not evidence of this inconsistency. As John Winthrop (1964:190-91) explained in his "Modell of Christian Charity":

God Almighty . . . hath so disposed of the Condition of mankind, as in all times some must be rich some poore, some highe and eminent in power and dignitie; others meane and in subjection. The Reason Hereof. 1. Reas: First, to hold conformity with the rest of his workes, being delighted to shewe forthe the glory of his wisdome in the variety and difference of the Creatures and the glory of his power, in ordering all these
differences for the preservation and good of the whole. . . .

2. Reas: Secondly, That he might have the more occasion to manifest the worke of his Spirit. . . . 3. Reas: Thirdly, That every man might have need of other, and from hence they might be all knit more nearly together in the Bond of brotherly affection.

Household relationships and the Ramist relate. Although hierarchy was thus viewed as basic to the social order, not all patterns of inequality were regarded as consistent with God's eupraxia. Puritan philosophizers held that the only social categories that should be directly linked were those that the principles of Petrus Ramus's logic identified as "relatives" or "relates."

According to Ramist logic, two entities were "relates" if they were "affirmative contraries." Avoiding an exclusion through the labyrinth of this system of logic, it might be simply stated that for Ramus affirmative contraries are the mutual causes of each other. Thus Anthony Wotton (1626:55-58), in his simplified version of Ramus's Art of Logick, writes that "Relatives are contraries affirming; the one whereof consists by the mutuall relation to the other." . . . Each is cause of being to the other. . . . [They] argue or declare each other . . . as the causes each of other." And in his commentary on Ramus's logic, Alexander Richardson (1629:150-55) explains that "each relate containes the efficient, matter, forme, and end of his fellow." . . . The whole being of the one relate is contained in the other."

Examples of relates provided by Wotton help clarify the nature of such interdependency. He thus regards all the following as paired relates: priest/people, master/servant, mistress/maid, buyer/borrower, father/son, prince/subject, parent/children, and brother/brother.

According to Edmund Morgan (1966:23-24),

Puritans thought of human relationships in [terms of Ramist logic]. The relations which formed the substance of social order all fell under the classification of relatives . . . and therefore were governed by the "law of relatives," as the definition which we have been pursuing was called. Since logic purported only to delineate and define the structure of reality, the law was merely a law of definition, not of conduct.

This law, however, had two important consequences for Puritan social organization in general and for the household in particular.
First, the law at least implied that a condition of inequality exists between most social relationships. Thus an implicit condition of superordination and subordination occurred between almost all of Wotton's examples of paired relates. The only exception was that of brother/brother; and it is difficult to understand the basis upon which Wotton identifies these as paired relates, since they appear to be "like" rather than "contrary" entities.

And second, the law facilitated the Puritan conception that the elements of their society were bound together through a condition of organic solidarity. As has already been seen, Puritans believed that Ramus's logic did not merely identify a pattern among nominalistic definitions and terms; they held that it revealed the actual relationships among existent entities. Just as the term minister could not be understood independent of its relate, congregation, so no existent man could be considered as a minister unless he was linked to an actual congregation. This view so pervaded Puritan society that no individual could be regarded as a citizen at large, independent of those individuals to whom he stood as a relate. Thus personhood was explicitly viewed as the consequence of individuals being actually linked as relates to others. John Winthrop (1964:196) appears to have had such an organic conception of the social order when in his "Modell of Christian Charity" he declared, "There is noe body but consists of partes and that which knitts these partes together gives the body its perfeccion, because it makes eache parte soe contiguous to other as they doe mutually participate with eache other both in strengthe and infirmity in pleasure and paine."

These considerations had important consequences for domestic organization. First, a condition of inequality was regarded as basic to household composition. The husband was superordinate to the wife, the parent to the child, and the master to the servant. Second, individuals within the household were seen as organically united as relates. And third, for any individual to be regarded as a socially complete person, he had to be linked as a relate within a domestic context to other individuals. If any individual migrated to Massachusetts without household ties, he was required by law to become
affiliated with some domestic group. The household was thus constituted as basic to the social order.

The church

Historical development of the church covenant concept

The quest for a pure church. Puritanism arose amid the conflict resulting from disagreement respecting the course of the English reformation. Anglican Protestantism was unique in that from its inception it was directed by royal decrees and government policy. Large segments of the population were dissatisfied with the established church that emerged as a consequence of this political activity. Many held that the reformation of the English church had not gone far enough and that additional changes were necessary before the church could be regarded as an adequate expression of institutionalized Christianity. During the reign of Elizabeth, the more extreme of these would-be reformers were given the appellation "Puritan" by their adversaries. The name was intended to suggest that they wanted the church to be excessively pure (Morgan 1963:6).

Many of the issues involved in this debate were as old as Christianity. As the Christian movement had developed during the first centuries of its existence, various sects arose contending that the true church must be composed exclusively of the spiritually pure, or of the truly converted, or of those whose behavior consistently corresponded to the moral precepts of New Testament scripture. In opposition to the stand of such sects, Saint Augustine (d. 604) developed the position that there are actually two churches: one invisible and one visible. The invisible church includes all the sanctified and pure, both living and dead. The visible church, on the other hand, is an institutional structure composed exclusively of mortals. Its purpose is to help individuals join the ranks of the invisible church, and it cannot achieve this purpose if it excludes the impure or backsliding from its membership. It is therefore essential that it include saints and sinners alike. At the same time, Augustine held that the visible church must not deviate too far from
the standards of conduct that should be manifest by true Christians. It must therefore strive to maintain pure doctrine and practice and exclude from fellowship more extreme sinners. During the ensuing centuries there was considerable debate respecting the degree to which the visible church should correspond to the invisible. The Reformation was in part a consequence of a pervasive understanding that the visible church had departed too far from its invisible counterpart. The various Protestant churches that emerged might be viewed as attempts to remedy this condition. The English Puritans were dissatisfied with the particular solution worked out by their government, and they were intent on effecting a more rigorous correspondence between the visible and invisible manifestations of the Christian church (Morgan 1965:1-4).

English Puritanism was a diverse movement. While most Puritans agreed that a properly constituted English church should doctrinally resemble the reformed Calvinist churches of the continent, there was no general agreement respecting the way in which the English church polity should be organized. The English Puritans that were to have the most impact on New England Congregationalism were commonly referred to as "Independents." According to Knappen (1966:490), this term was used to refer to all who desired "that each congregation should be legally independent of every other, [and] that there should be no ecclesiastical authority higher than the individual church." There were two basic camps among the Independents: the Separatists and the non-Separatists. The contributions that each made to the formation of New England church polity will be briefly reviewed.

Separatist Independents. The Separatists were the most radical of the English Puritans. They held that the established English church was completely unacceptable as a visible church and that no degree of internal reform could remedy the situation. A chief complaint that Separatists had with the established church was that membership was based on territoriality rather than on personal worthiness and desire. According to English law, virtually everyone within the territorial limits of England was a member of the Church of England while all residing within the boundaries of a particular
parish were members of that parish congregation. Separatists held that such a situation was improper and that a "gathered church" alone could qualify as a true church. According to Separatist understanding, a "gathered" church consisted of a group of people who joined together because of their mutual faith and the desire they had to live according to Christian principles. In order to perpetuate such a condition it was held to be essential that the group have the ability to exclude from membership all individuals whom they did not regard as qualified to participate in the group. Since these conditions did not exist within the Church of England, that church was false.

In attempting to organize and maintain gathered churches, Separatists were confounded with problems that differed from those of state-supported, established churches. As William Haller (1972:176) has written:

> Once having seceded, the [Separatist] sect was faced by the problem of maintaining its solidarity. . . . It identified the true church not with society nor with the nation but with an exclusive congregation of saints, unanimous in belief and uniform in practice, admitting to its communion only those who could give satisfactory proof of their [religious qualifications]. Admission to the congregation, that is, could only be by the consent of the members, and every member must bind himself in some signal way to accept the will of the whole group as his own.

The church covenant early became a principal means for establishing and maintaining such solidarity. It is difficult to reconstruct the details of the manner in which Separatist congregations began to employ church covenants for this purpose. They probably adopted the idea from earlier practices of Scottish and English Protestants. The Scots had a long-standing custom of binding themselves together when faced with internal disorder and external threat, and they employed "national" covenants as a means of establishing and maintaining Scottish Presbyterianism (Ahlstrom 1972:130-31; Herkless 1914; Smout 1969:59-100; W.A. 1967:347-60). Anglicans employed covenants in much the same way during the Marian persecutions. In these years Reformation leaders and their sympathizers "separated from the reste of the Lande, as from the world and ioyned in couenuant, by voluntarie profession . . . to obey the
truthe of Christ and to witness against the abominations of Antichrist" (Burage 1967a:70). During the same period English Protestant exiles on the Continent were faced with the task of organizing and maintaining religious congregations that had separate existence from the national churches of the countries in which they were residing. At least in some instances, covenants were employed to achieve this purpose. The English congregation in Frankfort on the Main is the best-known case of this kind. In describing this event, William Whittingham, the leader of the group, later wrote:

And for that it was thought the churche could not longe contynnewe in good order without discipline/ there was also a brief form devised/ declaringe the necessitie/ the cause/ and the order therof/ whereunto all those that were present subscribed/ shewing thereby that they were ready and willinge to submitt themselves to the same/ according to the rule prescribed in gods holie word/ at whiche time it was determined by the congregation that all suche as shulde come after/ shulde doo the like/ before they were admitted as members of that churche. (Burage 1967a:74)

While it is impossible to determine the degree to which Separatists were influenced by earlier Protestant employment of covenants, it is clear that the earliest Puritan Separatist congregations of which there is adequate historical record were using covenants as a means for group unity and conformity. As early as 1567 a Separatist group meeting in Plumbers' Hall, London, employed a covenant as a basis for membership. Each individual who joined evidently made the following declaration:

I have now joined myself to the church of Christ wherein I have yielded myself subject to the discipline of God's word as I promised at my baptism, which if I should now again forsake and join myself with the traditioners I should then forsake the union wherein I am knit with the body of Christ and join myself to the discipline of Antichrist. (Knappen 1966:212)

By 1582, Robert Browne, the first individual to publicly defend the Separatist movement, regarded a church covenant as a sine qua non of a true church (Walker, Williston 1969:18-20). And from the evidence at hand, by the time of the ascendency of James I, Separatists were in general agreement that a true church must of necessity be established by covenant.
Non-Separatist Independents. The non-Separatist Independents did not take the extreme position that the Church of England was false. They believed, however, that it must undergo extensive reform. The current episcopal form of church polity in which ministers received office through political appointment should be abandoned. In its place they proposed a system that balanced local autonomy with benign national supervision. The local congregation was to be left free to choose its own minister and to excommunicate members who would not maintain acceptable standards of conduct. Civil authority, in turn, would act to ensure doctrinal purity and harmony within the congregation (Morgan 1965:6-32; Knappen 1966:222-43, 330-33; Walker, Williston 1914:19-20).

Non-Separatists initially looked to the civil government to effect needed reforms in church polity. When this was not forthcoming, a number of them began exploring ways of "gathering" localized groups of faithful Christians while not formally deviating from established church policy. One way this was done was through limiting access to the communion. Although English law stated that church membership per se could not be restricted, the Book of Common Prayer indicated that the communion should be given only to the spiritually worthy. Various Puritan ministers required parishers to make a formal covenant and profession of worthiness before being permitted to partake of the communion. In this way covenant groups came to exist within the context of a number of Anglican parishes (Burrage 1967a:287-314; Morgan 1963:76-77).

As events developed in England, more and more non-Separatists came to accept the Separatist position that the proper way to ensure Christian discipline and orthodoxy was to establish a church by covenant. Thus Henry Jacob, a non-Separatist, declared in 1604 that a church is formed "by a free mutuall consent of Believers joyning and covenanting to live as Members of a holy Society togeather" (Morgan 1965:29). Such a stand placed non-Separatists in the difficult position of attempting to maintain allegiance to an ecclesiastical system that they believed was operating contrary to the will of Heaven.
The structure of the New England church polity

The relationship between the covenant of grace and the church covenant. The laws requiring conformity with the doctrine and practices of the established Church of England were embodied in a series of Acts of Uniformity (Adeney 1914:381-85). Since these acts did not extend beyond England and Wales, the organizers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony had the legal right to organize any form of church polity that was not inconsistent with the provisions of the royal charter that had authorized the colony's establishment. Because this charter had little to say regarding matters touching on religion, the founders of Massachusetts felt they had a free hand to devise any form of church organization that they desired, and they proceeded accordingly.

The Puritans who were instrumental in the formation of the New England church polity were mostly non-Separatist Independents who had come to accept the position that a covenant was essential for the proper creation of a church congregation (Burrage 1967a:288-90; Knappen 1966:332-33; Miller, Perry 1961:412-13; Morgan 1965:64-65). The system they devised was in large measure reflective of this orientation. As in England, only one form of ecclesiastical organization was tolerated. An individual was not compelled to be affiliated with the established church, but he was required to attend its services. And people were forbidden by law to engage in any form of religious association that was not in conformity with government-sanctioned procedures and doctrine. Each church congregation was established by an explicit covenant, and an individual could not become a church member until he established a covenant relationship with the other members of a particular congregation. The congregation had authority to appoint its own minister, to determine when an individual was qualified to be joined to them by covenant, and to excommunicate backsliding members. And at least initially there was no level of ecclesiastical jurisdiction higher than that of the individual congregation.

Most aspects of this scheme had often been discussed by non-Separatist Independents in England. What made the New England
church polity unique was the requirement that individuals not be
accepted as covenant members of congregations until it could be
determined that they had received the covenant of grace. By making
this a condition of church membership, the founders of Massachusetts
were endeavoring to create religious groupings composed exclusively of
individuals belonging to the invisible church. As Edmund Morgan
(1965; see also Miller, Perry 1967:447) has demonstrated, this
position set New England Puritans apart from both the Separatists and
non-Separatists of England. Earlier church covenants had required
belief in particular doctrine and compliance with specified rules of
conduct, but apparently none had demanded that an individual actually
give evidence that he was among the elect of God.

A difficulty with this position resulted from the Puritan
understanding that the covenant of grace was unilaterally established
by God independently of human ritual or behavior. It was consequently
maintained that there was no way to determine directly just when an
individual had received the covenant of grace. Puritans believed,
however, that the process of sanctification commenced after the
establishment of the covenant of grace and that the effects of
sanctification could be detected in the emotional state and behavior
of individuals undergoing that process. It therefore became
established as policy that an individual could not be accepted as a
covenant member of a church until the effects of sanctification were
detected in his life.

If an individual desired to become a covenant member of the
church, he was expected to examine his personal life in detail to see
if he could discover evidence of sanctification (Moran 1974; Morgan
1965:67-89). If he believed that such was the case, he was then to
present that evidence to the covenant members of the congregation. If
after careful scrutiny they determined that in all likelihood the
candidate was indeed experiencing the effects of sanctification, they
concluded that God had probably established a covenant of grace with
him. He would than be permitted to attest formally to the particular
church covenant employed by the congregation, and he would thus become
a covenant member of that church congregation. He would now be
designated as a "visible saint." He could partake of communion and be
possessed of the rights and duties that accrued to covenant church membership. Although Puritans acknowledged that mistakes were possible, they believed that such procedures essentially limited covenant membership to the elect and sanctified.

The half-way covenant. Children had an ambiguous position in New England church organization. As already discussed, the paradigm for the covenant of grace was based upon the biblical covenant between Jehovah and Abraham. Since Abraham's seed were included with him in that covenant, it was reasoned that the offspring of covenant church members somehow participated with them in the covenant of grace. They were thus said to be "born in the covenant" (Holifield 1974:43). As a result they received baptism as a "seal" of the covenant, and were regarded as members of the church. Small children, however, could not give evidence of sanctification, and it was deemed inappropriate that they become fully participating members of the congregation until they did so. They were thus not permitted to partake of the communion or assume the rights and duties of covenant members until the effects of sanctification were manifest in their lives. When and if this happened, they were allowed to subscribe to the church covenant and become fully functioning members of the congregation.

It appears to have been the initial assumption of the founders of the Holy Commonwealth that most if not all the children of covenant members would eventually evidence the effects of sanctification and thus be enabled to assume the full rights and duties of covenant members. After all, it was reasoned, if they were born in the covenant of grace, the consequences of that covenant should operate in their lives. As John Cotton declared:

The children of believers doe come on themselves to believe, by reason of the Covenant of grace which God hath made with believers and their seed, for by that Covenant hee hath promised to write the law of faith (as of all other saving graces) in their hearts, that they also may come in Gods time and way to enjoy all the other saving privileges of the Covenant, as did their Fathers before them. (Holifield 1974:157)

This, however, did not prove to be the case; and many of the children of original covenant members failed to give sufficient
evidence to allow them to become fully qualified covenant members of the church. This phenomenon has been explained in various ways. Some investigators have attributed it to a general decline in religiosity among second-generation New England Puritans, while others regard it as a consequence of increasing rigor in admittance procedures. Whatever its cause, it soon resulted in a difficulty that had evidently not been dealt with by the founders of the Holy Commonwealth: what is the status of the children of individuals who were born in the covenant but who subsequently did not give evidence of sanctification?

In 1662 the Massachusetts General Court called a synod of ministers to discuss this issue. The synod's resolution has become known as the "half-way covenant" (Bushman 1967:147-79; Morgan 1965:125-32; Pope, Robert G. 1969; Schneider, Herbert 1958:86-87; Sweet 1952:58-59; Walker, Williston 1969:249-51). According to the recommendations of the synod, the "unregenerated" child of a covenant member might have his own child baptized if he would publicly agree to "own" the covenant into which he had been born and which had been sealed upon him by baptism. This essentially meant that he would place himself under the discipline of the church, attempt to conduct his life according to its regulations, and instruct his children in proper conduct. Owning the covenant did not involve giving evidence of sanctification nor did it result in one becoming a full covenant member of the church. Thus while an individual who owned the covenant could have his children baptized, he would still not be regarded as a visible saint, be allowed to partake of the communion, nor receive most of the rights and duties of full covenant membership. Most congregations accepted the recommendation of the synod, and the half-way covenant became a regular feature of most New England Congregational churches.

The bases of relationships. In a manner somewhat reminiscent of the household, solidarity within the church polity was a product of the interplay of nature and law. After the Great Migration came to a close in the early 1640s, it became almost impossible for an individual to be admitted to church membership unless he was descended
from visible saints. The rationale behind this restriction was an outgrowth of Puritan understandings regarding the nature of the covenant of grace: once it was granted that this covenant could be transmitted by descent, it became possible to assume that such transmission was generally restricted to a few select families. As Increase Mather explained: "God hath seen meet to cast the line of election so, as that generally elect Children are cast upon elect Parents. . . . There are some Families in the world, that God hath designed to shew mercy to them from generation to generation" (Morgan 1966:183).

The consequence that such a position had for the church polity might best be approached through an examination of the distinction that Puritans made between "real" and "federal" holiness. Various New England divines came to the conclusion that the reason not all children of visible saints experienced regeneration was that the covenant God made with Abraham actually included the promise of two forms of holiness: "inward real holiness," that would personally accrue to him as a consequence of sanctification; and "federal holiness" that would be transmitted by descent to his offspring (Morgan 1965:134; Holifield 1974:153-54). Since visible saints had entered the same covenant relationship with God as had Abraham, their descendants were possessed, like his, of federal holiness. A recipient of federal holiness had the possibility, but not the certainty of ultimately receiving inward, real holiness. But while federal holiness did not assure its possessor of ultimate salvation, it did set him apart from the mass of mankind. Descendants of visible saints should thus receive baptism as a seal of the covenant into which they were born, and being endowed with federal holiness, they should be accepted as part of the visible church.

Because he had been born into no demonstrable covenant, a child who had not descended from visible saints was in a very different situation. Since baptism was regarded as the seal of a covenant relationship between God and man, there appeared to be no justification in allowing such an individual to be baptized. Because there was no reason to assume that he was possessed of federal holiness, it did not seem appropriate that he be regarded as part of
the visible church. And given such inauspicious circumstances, there appeared little hope that God might condescend, as he had with Abraham, to instigate a completely new covenant of grace.

The manner in which Puritans linked the parent-child relationship with the attainment of holiness becomes more comprehensible when it is realized that Puritans regarded the state of holiness, like the parent-child bond, to be an aspect of the order of nature. As has just been seen, in Puritan thought there were but two categories of holiness: federal and real. The attainment of each of these was the consequence of a natural process. Federal holiness was thus transmitted through the only human relationship whose solidarity was preserved by the primeval law of nature. And the acquirement of real holiness was the consequence of "regeneration," by means of which an individual's nature was transformed to correspond more closely with the nature of primeval man. Thus when discussing the state of real holiness, Jonathan Edwards (1962:236, 254) declared:

This new spiritual sense, and the new dispositions that attend it, are no new faculties, but are new principles of nature. . . . When a natural man denies his lust, and lives a strict, religious life, and seems humble, painful and earnest in religion, it is not natural; it is all a force against nature; as when a stone is violently thrown upwards; but that force will be gradually spent; yet nature will remain in its full strength, and so prevails again, and the stone returns downwards. As long as corrupt nature is not mortified, but the principle left whole in a man, it is a vain thing to expect that it should not govern. But if the old nature be indeed mortified, and a new and heavenly nature infused, then may it well be expected, that men will walk in newness of life, and continue to do so to the end of their days.

But while holiness was a condition of nature, the church covenant itself was an aspect of the order of law. It both defined and established the code of conduct that should obtain among individuals endowed with holiness. As there were two levels of holiness, so there were two covenantal orders within the church polity: the half-way covenant for those who had been granted only federal holiness and the full church covenant for the regenerate that had achieved real and inward holiness.

The ability of servants to become covenant members of their master's congregations likewise lay within the order of law. This
practice was justified on the scriptural grounds that Abraham had
circumcised his servants (Genesis 17:23) and thus apparently included
them as part of familial-based church congregation. And as has
already been seen, Puritans felt that servants were under the domestic
jurisdiction of their masters, and thus possessed of certain of the
legal rights and duties of children. Puritan servants, however, were
regarded generally as religious reprobates (Morgan, Edmund 1966:123),
and it appears that few were actually admitted to covenant membership
in church congregations.

The ordering of relationships. In terms of Ramus's logic,
only one basic hierarchically paired relationship existed within the
church congregation: pastor and people (see Morgan 1966:24). The
concepts of holiness and covenant, however, combined to create a
four-tiered structure of inequality in which each category was
distinguished from the others either in degree of holiness, or
participation in covenant, or both. At the most general and inclusive
level were all in attendance at services. Since all inhabitants of
the Holy Commonwealth were required by law to attend church meetings,
this level included both church members and non-church members alike.
This category shared no particular holiness, but (as will be shown in
the next section) they all participated in a common civil covenant.
At the next level were all church members. They were distinguished
from the nonmembers by the fact that they shared federal holiness.
The next category included all who had entered into any type of church
covenant with the other members, be it half-way or complete. They
were not distinguished from the general church membership by virtue of
holiness but by covenant and code of conduct. The fourth and final
category was composed exclusively of visible saints. They were
distinguished both by their possession of real holiness and by the
fact that they alone were complete covenant members of the church.
They were the manifestation of the Puritan goal: as the elect of God,
they were the embodiment of holiness; as covenant church members, they
were the manifestation of ideal conduct.
The state

Historical development of the Puritan state concept

According to Puritan understanding, had man persisted in the primeval condition in which he was created, there would have been no need for civil government (Miller 1964:142-43). Prior to the Fall, man by nature was just and innately capable of maintaining proper relationships. When Adam's transgression resulted in the corruption of human nature, however, men lost the natural ability to deal correctly with each other. This necessitated that God establish a basis other than nature for the regulation of human conduct. Thus government came into existence.

Since it existed apart from nature, Puritans held that government could be established upon one of two bases: force or covenant. Most Puritans held strongly to the position that only the second of these two alternatives would result in a just government. As early as the reign of Mary, Puritans were justifying tyrannicide on the grounds that valid government must originate in some form of social compact (Morgan, Edmund 1965:29). And after the death of Elizabeth, Puritans joined with parliamentarians in opposing the absolutist conceptions of the Stuart monarchs. The two groups came to share a conception of society in which "the power of the ruler should be exercised in accordance with established fundamental law, and that the government should owe its existence to a compact of the governed" (Miller, Perry 1964:146).

The civil covenant

The founders of Massachusetts endeavored to synthesize this conception of a properly ordered society with their desire to establish a holy commonwealth where human conduct was regulated according to strict religious discipline. The result was an organizational scheme that had close affinity to the congregational structure. This scheme was based on the assumption that a distinctive social covenant bound together all the inhabitants of Massachusetts
and related them as a group to the Puritan god. As John Winthrop declared to his fellow passengers while still aboard the Arabella:

For the worke we haue in hand, it is by a mutuall consent through a speciall overruleing providence . . . to seeke out a place of Cohabitation and Consorteshipp under a due forme of Government both civill and ecclesiasticall. . . . Thus stands the cause betweene God and us, wee are entered into Covenant with him for this worke, wee haue taken out a Commission, the Lord hath given us leaue to drawe our owne Articles . . . Now if the Lord shall please to heare us, and bring us in peace to the place wee desire, then hath hee ratified this Covenant and sealed our Comission [and] will expect a strickt performance of the Articles contained in it . . . but if wee shall neglect the observacion of these Articles . . . the Lord will surely breake out in wrath against us, be revenged of such a perjured people, and make us knowe the price of the breache of such a covenant. (Winthrop 1964:201-203)

In order to maintain this covenant, early New England Puritans established civil regulations which they regarded as consistent with the will of Heaven, and then required all that settled among them to conform to those rules. In justifying a law that sought to restrict immigration to such individuals, Winthrop in 1637 declared:

1. No common weal can be founded but by free consent.
2. The persons so incorporating have a public and relative interest each in other, and in the place of their cohabitation and goods, and laws, &c and in all means of their wellfare so as none other can claime priviledge with them but by free consent. . . .
   . . . The intent of the law is to preserve the wellfare of the body; and for this ende to have none received into any fellowship with it who are likely to disturbe the same. (Miller and Johnson 1963:200-201)

The bases of relationships

Although non-Puritans who would agree to abide by the civil regulations of the Holy Commonwealth were allowed to settle in Massachusetts, authority to establish, administer, and enforce law was restricted to the regenerate. This was done by first limiting freemanship to visible saints and then by requiring that freemen elect public officials from among their own ranks (Morgan 1958:84-100). It was believed that only the regenerate were capable of preserving that form of civil government that would be pleasing to heaven: having
undergone sanctification, such men had clearer perception and deeper insight into the mind of God than the unregenerate.

Unless their policies deviated from established law, it was deemed essential for the preservation of the covenantal order that the general population accept the directions of the sanctified civil leaders. As Governor Winthrop explained in 1645 (Miller and Johnson 1963:205-7), a man outside of civil society has freedom to do as he wishes. If, however, he decides to join a civil order that is based upon a social compact, he enters a covenant with the other members of that order and the only freedom he still has is to obey its legally appointed leaders. And since the civil order of the Holy Commonwealth is based upon a covenant with God, failure to follow the directions of leaders can result, not only in disruption to the social order, but in the actual retribution of an offended deity.

The ordering of relationships

The civil system developed into a complex entity in which there were various forms and levels of administration. If all of these are reduced to their essential properties, however, a simple and consistent pattern persists: a covenantal relationship of inequality between regenerate magistrates and the rank and file citizens (Breen 1980:24-25; Bushman 1967:3-21; Miller 1964: 16-47, 141-52; Morgan 1958:84-100). This pattern is both consistent with the Ramist relate and similar in many aspects to the church structure. Unlike the church, the civil structure itself has no natural relationships. As has already been discussed, however, the qualifying holiness possessed by civil magistrates was understood by Puritans to be an aspect of the order of nature. Consequently, civil organization, like both the household and the church, consisted in an interrelationship between the order of nature and the order of law.

Puritan Covenantal Organization as a Unified System

Encompassment

Thus far the household, the church, and the state have been examined as separate covenantal systems. As has been illustrated,
each has its peculiar characteristics and relates individuals in terms of a distinctive pattern. Despite such differences, the three can be seen as jointly comprising a unified covenantal system that served as the basis and the framework for the group identity and solidarity of New England Puritans.

Much of the unity of the total system was derived from the similarity of form in the three subsystems. All relationships within the three subsystems were regarded as established either by nature or by covenant. And all subsystems ordered such relationships in terms of similar patterns of inequality. Most of these relationships of inequality were fully consistent with the logic governing the Ramist relate. This was clearly the case for relationships such as husband-wife, parent-child, master-servant, pastor-congregation, and magistrate-citizen. While general group relationships within the church and the state might not be clearly identifiable as Ramist relates, they conformed to the same general structure of inequality as those relationships that were. As has been seen, all group boundaries within the church congregation were based on the interplay of covenant and holiness. The result was a four-tier structure in terms of which categories of individuals were ordered from most holy to most depraved. The state, on the other hand, had only one basic internal group boundary: this was the division between freemen and nonfreemen. This boundary was based on a combination of sexual and regenerative inequality. Thus to qualify for freemanship, one had to be both a male and a visible saint.

The three subsystems were also incorporated into a single structure through a process of encompassment. First, the individual was encompassed by the household, and his position within Puritan society was dependent upon relationships that bound him to the other members of a domestic group. The parent-child bond, the one natural relationship within Puritan society, was central to the household; all other domestic relationships were established by binding additional persons through covenant to those thus joined by nature. And since by law, all the inhabitants of the Holy Commonwealth were required to have membership in a particular household, everyone in Puritan Massachusetts was related either by nature or by covenant to a small
group of individuals within the context of a hierarchically ordered domestic structure.

Second, the household was encompassed by the church congregation, since by law everyone was required to attend religious services, all the citizens of Massachusetts were in one form or another under the jurisdiction of a particular church. An individual's relationship to the church he attended, however, was at least partially a consequence of his domestic ties. Thus an individual generally could only become an actual member of a church if he possessed federal holiness by being born in the covenant or if he was servant to a master that was a member of the church. Since federal holiness was transmitted by descent, the parent-child bond was basic to church structure in a manner analogous to its position in domestic structure.

And third, the church congregation was encompassed by the state. The commonwealth was understood as a whole to be in a covenant relationship with God, and the state had the responsibility to see that citizens performed their covenantal duties. To carry out this obligation, it had the authority to supervise the affairs of individual church congregations and to establish what religious teaching and practices were acceptable. Although local congregations were given some freedom of action, there were limits beyond which the state would not permit them to go. And if any one refused to submit to state regulations in religious matters, he could face imprisonment, banishment, or death. But while the state supervised the church, it was in a sense also an outgrowth of the church. This was because freemanship, by which one acquired the full rights of citizenship, was dependent upon becoming a full covenant member of a church congregation.

It appears clear that encompassment involved a dual process. Each covenantal subsystem had jurisdiction over covenantal relationships that it encompassed. Thus the church had jurisdiction over the household and the state over the church. At the same time, critical aspects of each subsystem were based upon elements of the covenantal order that it encompassed. Household solidarity was in large measure based upon the parent-child bond; federal holiness,
which qualified one for church membership, was transmitted through this bond; and freemanship within the state was predicated upon the attainment of real holiness, which was seen as an extension of federal holiness. The natural parent-child bond was thus central to the entire covenantal order. It was consequently with some justification that Cobbert declared the family to be "the Mother Hive, out of which both . . . State and Church issued forth" (Morgan 1966:133-34).

Identity and solidarity within the context of a unified covenantal system

This unified covenant system had important consequences for the group identity and solidarity of the Puritans of the Holy Commonwealth. Most immigrants of the Great Migration came in family units and were motivated, at least in part, by a desire to establish a new social order based on religious principles (Breen 1980:46-67). Although they came from diverse backgrounds in England, upon arriving in Massachusetts they were able to be incorporated as households into a covenant system that related them in a distinctive and particularistic manner to other individuals of similar inclinations and that conferred upon them the identity of Israel reconstituted. They conceived of themselves as a holy nation that existed apart from the rest of mankind. Such understandings invite analysis in terms of Weberian charismatic categories.

Charismatic attachment and the Puritan covenantal system

Puritan covenant organization shared certain characteristics with the Weberian sect. The Puritan notion of holiness is easily identifiable with Weber's concept of charisma; and like his sect-type, the Puritan church congregation sought to be an exclusive aristocratic group bound together by the common possession of charismatic holiness. The distinction Puritans made between real and federal holiness, however, resulted in Puritan church organization becoming hierarchically ordered in a manner that is inconsistent with Weber's conception of a "pure sect." Puritan "real holiness" is thus
essentially identical with the Weberian category of "personal charisma," while "federal holiness" is basically equivalent to his notion of hereditary charisma. By differentiating between these two charismatic forms, a situation was created in which an exclusive group of personally charismatic individuals were recruited from a more general but still restricted pool of people bound together by the common possession of hereditary charisma. By dealing with religious qualification in this way, hereditary charisma in the form of federal holiness had important consequences for the group identity and solidarity of individuals who did not necessarily perceive themselves as biologically related and whose previous corporate existence did not extend for more than two or three generations.

The Puritan covenant system deviated even further from the Weberian sect by the fact that the Puritan state regulated the church congregation and required the attendance of nonqualified individuals. According to Weber, such a condition is characteristic of a church and contrary to sectarian organization (Weber 1958a:306, 314, 316; 1958b:225; 1968:52, 56, 1164, 1206, 1208-9). The employment of state power in this way creates a situation in which individuals are bound together by force rather than by the understanding that they are in common in possession of charismatic attributes.

The Puritan covenant community is consequently by no means a consistent example of the Weberian sect-type organization. While the visible saints evidently understood themselves to be united by the common possession of personal charisma, such a perception was not basic to unity within the community as a whole. The concept of federal holiness was likely of importance for the group identity and solidarity of individuals who had descended from visible saints. It is difficult, however, to make an adequate assessment of its impact, since participation in the religious congregation was enforced by penal sanctions. Thus while charismatic attachment was an important aspect of solidarity within the covenant community, it should not be regarded as the primary basis upon which unity was achieved.
The locus of power in the Puritan covenantal system

The basis for unity within the covenantal system can perhaps be better established through an examination of the locus of power than through an analysis of the structure of charismatic distribution. Although the Holy Commonwealth has been characterized by some as a theocracy, very little power was actually vested in the church polity itself.

First, religious administrators had virtually no ability to enact binding performatives. According to Puritan religious understanding, all relationships between God and man had to be initiated by God. As a result no mortal could perform a ritual that would affect an individual's actual relationship to God. While baptism and communion were administered to certain individuals as "seals" of their covenant relationship with God, the enactment of these rituals in no way affected the actual establishment of such covenants. If God had thus elected a particular individual to be saved, his salvation was assured even if he was never baptized; and if an individual had not been elected by God, the ritual of baptism would avail him nothing (Holifield 1974:150-59). For Puritans, as for other Calvinists, "Every attempt to resort to magic sacraments is a foolish infringement on God's established order; the church does not dispose such means. Thus the church has been completely divested of its charismatic character and has become a mere social institution" (Weber 1968:1198). While the Puritan church could admonish sinners and seek to separate the holy from the unholy, it had power neither to bind God nor actually to produce holiness in its membership.

And second, the state, not the church, had ultimate power to ensure religious conformity and participation in the covenantal order. It was the state that established and enforced regulations that all religious organizations must conform to the Puritan congregational system, that all citizens must attend religious services, and that all freemen and civil administrators must be visible saints. It is true that such actions ensured the dominance of a particular religious system. But that dominance in large measure remained a function of state power. It thus appears that the locus of
power was centered in the state, and that much of the solidarity of the Puritan covenant system was a consequence of state power. Such a position is substantiated by an examination of factors leading to the decline of the unified covenantal system.

Decline of the unified covenantal system

Erosion of the covenantal system appears to have been a consequence of visible saints losing the ability to monopolize political power. Because of factors that have already been discussed, by the mid-1600s, full rights of citizenship in the Commonwealth were restricted to a small minority of religiously qualified men. It has been estimated that during this time only about 20 percent of the adult male population were regarded as regenerate and thus enabled to become freemen (Morgan 1966:171). Many of the disenfranchised were dissatisfied with such a situation and endeavored to have the English government take corrective measures. In 1684 the Court of Chancery in London annulled the Massachusetts Charter and abolished its elective system of government. The crown appointed Edmund Andros as governor. He brought an Anglican minister with him from England and instigated Anglican services in Boston. Thus Congregationalism ceased to be the only recognized religious system in Massachusetts (Breen 1980:92-93; Mead 1956:326).

In 1689, during the excitement of the Glorious Revolution, the local citizenry forcibly removed Andros as governor and provisionally reinstigated the system of government that had existed under the old charter. There was, however, considerable unrest among those denied freemanship upon religious grounds.

On February 12, 1690, the General Court [of Massachusetts] decided that henceforth adult males who possessed good character, who paid four shillings . . . and who owned a house or lands worth at least six pounds were eligible to become freemen. This seemingly innocuous act opened a floodgate of political participation in Massachusetts Bay.

During March and April over nine hundred men enrolled as freemen for the first time. Since the adult male population was about ten thousand, this would indicate that "almost ten percent of the colony's
adult males took advantage of this legislation within only sixty days" (Breen 1980:95-96).

In 1691 a new charter was established for the Bay Colony. It was essentially a compromise between local colonial leaders and the central government in England. While Puritans attempted to maintain their covenant order in terms of the new charter, through the extension of freemanship to the unregenerate and the granting of tolerance to religious groups that did not conform to the Puritan church polity model, the basis of unity within the covenant system was undermined. For example, an independent church was organized in Brattle Street, Boston, in 1698. In this church baptism was extended to the children of all professed Christians and giving evidence of regeneration ceased to be a qualification for receiving communion. Although Increase Mather and other Puritan leaders attempted to bring the Brattle Street church into line with more orthodox Puritan congregations, they lacked the power to do so (Schneider, Herbert W. 1958:87-89). It thus became possible for any religious group to establish a church system according to methods and principles that they deemed proper, and each congregation was essentially freed to develop as it desired. By placing ultimate power for unity and solidarity within the state rather than the religious organization, Puritans had opened the way for their covenantal system to be undermined as soon as the state ceased to exercise the power that would ensure its preservation.
CHAPTER III

THE EMERGENCE OF MORMONISM IN THE CONTEXT OF

THE SECOND GREAT AWAKENING

And now, behold, . . . I bring . . . my gospel to the knowledge of my people. Behold, I do not bring it to destroy that which they have received, but to build it up. (DC 10:52)

Historical Background of the Second Great Awakening

The period between the early 1790s and the mid-1840s has been designated by historians of American religion as the Second Great Awakening. During this period succeeding waves of revivalism and religious enthusiasm swept through the villages and cities of America. This phenomenon has been interpreted in part as a reaction to the condition of pluralistic voluntarism that had come to characterize American religion.

Church and State in European Civilization

The pluralistic voluntarism of nineteenth-century American religious organization was far removed from the concept of religious order that had earlier been espoused by the founders of Massachusetts. In the centuries before the Reformation, a symbiotic relationship had evolved in Europe between religious and civil authority. Civil authority was supported and provided with sacred sanctions by a universal church. In turn, civil authority backed the church and attempted to maintain religious orthodoxy and solidarity through coercion. Universal conformity to a monolithic church was deemed vital for both civil and religious order.

While the Reformation resulted in the collapse of the monolithic church, it initially did little to disrupt the basic
relationship that had developed between civil and religious authority. In areas where Catholicism was able to maintain its dominance, civil power was employed to prevent the growth of Protestantism and to ensure religious conformity and orthodoxy. In most regions where Protestantism was able to achieve permanent ascendancy, the situation was similar. Protestant state churches were established, and civil power was employed to enforce conformity. Sidney Mead (1956) designates such state churches as right-wing churches and contrasts them to unestablished, nonconforming "left-wing" religious groups who believed that religious orthodoxy should not be enforced by civil power. As exemplified by the Anabaptists on the continent and the Brownists in England, left-wing churches became the object of persecution by both the right-wing churches and by the state.

The Growth of Pluralistic Voluntarism in Early America

In virtually all early colonizing ventures of areas that would later become the original United States, the attempt was made to perpetuate the European practice of enforcing religious conformity to an established church through the employment of civil power. With the exception of Plymouth, "all the first settlements . . . were made under the religious aegis of right-wing groups." And even in Plymouth laws were soon passed that "made the support of the church compulsory, demanded that voters be certified as 'orthodox in the fundamentals of religion,' and passed laws against Quakers and other heretics" (Mead 1956:318).

By the beginning of the American War of Independence, however, this pattern had fundamentally changed. Mead (1956:320-26) attributes this transformation to three primary factors. First, the vast areas over which settlements spread militated against any consistent enforcement of laws calculated to ensure religious conformity. Non-conformists could generally readily move to more tolerant areas if civil authority was being employed to curtail their religious activities. Second, "self-interest" on the part of colonial proprietors and administrators often resulted in the nonenforcement of
such laws. In their desire to attract large populations and to maintain internal harmony, they tended to permit more religious diversity than colonial statutes permitted. And finally, increasing pressure from England resulted in the abolishment of many laws enacted to prevent religious diversity. Political and religious upheavals in England during the mid-seventeenth century resulted in increased religious tolerance in the mother country. These developments affected English colonial policy. By the end of the century, the crown had taken strong measures to curtail the use of civil power to enforce religious conformity within the colonies (as exemplified by the abolishment of the first Massachusetts Bay Charter).

The tendency toward the noninvolvement of civil authority in religious matters developed even further with the ratification of the First Amendment, which prohibited the federal government from establishing a national church or from interfering with the free exercise of religion. Although the Constitution did not forbid the existence of established churches in the individual states, this practice was terminated in all states outside New England by 1800 (Sweet 1952:58). And even within New England, the region that had traditionally placed most emphasis on the importance of established religion, state support of religious organization was coming under increasing disfavor. Thus by the beginning of the nineteenth century, each religious organization in America was essentially left free to determine its own future. Its success or failure was to be dependent upon its ability to attract followers rather than upon the support of the state.

The elimination of the use of civil power to enforce religious conformity was essentially novel in the development of Christianity. Organized religion initially lost considerable ground. Throughout the colonial period, church affiliation steadily declined. By the time of the Revolutionary War, only some 8 percent of the American people were churched (Allen and Leonard 1976:10). And conditions generated by the war created additional difficulties for organized religions. First, during the war years, forms of rationalism, naturalism, and deism gained increasing respectability among large segments of the American population. And second, many of the more prominent churches suffered
loss in prestige and organizational ability during this period. Many of the leading Anglican ministers had defected to the British. Both Anglicanism and Methodism had to reorganize without direction from England. The Quakers had become suspect because of their opposition to the war. And the Congregationalists were under fire because of the state support that they continued to receive in some parts of New England (Hill, Marvin 1968:6-8; Mead 1956:327-34).

Revivalism and the Expansion of Evangelical Protestantism

The Second Great Awakening began essentially as an attempt to reverse this trend by creating conditions that would encourage increased participation in organized churches. The revival became the chief instrument to achieve this end. Revivalism was an outgrowth of a religious movement referred to as Pietism (Mead 1954:328-33). Pietism, which had originated in Europe in the late seventeenth century, sought for religious revitalization through individual emotional transformation. "Pietists tended to make personal religious experience more important than assent to correctly formulated belief" (Mead 1954:328). Pietism had first become an important force in American religion during the First Great Awakening, which occurred in the 1730s and 1740s. Although Pietist techniques were most extensively used during that period by such European transplants as George Whitefield, they were employed by the American divine Jonathan Edwards. The New England version of Pietistic revivalism appropriated Edwards's name and became generally known as Edwardian religion.

During the Second Great Awakening the revival became much more extensively employed than at any previous time. Lacking the ability to use coercive political power for the achievement of their ends, the persuasive powers of emotionalism and psychologically induced enthusiasm became standard tools of the trade for ministers involved in this movement. Such religion became known as evangelical Protestantism.
The Multiplication of Religious Forms

But while the Second Great Awakening ostensibly began as an attempt to bring larger numbers of Americans into organized churches, it provided the context for the development of various diverse and innovative forms of religious expression. According to Gordon S. Wood (1980:361), such developments were in part the result of the broader social context in which the Second Great Awakening occurred.

Evangelical revivalism, utopian communitarianism, millennial thinking, multitudes of dreams and visions by seekers, and the birth of new religions were in fact all responses to the great democratic changes taking place in America between the Revolution and the Age of Jackson. The remains of older eighteenth-century hierarchies fell away, and hundreds of thousands of common people were cut loose from all sorts of traditional bonds and found themselves freer, more independent, and more unconstrained than ever before in their history.

The Socioreligious Background of Joseph Smith

Emerging during the height of the Second Great Awakening, Mormonism has in many ways proved to be a difficult religious movement to categorize adequately. As Sydney Ahlstrom (1972:508) has written, it is certainly the culminating instance of early nineteenth-century sect formation, and at the same time that period's most powerful example of communitarian aspiration. On the other hand, the transformation brought about by numerical growth, economic adoption, internal divisions, external hostility, and heroic exploits renders almost useless the usual categories of explanation.

Joseph Smith's Link with the Puritan Tradition

One way to begin to understand the nature of Mormonism is through an examination of the socioreligious background of Joseph Smith, its prophet-founder. Joseph Smith had a strong Puritan heritage. His paternal ancestors had resided for several generations in and around Topsfield, Massachusetts. His great-grandfather Samuel Smith had represented Topsfield in the Massachusetts General Court and was active in public worship (Anderson, Richard 1971:89-91, 188-89 note 120). His grandfather Asael Smith was baptized into the Topsfield Congregational Church four days after his birth (Anderson,
Richard 1971:89, 188-89 note 120). Asael married Mary Duty, who had also been baptized into the Congregational church (Anderson, Richard 1971:91, 191 note 127); and at the time their infant son Joseph (the father of the Mormon prophet) was baptized in 1772, they both "owned the covenant" (Anderson, Richard 1971:91-92, 191-92 note 129). Although Asael was a pew holder in the Topsfield Congregational Church, he had the reputation of being a religious rebel. In 1797, after moving to Tunbridge, Vermont, Asael and his sons Jesse and Joseph joined a Universalist society (Anderson, Richard 1971:106, 207-8 note 185). It is unclear, however, to what degree this action reflected Asael's abandonment of Congregationalism; even after he became a Universalist he remained a pew holder in the Tunbridge town meetinghouse (Anderson, Richard 1971:207-8 note 185). With the exception of his son Joseph, all his children evidently became active in either Congregational or Presbyterian churches (Anderson, Richard 1971:105).

Solomon Mack, the maternal grandfather of Joseph Smith, Jr., was born in Lyme, Connecticut in 1732 (Mack 1811:3). While still a young child he was "bound out" as an indentured servant. He continued in this service until he was about twenty-one years of age. The man who had charge over him failed to teach him to read and never spoke to him "at all on the subject of religion." Solomon relates that during this period "I was totally ignorant of divine revelation or anything appertaining to the Christian religion" (Mack 1811:4). In 1759 Solomon married Lydia Gates of East Haddam, Connecticut (Anderson, Richard 1971:163-64 note 24). The daughter of a deacon, Lydia was baptized shortly after her birth in 1732; and in 1762 she was "received to communion" in the East Haddam Congregational Church (Anderson, Richard 1971:26, 177-78 notes 81, 82). Much of the Macks' married life was spent in wilderness areas of Vermont and New Hampshire, where there was little organized religion. Because of Solomon's indifference to religion, Lydia took over the religious education of their children and evidently imbued them with deep religious fervor (Anderson, Richard 1971:27; Smith, Lucy 1958:9-36). In his later years Solomon came under his wife's religious influence. He experienced what he regarded as a miraculous religious
manifestation that resulted in his conversion to Christianity (Mack 1811:18-23). He thereafter authored a pamphlet narrating his life and describing his conversion. Shortly before his death he spent considerable time riding through the countryside discussing his religious beliefs and selling copies of the tract (Anderson, Richard 1971:23-26).

The Gospel Primitivist Movement and the Religious Orientation of Joseph Smith's Parents

The future founder of Mormonism was born 23 December 1805 in Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont. During his early childhood both of his parents were evidently "seekers." Seekism was but one manifestation of the wide-spread "gospel primitivist movement." Gospel primitivism developed within the context of the Second Great Awakening. It was not a unified movement, and it took diverse forms in different sections of the country. Gospel primitivists, however, tended to share the following characteristics: (1) a strong belief that existing churches were corrupt and apostate; (2) an opposition to the sectarian conflict generated by revivalism; (3) disapproval of the Calvinist doctrine of election; (4) stress on the authoritative nature of the Bible; (5) opinion that the solution to the present difficulties of Christianity was a "restoration" of the practices and doctrines that had characterized the "primitive church" of New Testament times, and (6) a belief that the millennial reign of Christ was imminent.

While many primitivists organized themselves into associations which they regarded as valid expressions of original Christianity, seekers kept aloft from all organized churches. Instead, they remained "seeking" the true church, which they could not equate with any form of organized religion of which they were aware (Hill, Marvin 1968, 1969; Latourette 1941:428; Mead, Sidney 1954:295-99; Murch 1962; Rupp 1844:166-70, 250-65, 520-21, 730-31; Sweet 1952:190-233). Thus the prophet's mother, Lucy Mack Smith, later wrote that during this period she had come to the conclusion that "there was not then upon the earth the religion which I sought. I therefore determined to examine my Bible, and taking Jesus and His disciples for my guide, I
endeavored to obtain from God that which man could neither give nor take away" (Smith, Lucy Mack 1958:36). Her husband evidently entertained similar views. According to Lucy, he held that there was no one class of religionist that knew any more concerning the kingdom of God than those of the World, or as such as made no profession of religion whatsoever. . . . He [consequently] would not subscribe to any particular system of faith, but contended for the ancient order as established by our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and His apostles. (Smith, Lucy Mack 1958:48, 46)

While Joseph Smith's parents had thus departed considerably from the Congregationalism of their ancestors, young Joseph had ample opportunity to be exposed to ideas that were reminiscent of the religious conceptions of Puritan New England. As a child he was in close contact with his Grandmother Lydia Gates Mack, who, as has already been indicated, had been admitted to communion in a Congregational church. During his first years of schooling he was taught by Deacon Jonathan Rinney (Hill, Donna 1977:35). And in 1814 he spent some time with his Uncle Jesse Smith in Salem, Massachusetts. Jesse Smith was a strict Calvinist. His nephew George A. Smith categorized him as a "Covenanter" (JD 5:103). And he was the only one of Asael Smith's five surviving sons who did not eventually convert to Mormonism. When Mormon relatives came to discuss religion with him, he forbid them to talk "about the Bible at all in his house unless it was upon limited election" (Anderson, Richard 1971:111).

Socioreligious Conditions in the Burned-over District

In 1816 the Smith family left the New England hill country and migrated to the Finger Lakes region of western New York. This placed them in the heart of an area whose frequent and intense religious revivals resulted in its becoming known as "the Burned-over District." At least three basic factors appear to have contributed to this phenomenon.
Socioreligious background of migrants

First, there was the socioreligious background of the area's population. Although settlement beyond the Adirondacks and Catskills hadn't begun until the late 1780s, by the time the Smiths arrived, there were some 200,000 people in the region. Over two-thirds of these were from New England (Allen and Leonard 1976:18-19; Cross 1965:3-5). Yankee concentration was sufficient to lead Timothy Dwight to refer to the populous as "a colony from New England" (Hill, Marvin 1975:5). Most of these Yankee transplants, like the Smiths, had come from the New England hill country, which had much more of a tradition of Pietism than did New England's coastal regions. Thus, according to Cross (1965:7),

The Congregationalists and the Separatists alike residing in the western hills remained in the Edwardian tradition, denying the Half-way Covenant and resisting deism and irreligion during the era of the American Revolution. In these younger, poorer, more isolated sections revivals had continued from time to time, bridging the gap between the religious fervor of the 1740s and that following 1790. Here it was, chiefly, that the "Second Awakening" made thorough and permanent conquests, far beyond its effect on the rest of New England."

The age of the migrants might also have been an important factor. According to Cross (1965:6), many of them were younger sons "for whom the scrubby farms held little opportunity. . . . Although two-thirds of all Vermonters were twenty-five or under in 1800, the emigrants were, on the average, still younger." This might have made them more susceptible to revivalism. First, there was less chance that they had already been converted and churched in New England. And second, revivals in general tended to attract younger individuals. Joseph F. Kett (1977:62-85) thus found that most converts during the Second Great Awakening were either adolescents or in their early twenties.

Economic factors

A second important factor was the social disruption created by the economic conditions of the region. Certainly the mass migration
itself, proved disruptive to the settlers as they removed themselves from established routines and social networks. The nature of the migration, however, probably militated against some of the more severe consequences that can accompany such large-scale social dislocation. While some migrants came singly, "large family groups comprised the bulk of the westering horde," and in some instances almost entire "New England villages moved as units" (Cross 1965:5).

Once settled in western New York, the migrants encountered economic conditions that differed markedly from those in the New England hill country. In the period following the revolution, New York State experienced rapid economic development. Between 1791 and 1831 its commerce increased tenfold. "Industry trailed commerce, but after 1811 when a general incorporation law made it feasible, scores of new firms were begun in sugar refining, chemical, iron and steal, brewing, brick making, and textiles" (Hill, Marvin 1975:5). The building of the Erie Canal, whose construction commenced the year after the Smiths left New England, brought western New York into much closer contact with the more industrial East. This resulted in a condition of rapid economic change and development. The canal disrupted traditional trade relationships, opened up new markets for agricultural produces, undermined home manufacturing and local industrial production, and stimulated occupational diversification (Blumin 1976; Cross 1965:55-77; Miller, Roberta 1976). According to Jan Shipp (1974:7) such economic changes had important consequences for social relationships. "The unfolding economic opportunities that attended the building of the Erie Canal seemed to make all men fortune's heirs; status came with success, and society no longer gave church membership special social or religious privilege." And Marvin Hill (1975) is of the opinion that population growth and economic development on such a large scale created wide-spread anxiety and frustration. He believes that this emotionally charged milieu resulted in both increased concern about religion and attraction to the enthusiasm of revivalism.
Revivalistic preachers

The third, and perhaps most decisive factor, was the overabundance of revivalistic ministers in the region. During the course of the Second Great Awakening, individuals both in New England and in western New York itself became alarmed at the large number of "unchurched" settlers. In response a number of societies began supporting missionary ministers in the area. In 1814, for example, the Connecticut Missionary Society had 34 preachers in the region; the Massachusetts Missionary Society, 30; the Hampshire Society, 14; and the Bershire and Columbia Society, perhaps 14. In 1818 the Presbyterian General Assembly was supporting 8 missionaries in the area. In 1827 the American Home Missionary Society reported that it was supporting 120 missionaries in New York State (Cross 1965:21-22). There were also a number of smaller societies that were sending out missionaries. In addition, various Methodist ministers and assorted preachers from smaller sects were also in the area. By far the largest number of these missionary preachers came from New England's western hill country and were imbued with its strong revivalistic tradition.

The overabundance of revivalistic missionaries led to bitter sectarian conflict. Ministers of diverse theological persuasions and supported by different missionary societies were in keen competition for the conversion of the same individuals.

The American Home Missionary movement in western New York was the primary source of bitter sectarian warfare. It encouraged the multiplication of churches, and consequently the rivalry of opposed faiths, in neighborhoods which would never adequately support more than one or two and where the financial burdens would never have been assumed without external aid. It maintained full-time pastors in places which could not support one and forced rival sects to add to their commitments in self-defense. These circumstances created lay pressure upon ministers of all denominations to induce revivals, to make converts, and to get them away from other churches. (Cross 1965:47)

Joseph Smith in the Burned-over District

As a youth in western New York, Joseph Smith was exposed to the socioreligious conditions characteristic of the Burned-over
District. His family initially settled in the village of Palmyra. Two years later, in 1818, they moved onto a farm located some two miles to the south and continued to reside there until they left New York in 1831. This placed them in the extreme northwest section of the township of Manchester and almost as close to that village as to Palmyra (Hill, Donna 1977:42). According to Whitney Cross, Palmyra and Manchester "very nearly typified the region" (Cross 1965:140). Settlement in both places had begun about 1790, and the populous was "chiefly from Connecticut and Vermont." The two towns were markedly affected by the general economic changes in the region and particularly by the construction of the Erie Canal, which passed through Palmyra and was in operation there by 1822 (Porter 1971:37). The population of Ontario County (in which both towns were located) increased from 42,032 in 1810 to 88,267 in 1820. During the same period Palmyra and the adjacent village of Macedon increased from 2,614 to 5,416.

In Ontario County between 1825 and 1835 household manufactures declined from 376,581 to 178,998. In Palmyra in 1810 households produced 33,719 yards of cloth, but by 1821 factories produced 433,820 yards. When the Smiths arrived at Palmyra the village consisted of a few log huts and wooden houses, with a store or two. Before they left in 1831, there were brick houses three rows deep, three church houses, a bank under construction, and an incorporated school district. (Hill 1975:9)

The Reverand Horace Easton, pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Palmyra, probably echoed the sentiments of many in the town when he stated that Governor "Clinton performed a most desirable 'marriage service.' He united the Great Lakes with the Atlantic and sent fruitfulness and life through half a hemisphere" (Porter 1971:37). As Whitney Cross (1965:140) indicates,

The Smiths came to no cultural backwash. Though the society they entered was more youthful, it was less isolated and provincial, more vigorous and cosmopolitan, than Vermont. It was reaching economic stability but remained on the upgrade, whereas "rural Vermont had already started into decline.

According to Cross, the Palmyra-Manchester area was "thoroughly indoctrinated in revivalistic religion" (Cross 140). Revivals had occurred there at least as early as the turn of the
century. For several decades thereafter succeeding waves of intensive revivlist activity were interspersed with periods of religious calm. This area might well have been a focal point for the revivlist enthusiasm of a much wider region. In his study of the Burned-over District, Cross identified twelve "primary centers of enthusiasm" and found that seven of these "ranged from Palmyra southward" (Cross 140). Revivals in this area could certainly attract large numbers of people. "In a camp meeting held in Palmyra in 1826, one reporter estimated that 10,000 people had gathered on the grounds to behold the spiritual drama" (Backman 1969:306).

Mormonism as a Response to Joseph Smith's Early Socioreligious Environment

The Impact of Revivalism

Three aspects of Joseph Smith's socioreligious background appear to have had particular consequences for the development of Mormonism. First, Mormonism emerged at least in part as a response to the sectarian conflict generated by the revivalism of the Second Great Awakening. Many early Mormons apparently could not resolve their religious problems within the revivalistic context; and from its inception, Mormonism was opposed to revivalistic techniques (Ellisworth 1951:339-40).

Joseph Smith himself provides perhaps the best example of the frustrations and religious turmoil that many who became Mormons had experienced as a result of revivals. He later indicated that while attending revivals as a young boy, he "wanted to feel and shout like the rest but could feel nothing" (Neibaur, Alexander, ms a, 24 May 1844). He maintained that the sectarian conflict generated by a religious revival held in his neighborhood during the year 1820 provided the catalyst for a theophany that eventually resulted in the founding of Mormonism. While writing an official history of Mormonism in 1838, he related that:

Some time in the second year after our removal to Manchester, there was in the place where we lived an unusual excitement on the subject of religion. It commenced with the Methodists, but soon became general among all the sects in that region of country . . .
and great multitudes united themselves to the different religious parties, which created no small stir and division among the people. . . . For notwithstanding the great love which the converts to these different faiths expressed at the time of their conversion, and the great zeal manifested by the respective clergy, who were active in getting up and promoting this extraordinary scene of religious feeling, in order to have everybody converted as they were pleased to call it, let them join what sect they pleased—yet when the converts began to file off, some to one party and some to another. . . . a scene of great confusion and bad feelings ensued; priest contending against priest, and convert against convert. . . . In the midst of this war of words and tumult of opinions, I often said to myself, what is to be done? Who of all these parties are right, or, are they all wrong together? If any one of them be right, which is it, and how shall I know? . . . At length I came to the conclusion that I must either remain in darkness and confusion or else I must . . . ask of God. . . . So . . . I retired to the woods. . . . I kneeled down and began to offer up the desires of my heart to God. . . . I saw a pillar of light exactly over my head. . . . which descended gradually until it fell upon me. . . . When the light rested upon me I saw two personages, whose brightness and glory defy all description, standing in the air above me. One of them spake unto me, calling me by name, and said—pointing to the other—"This is my beloved son, hear Him." . . . I asked the personages . . . which of all the sects was right—and which I should join. I was answered that I must join none of them, for they were all wrong. (HC 1:2-6)

Many early converts to Mormonism appear to have struggled with issues similar to those related by Joseph Smith.

Joel Hills Johnson said that as a boy of fifteen or sixteen he felt guilty, like a sinner, and his mind was greatly wrought up. Warren Foote said that . . . he often went to Methodist revivals, that he wanted to be a preacher, but seeing them "jump" and hearing them shout and sing disgusted him, and he became a religious seeker. George A. Smith, after joining the Congregational Church, said he still felt guilty. He went to many revivals, but after he was the only one not converted and was sealed up to damnation, he was in despair. Willard Richards had a similar experience when he was rejected by the local Congregational Church; he wrote later that revivals stir up "unnecessary fears and torture the mind." . . . Orson Hyde . . . was converted at a Methodist camp meeting, . . . but was not entirely satisfied. Lewis Shurtleff drifted from Baptist to Campbellite but still did not feel saved, having had no conversion experience. . . . Lorenzo Dow Young went to a Methodist revival and saw everyone but himself experience a change of heart. . . . [And] Parley P. Pratt . . . "felt anxious to be saved." . . . [With this object in mind he] attended Baptist meetings but was
unable to "tell them of any particular experience of religion."
(Hill, Marvin 1980:425)

Such experiences were probably typical among early Mormon converts, for most were apparently recruited from the ranks of evangelical Protestantism. Thus, in a study dealing with Mormon missionary activity prior to 1860, Samuel George Ellisworth (1951:339) found that "in addition to the great number of religious shifters and free thinkers, Mormonism recruited its numbers from among the Methodists and Baptists predominately, from among the Disciples of Christ and Congregationalists to a much lesser extent, and from the Presbyterians." In a demographic analysis of early Mormon converts, Laurence M. Yorgason (1974:42) found similar tendencies. Of those in his sample that were affiliated with another church at the time of their conversion, 89 percent belonged to churches that employed revivalistic techniques.

The Impact of Gospel Primitivism

Second, early Mormonism might be regarded as part of the broader gospel primitivist movement. Marvin Hill (1968; 1969) has carefully compared early Mormonism with primitivistic churches of the period and has found marked similarities. Mention of the primitivistic orientation of Joseph Smith's parents has already been alluded to. Evidently many other early converts to Mormonism shared similar views. Thus Wilford Woodruff states that prior to his conversion to Mormonism, "I did not join any church for the reason that I could not find any denomination whose doctrines, faith and practices agreed with the Gospel of Jesus Christ." Oliver Huntington stated that he withdrew from the Presbyterian church because he came to feel that "they had a form of Godliness but denied the power thereof." He consequently "searched the scriptures daily and found the faith once delivered to the Saints was not among men." And before his exposure to Mormonism, Newel Knight had come to the conclusion that there "had been a falling away and that the gospel would be restored" (Hill 1968:57-58). These are but a few of many examples that could be cited. Yorgason (1974:45) concluded that at least 57
percent of his sample had a primitivistic orientation prior to their conversion to Mormonism.

The Impact of Puritanism

And third, Mormon doctrine and practice appear to have been highly influenced by Puritanism. Joseph Smith's Puritan background appears in no significant way to have set him apart from many who converted to Mormonism during the early years of its existence. Of the twenty-six men he promoted to positions of high leadership in the Church, twenty-two had been born either in New England or New York (Ellisworth 1951:392). Such a pattern seems to have held for the general membership of the Church. Thus 75 percent of Yorgason's sample (1974:32) were born either in New England or New York. And after carefully analyzing the missionary activities of early Mormonism, Ellisworth (1951:341) concluded that it "made the greatest number of its converts and organized the greatest number of congregations in the middle-sized, settled communities of New York and New England.

For well over a hundred years observers have assumed that there is an intimate relationship between Puritanism and Mormonism. As early as 1867 the English editor William Hepworth Dixon (1973:366) reported an unidentified American journalist as saying that "everybody in this country has got into the habit of calling... [the Mormons] the spawn of our New England coventicles," and in 1871 Ralph Waldo Emerson characterized Mormonism as "an after-clap of Puritanism" (Thayer 1973:384). More recent investigators share similar opinions: thus Frawn Brodie (1971:1) writes that Joseph Smith "was as much a product of New England as Jonathan Edwards"; Mark Leone (1979:79) takes the position that "New England Calvinism... formed one mainstream from which Mormonism flowed"; and Robert Bellah (1978:3) feels that any investigator of Mormonism would do well to begin his analysis "with the example of Puritan New England in mind."

Despite the often repeated observation that there is an important connection between Puritanism and Mormonism, there has been little systematic attempt to investigate the precise nature of that
association. In the literature one generally finds only listings of traits that various investigators hold to be the most significant links between the two religious systems. The following are just some of the posited similarities: (1) emphasis on reason and an orderly relationship among ideas (Cross 1965:145; DePillis 1966:84); (2) interest in theorizing and speculation (DePillis 1966:84); (3) belief in the perfectibility of men (Davis 1972:21); (4) an ethic of thrift and industry (Allen and Leonard 1976:21); (5) emphasis on the importance of a Christian calling (Davis 1972:21); (6) a sense of social obligation (Cross 1965:145); (7) an institutional cast of mind (DePillis 1966:88); (8) desire to establish a well-ordered close-knit community, an ideal theocracy, and a church of saints (Allen and Leonard 1976:21; Cross 1965:145-46; Davis 1972:21; Hansen 1981:92; Jamison 1961:213, Wood 1980:384); (9) belief in providential history, in predestination, in a restoration of the "ancient order of things," and in America as a chosen land (Allen and Leonard 1976:21; Davis 1972:21; Jamison 1961:213); (10) belief in continuing revelation coupled with an element of mysticism and superstition (Cross 1965:146; Davis 1972:21); and (11) similar view of family life and a positive attitude toward sex in marriage (Hansen 1981:147, 153). Perhaps the most significant parallel, similar covenant structure, has received only scant attention.

Mormon Covenant Organization as an Attempt to Establish Group Cohesiveness amid the Socioreligious Flux of the Second Great Awakening

In examining the socioreligious context in which Mormonism emerged, the ideology that it developed, and the background of its early converts, Marvin Hill (1975:4-5) concludes that early Mormonism was fundamentally a "quest for refuge." He writes:

It seems likely that the Mormons reacted against the disintegration of the rural, socially harmonious village community with its dominant religious orientation which its leaders had known in New England, and the triumph of a commercially oriented, acquisitive, openly pluralistic and competitive, and implicitly secular social and religious order in western New York. The early
Mormons, I would argue, were fugitives from social change and political and social conflict, their Kingdom of God a refuge.

Klus Hansen comes to very similar conclusions. He essentially accepts Perry Miller's (1965:3-95) and William G. McLoughlin's (1974; 1978) position that the Second Great Awakening was instrumental in the creation of the political, economic, and religious pluralism of contemporary America. He holds that Mormonism developed as a "counterideology to these tendencies" (Hansen, Klus 1981:50-527). It was a "revitalization movement" of sorts that "appeared on the American religious scene at precisely that moment when external religious authority, both intellectually and institutionally, was in headlong retreat before the forces of individual responsibility" (1981:20). Thus, holds Hansen, Mormonism (as a reactionary response to the divisive nature of American pluralism) was fundamentally "a quest for order" (1981:69).

The Hill-Hansen hypothesis is a useful perspective from which to examine the emergence of Mormon covenant organization. From its inception Mormonism has been regarded by its exponents as an authentic restoration of primitive Christianity. One of its distinctive attributes, however, is a system of order reminiscent of Puritan covenant structure. Thus Gordon Wood (1980:384) writes that "Mormons reversed America's separation of church and state and tried to reestablish the kind of well-knit commonwealth that John Winthrop had envisioned two hundred years earlier." Indeed, John Dillenberger (1978:185-86) sees Mormonism as attempting to perpetuate a type of socioreligious order whose roots extend as far back as the medieval Lollards. Writes he:}

Mormonism belonged to an English type of Christianity as compared with a Continental type. . . . Theologically, the religion of Israel and of Christ. . . . on the Continent took the form of a culture formed by religious perceptions, as contrasted with the forming of a total society analogous to Israel in England. From the medieval Lollards to the Puritans . . . the identification with Israel, the creation of a new Israel, the identification of the land and people with Israel has been constant [in English Christianity]. . . . The impossibility of creating such a society in England led, of course, to New England, the real new Israel. The Puritan experiment in New England was more successful in its ethos than its theology, which increasingly divided and fragmented
the very society it was intending, in analogy to Israel, to create. It was the Mormons who found and made the place a society in genuine analogy to Israel. The religious-social experiment which was frustrated in London, and abortive in Boston, succeeded in Salt Lake City.

In attempting to provide an explanation for this phenomenon, it might be posited that Joseph Smith and other early Mormons drew on persisting aspects of the Puritan tradition when attempting to establish a religious system that would unite them despite the centrifugal forces of the Second Great Awakening. The result was in no sense a simple reinstitution of Puritan covenant structure. Mormon covenant organization, however, does share sufficient elements with the earlier system that the two can be meaningfully compared.
CHAPTER IV

ISRAEL'S PROMISED LANDS: MORMON COVENANT ORGANIZATION, 1830-1838

We believe that God has set his hand the second time to recover the remnant of his people, Israel; and that the time is near when he will bring them from the four winds . . . and reinstate them upon their own lands which he gave their fathers by covenant.

--Oliver Cowdery (MA 1:1-2)

This chapter will deal with the development of Mormon covenant organization prior to the expulsion of the LDS people from Missouri during the winter of 1838-39. During this period many of the persistent elements of the Mormon covenant structure were formulated. These include (1) the identification of the Mormon covenant community with the house of Israel; (2) the formulation of various covenantal categories based on imagery associated with the house of Israel motif; (3) the conceptualization of interaction between nature and law as the basis for inclusion within these covenantal categories; (4) the emergence of a covenantal network linking individuals within the group; (5) power within the system being monopolized by the hierarchically ordered priesthood structure of the Church; and (6) the Mormon family being encompassed by the Church hierocracy.

The Mormon group's self-identity during the earliest years of its existence was essentially that of Israel gathering upon its promised lands in western Missouri, where it was to achieve unity through a covenantal network of economic cooperation. As will be seen, external persecution and internal dissension made this pattern extremely difficult to institute; and when the Church was finally expelled from Missouri, its promised land was lost and its raison d'etre undermined. This necessitated radical changes in the group's covenant structure, which will be examined in the next three chapters.
Mormon Historical Perspective

As has already been indicated, Mormonism manifested several characteristics of the primitive gospel movement. Perhaps the most significant of these for the development of Mormon covenant organization were the following beliefs: (1) existing Christianity was in an apostate condition; (2) Christ's millennial reign was imminent; and (3) the "restoration" of the primitive church was both possible and crucial.

Early Mormons felt that the sectarian conflict and social upheaval of antebellum America gave evidence that Christianity was in an apostate condition. Thus in 1831-32 Joseph Smith (ms a) declared that while a youth of twelve

my intimate acquaintance with those of different denominations led me to marvel exceedingly for I discovered that they did not ... adorn their profession by a holy walk and Godly conversation. . . . I pondered many things in my heart concerning the situation of the world of mankind the contentions and divisions the wickedness and abominations and the darkness which pervaded the minds of mankind. . . . I found that mankind did not come unto the Lord but that they had apostatized from the true and living faith and there was no society or denomination that built upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ as recorded in the new testament.

It was believed that this condition of apostasy would bring the judgments of God upon the world and that these judgments would in turn usher in Christ's millennial reign. Thus in a revelation that Joseph Smith dictated in November 1831, the Lord exclaims:

Prepare ye, prepare ye for that which is to come, for the Lord is nigh;
And the anger of the Lord is kindled, and his sword is bathed in heaven, and it shall fall upon the inhabitants of the earth.

for they have strayed from mine ordinances, and have broken mine everlasting covenant;
They seek not the Lord to establish his righteousness, but every man walketh in his own way, and after the image of his own god, whose image is in the likeness of the world, and whose substance is that of an idol, which waxeth old and shall perish in Babylon, even Babylon the great, which shall fall. (DC 1:12-16)

It was in such a context that the "restoration" of the primitive church was regarded as crucial. It was believed that those who could embrace the true and uncorrupted religious system of God
would escape his judgments and be prepared for Christ's millennial reign (HC 1:11-14; Smith, Lucy, ms a). The religious system established by Joseph Smith was held by faithful Mormons to be such a restoration. Thus in the revelation already referred to, the Lord declares:

I the Lord, knowing the calamity which should come upon the inhabitants of the earth, called upon my servant Joseph Smith, Jun., and spake unto him from heaven, and gave him commandments; And also gave commandments to others, that they should proclaim these things unto the world; . . . . . . that every man might speak in the name of God the Lord. . . . That faith also might increase in the earth; That mine everlasting covenant might be established. (DC 1:17-22)

Such understandings were readily adaptable to a "dispensational" interpretation of history. Although this perspective underwent considerable amplification during later periods of the Church's history, its essential elements had become central to Mormon ideology prior to the Missouri expulsion. According to Mormon belief, the history of the earth is divided into various "gospel dispensations." At the head of each dispensation is a pivotal prophet to whom the Lord reveals "the gospel plan" and with whom He establishes His covenant. Under the authorization of the Lord, the prophet organizes his followers according to the provisions of this covenant. As long as they adhere to the covenant and comply with the gospel, they are blessed by the Lord and are regarded by him as peculiarly his people. In time, however, they cease to live the gospel and depart from the covenant. This results in a condition of apostasy. Such apostasy necessitates the Lord calling a new prophet, instigating yet another gospel dispensation, and restoring his covenant again to the earth. The Saints did not believe, however, that this dispensational cycle would continue indefinitely. The final dispensation, referred to as "the dispensation of the fulness of times," commenced with the divine calling of Joseph Smith (DC 27:13; 76:106; 110:12, 16; 112:30; EJ 1:36-42).
Emphasis on the fundamental importance of religious authority was a distinguishing characteristic of Mormonism from its inception. Mario DePillis (1966) speculates that this phenomenon was in part an outgrowth of the religious milieu in which Mormonism emerged. Amid the voluntaristic pluralism of the Second Great Awakening, it became crucial for a new religious movement to present credentials by which it could claim to be a valid embodiment of divine purpose. Various religionists within the primitive gospel movement sought to establish such credentials by drawing parallels between their particular religious systems and their understandings of primitive Christianity. In this way they could promulgate their respective churches as valid "restorations" of Biblical religion. Joseph Smith claimed more than such men. He maintained that Mormonism was not merely a reinstatement of the teachings and organizational patterns of biblical religion, but that it was a unique restoration of the actual power of God. Accepting his position, his followers believed that Mormonism monopolizes divine authority.

As Joachim Wach (1944:194-96) has comprehended, such a position provided the basis for the Mormons' view that theirs was a distinctive and unique religious system. By first maintaining that their group was singularly endowed with divine authority, and then by developing an elaborate organizational system regarded as an embodiment of that authority, Mormons produced an institutional structure which they regard as exclusive and as independent of all other organizational forms. It thus became for them the "only true and living church upon the face of the whole earth" (DC 1:30). Wach holds that such a condition qualifies Mormonism to be regarded as a prime example of an "ecclesiastical ... independent group."

Mormons employed the term priesthood when referring to their conception of the power and authority of God. By being endowed with the priesthood, mortal men became God's duly authorized agents and were thus empowered to fulfill his purposes on earth; while without
"the authority of the priesthood, the power of godliness is not manifest unto men in the flesh" (DC 84:21). When discussing the priesthood, Mormons distinguished between priesthood as the power of God, and "the keys of the priesthood," which are authorizations to exercise that power in certain prescribed ways. According to Mormon understanding, two men could have equal priesthood power; yet, because they had been given different "priesthood keys," they would not be entitled to employ that power in the same manner.

According to Mormon belief, an individual could receive the priesthood in only one way: through formal ordination by someone who already possessed the priesthood and who held the "keys" to confer it on others. Mormons held that whenever there has been a gospel dispensation, there have been mortals who have had the priesthood. In the primitive Christian church, Christ ordained his apostles to the priesthood and gave them the keys to confer it on others. Following the death of the apostles, the membership of the primitive church departed from the gospel. Because of this situation, the Lord withdrew the keys to confer the priesthood on others. Those who already had the priesthood died. And thus through a process of attrition, the priesthood disappeared from the earth.

There then ensued "the Great Apostasy," a period of some sixteen hundred years during which time the priesthood was absent from the earth. This situation was remedied only when the priesthood was restored at the opening of the dispensation of the fulness of times. Joseph Smith claimed that the priesthood power was restored to earth when he was ordained to the priesthood by "resurrected beings" who had themselves, as mortal men, been ordained to the priesthood during the previous gospel dispensation. This was accomplished in two stages. First, on 15 May 1829, Joseph Smith and his associate Oliver Cowdery were visited by John the Baptist. He laid his hands on their heads and conferred upon them the lesser or Aaronic priesthood, which empowers one to "administer in outward ordinances." Some weeks later they were visited by Peter, James, and John, who conferred on them the higher or Melchizedek Priesthood, which "holds the right of presidency and has power and authority over all the offices in the church in all ages of the world" (DC 107:8, 20; HC 1:39-42).
These two ordinations restored general priesthood power to earth, and Mormons believed that they could now receive the power and authority of God by being ordained to the priesthood by Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery, or by some other Church member who had received priesthood power and keys from them. As Ezra Booth observed shortly after his break with Mormonism in September 1831, "Many of them have been ordained to the High Priesthood or the order of Melchizedek; and profess to be endowed with the same power as the ancient apostles were" (Howe, E.D. 1834:180).

Each individual ordained to the priesthood was believed to have entered a special covenant with the Lord, referred to as "the oath and covenant of the priesthood." Thus an 1832 revelation declares:

For whoso is faithful unto the obtaining these two priesthoods of which I have spoken, and the magnifying their calling, are sanctified by the Spirit unto the renewing of their bodies. They become the sons of Moses and of Aaron and the seed of Abraham, and the church and kingdom, and the elect of God. . . . And this is according to the oath and covenant which belongeth to the priesthood. Therefore, all those who receive the priesthood, receive this oath and covenant of my Father, which he cannot break, neither can it be moved. But whoso breaketh this covenant after he hath received it, and altogether turneth therefrom, shall not have forgiveness of sins in this world nor in the world to come. (DC 84:33-34, 39-41)

But while the ordinations by John the Baptist and Peter, James, and John once again gave mortals access to priesthood power, these ordinations in themselves did not enable Joseph Smith to employ priesthood power in all its various manifestations. In order for him to do so, it was necessary that he receive additional priesthood keys that would authorize him to use the priesthood in specific and prescribed ways. According to Joseph Smith this was accomplished in stages by visitations from a number of divine personages who delegated to him priesthood keys over which they had special jurisdiction. Throughout his lifetime he made numerous references to these encounters. Thus in September 1842 he indicated that at various times he had been visited by "divers angels, from Michael or Adam down to the present time, all declaring their dispensations, their rights,
their keys, their honor, . . . and the power of their priesthood" (DC 128:21).

Priesthood ordinances

Mormons associated divers and far-reaching operations with their conception of priesthood. Most of these can be divided into two basic categories: (1) the performance of ordinances and (2) Church organization and administration. Mormons believed that with the proper keys, an individual who possessed the priesthood had the ability to officiate in ritual performatives that were acknowledged by God as valid. Such activities were referred to as "priesthood ordinances."

Covenant making

Integral to various of these ordinances was the making of covenants. The Saints thus talked about the "baptismal covenant," "the covenant of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper," "the oath and covenant of the priesthood," and the "marriage covenant." Such covenant-based ordinances involved the establishment of binding relationships among individuals and between individuals and God. It was understood that if the participants involved in such an ordinance were to abide by the covenant they entered into, the relationship thus established was "ratified" by virtue of the authority of God delegated to the priesthood holder officiating in the ordinance. Like the Puritans before them, Mormons believed covenant making to be among the most serious acts that mortals could perform. Thus various Mormon scriptures indicate that dire consequences can follow the breaking of priesthood-ratified covenants (i.e. DC 84:41).

Mormons differed from Puritans, however, in their belief that mortals are capable of initiating covenants that obligate God. This dissimilarity appears to be associated with distinctions in understandings regarding the nature of man. According to Puritan thought, man is absolutely a product of an omnipotent deity; and, because of his depraved state, is a being fit for eternal damnation. The distance between God and man is consequently regarded to be so
great that all relationships between the two must be initiated by God. Mormons conceived of a much closer relationship between God and man. Even prior to the establishment of Nauvoo, Joseph Smith taught that man's fundamental elements consisted of eternally existing "intelligence" (DC 93:28); that man existed as a spirit being before the physical creation of the earth and is a "begotten" child of God (DC 76:24; PGP Moses 3:5); and that man can eventually receive all that God the Father has and thus himself become a god (DC 76:58-59). Given such understandings, it was not difficult for Mormons to believe that they could possess divine power and authority by virtue of which they could initiate covenants that would bind God (i.e. MA 1:10:146).

Sealing

Associated with the Mormon conception of priesthood was a distinctive usage of the morpheme seal. As has been indicated, Puritans referred to the visible symbolization of a covenant as its "seal." Thus circumcision and baptism were regarded as seals of the covenant of grace. For Mormons, on the other hand, seal came to denote the performative process by which covenantal promises were ratified. The term appears to have first been employed in conjunction with assurances individuals received from priesthood holders that their eternal salvation was secure. Thus in October 1831, Joseph Smith declared that Mormon elders holding the "high priesthood . . . have power given them to seal up the Saints unto eternal life" (CM, 25 Oct. 1831). Journals kept by early Mormon missionaries give some indication of how such sealing power was employed. The following entries are found in a journal kept by Reynolds Cahoon while he was involved in missionary work during the month of November 1831:

Came to Shalesville, held a meeting in the evening with the brethren and after laboring with them for some length of time, Brother David sealed them up unto eternal life. . . . Saturday evening held a meeting at Brother Smith's and found them in the faith of the Book of Mormon. Broke bread with them. Sealed up the church unto eternal life. . . . Held a meeting with the Brethren at Mr. Reeds and blest the children in the name of the Lord and sealed the church unto eternal life. (Cahoon, Reynolds, ms a)
And Jared Carter relates that when he was about to take leave of a small Mormon congregation the following January, he "felt directed by the Spirit to declare unto the Brethren that that day was a sealing time with them . . . and it appeared to me that the Church of Christ in that place were sealed up to the Lord and . . . I then felt that I could leave them without any fears for I had the testimony that God would keep them" (Carter, Jared, ms a). The concept of sealing was then later generalized to express the bestowal of various promises. For example, Joseph Smith relates that on 21 January 1836 he anointed his father's "head with . . . consecrated oil, and sealed many blessings upon him. . . . [Afterwhich] my father anointed my head and sealed upon me the blessings of Moses, to lead Israel in the latter days . . . ; also the blessings of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (HC 2:379-80).

Exclusiveness of Mormon priesthood ordinances

Mormons held that with the loss of the priesthood at the beginning of the Great Apostasy, men had ceased to have ability to perform ordinances which were recognized as valid by God. They consequently believed that religious rituals performed by individuals outside the LDS church were null and void. Thus when certain people who had been baptized by non-Mormon ministers sought to join the Church without undergoing rebaptism by Mormon priesthood holders, Joseph Smith received the following revelation:

Behold, I say unto you that all old covenants have I caused to be done away in this thing; and this is a new and an everlasting covenant, even that which was from the beginning. Wherefore, 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. Wherefore, enter ye in at the gate, as I have commanded, and seek not to counsel your God. Amen. (DC 22)
Church organization and administration

The relationship between priesthood and church

The routinization of the Mormon concept of priesthood entailed the resolution of various issues respecting the allocation and administration of authority. Central among these was the relationship both between the priesthood and the Church and among individuals ordained to the priesthood. It was over a year after Joseph Smith had claimed to receive priesthood authority that he proceeded to organize the Church. While he indicated that the methods he followed were received by revelation (HC 1:60-61), they had close affinity to Congregationalist concepts of church government. According to Joseph Smith's account, he met on 6 April 1830 with five other men in a farmhouse at Fayette, New York. He first asked these men if they would accept him and Oliver Cowdery as their teachers in the things of the Kingdom of God, and whether they were satisfied that we should proceed and be organized as a Church according to [the] commandment which we had received. To these several propositions they consented by a unanimous vote. I then laid my hands upon Oliver Cowdery, and ordained him an Elder of the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints"; after which he ordained me also to the office of an Elder of said Church.

... We now proceeded to call out and ordain some others of the brethren to different offices of the Priesthood, according as the Spirit manifested unto us. (HC 1:77-79)

With such organizational procedures, Joseph Smith appears to have sought to establish a dual claim to authority: (1) by ordination from divine beings; and (2) by the "common consent" of the membership of the Church and subsequent ordination within that organization. This apparent ambiguity appears in part to have been an attempt to address an issue that would have to be faced by any individual seeking to establish a following within the context of a social environment characterized by voluntaristic pluralism: in such a milieu, even a man claiming authority through divine ordination could only exercise religious domination by the consent of those willing to submit to his leadership.
During the earliest years of the Church's existence there was considerable conflict over the issue of whether a man's authority within the Church resulted from the collective will of the people over whom he had jurisdiction or from the priesthood power and keys which he possessed and which were ultimately traceable to divine ordinations. The notion that each individual holding a position in the Church must be "sustained" by the vote of the people over whom he was to exercise authority became basic to the Mormon notion of Church government (DC 20:63-65; 26:2; 28:13; 38:34; 41:9; 51:12; 72:7). And John Corrill (1839:25), who left the Church in 1838, the next year wrote that Joseph Smith taught the church that [all Mormon ecclesiastical authorities] were nothing more than servants to the church, and that the church, as a body, had the power in themselves to do any thing that . . . those authorities could do, and if . . . these constituted authorities . . . did not perform their duty to the satisfaction of the church, the church had a right to rise up in a body and put them out of office . . . for the power was in the people and not in the servants.

Despite such practices and statements, by the time the Church became centered in Nauvoo, the predominate view seems to have been that priesthood existed logically prior to the Church and that the Church as an institution was but an operational structure to fulfill the objectives of priesthood leaders. As Apostle Parley P. Pratt (MS 1:237) wrote in 1841, "Where there is no priesthood there can be . . . no church of God. All doctrine, ordinances, gifts, and blessings pertaining to the church of God spring from an inspired Priesthood as directly as a stream flows from a fountain." Thus the Congregational-like procedure of sustaining ecclesiastical officers became essentially a formality, and position and authority within the Church was understood as a product of divine authority.

The office of president of the Church

Although Mormonism traced its origins to the early revelations of Joseph Smith and to the priesthood ordinations that he (in conjunction with Oliver Cowdery) received from divine beings, these events in themselves were not regarded as sufficient to assure Joseph
Smith's preeminence within the ecclesiastical organization of the Church. His position as the head of the Church was forged through a complex process involving acceptance of his revelations as alone authoritative for the Church, formal sustainings by the Church membership, and understandings regarding the nature of priesthood keys.

On the day the Church was organized Joseph Smith dictated a revelation which stated that a record would be kept by the Church in which he was to be "called a seer, a translator, a prophet, an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder of the church through the will of God ... being inspired of the Holy Ghost to lay the foundation thereof, and to build it up unto the most holy faith" (DC 21:1-2). Over the next few months conflict developed in the new church as Oliver Cowdery and others started to question some of Joseph Smith's pronouncements and to accept as valid revelations being received by a convert named Hiram Page (HC 1:104-5, 109-10). The crisis was resolved through both revelation and the vote of the Church. First, in September 1830, Joseph Smith issued a revelation in which Oliver Cowdery was informed that "no one shall be appointed to receive commandments and revelations in this Church excepting my servant Joseph Smith.... Thou shalt not command him who is at thy head, and at the head of the church; For I have given him the keys of the mysteries and revelations" (DC 28:2, 6-7). And second, minutes from a general conference of Mormon elders held on September 26 state that "Brother Joseph Smith Jr. was appointed by the voice of the conference to receive and write revelations and commandments for this Church" (CM, 26 Sept. 1830).

Such actions resulted in the understanding that Joseph Smith had a monopoly over prophetic and revelatory power. Thus all Church doctrine and policy were seen as emanating from the will of God as expressed in the pronouncements of Joseph Smith. The membership of the Church was then expected formally to "sustain" such pronouncements and conform to their dictates. As Exra Booth cynically remarked, "Everything in the church is done by commandment: and yet it is said to be done by the voice of the church. For instance, Smith gets a commandment that he shall be the "head of the church," or that he "shall rule the Conference." ... For this the members
of the church must vote, or they will be cast off for rebelling against the commandments of the Lord. (Howe, E.D. 1834:181-82)

The understanding that Joseph Smith was the Lord's "mouthpiece" appears to have developed with little difficulty into the position that he ultimately possessed earthly control over all aspects of the priesthood. This conception was formalized at a conference of elders held on 25 January 1832. Joseph Smith was first "acknowledged" by those assembled as "President of the High Priesthood" and then ordained to that position by fellow high priest Sidney Rigdon (Cahoon, Reynolds, ms a; JH, 25 Jan. 1832). A revelation received in March 1835 explained the rights and obligations that were associated with such a "calling": "The duty of the President of the office of the High Priesthood is to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto Moses... having all the gifts of God which he bestows upon the head of the church" (DC 107:91-92). By the time the Church became headquartered at Nauvoo, the position that had been forged for Joseph Smith as president both of the Church and of the high priesthood evidenced many of the conditions characteristic of office charisma (see Weber 1968:1139-41). His claim to presidency was based on the understanding that he possessed the capacity to monopolize all priesthood keys. He held all the keys. As such he alone could receive revelation that was binding on all the Church and supervise all its administrative aspects. He could delegate keys to others as he deemed appropriate. They would then be empowered to fulfill particular positions in the Church, perform specific ordinances, and receive revelations that were appropriate to their particular spheres of jurisdiction. But because it was understood that Joseph Smith could recall all the keys that he might delegate, no one else in the Church possessed autonomous authority.

Comparisons between Puritan and Mormon Concepts of Religious Authority

According to both Puritan and Mormon understanding, a basic purpose of correctly formulated ecclesiastical organization is to establish and preserve a divinely formulated pattern of human
association. The ecclesiastical systems that the two groups devised to accomplish this objective, however, have marked dissimilarities.

Puritans regarded religious power and authority to be ultimately derived from the collective will of the religiously qualified. There were essentially two loci of power: the localized groups of visible saints bound together by church covenants; and the state, which received its authority from the visible saints qua freemen. The localized church covenant groups had power to determine who was both religiously and politically qualified by virtue of their ability to select which individuals would be designated as visible saints and thus given the right to enter a church covenant group. The state, on the other hand, had general supervision over the church congregations and had authority to prohibit the development of religious pluralism and unorthodox religious expression.

In sharp contrast to Puritan understandings, Mormons came to regard religious power and authority as derived, not from the action of any human collectively, but from a divinely restored priestnood. Through ordination to various offices in the priesthood, adult male members could possess aspects of that power. But the president of the Church maintained a monopoly over priesthood power, for he alone had ultimate control over priesthood keys. While members of the Church were given the opportunity to "sustain" the actions of the president of the Church, his authority was not seen to be derived from their approval.

The Puritans of Massachusetts Bay Colony were not religious Separatists. They made no claim that their religious system was the "only true church." They were not Anabaptists and indeed maintained that there was no actual connection between religious ritual and election by God. Religious control was understood essentially as a result of state action and not as a consequence of establishing claims of religious exclusiveness. Mormons, on the other hand, unequivocally regarded their organization as the only true church. They alone possessed the priesthood, and it was impossible for an individual to become religiously qualified to "inherit the kingdom of God" without participation in Mormon rituals. Lacking ability to enforce their views by state action and existing in a milieu characterized by bitter
conflict among competing religious systems, Mormonism's continued existence became centered upon individuals accepting its claims of religious exclusiveness. The Mormon notion of religious authority might thus be understood in part as a means for counteracting the centrifugal tendencies of voluntaristic pluralism.

As has been pointed out, the Puritan system became fragmented when the visible saints lost the ability to maintain religious conformity through the application of state power. Lacking any real centralized authority structure independent of the state, each individual congregation was essentially set free to determine its own course. In contrast, Mormonism possessed a highly developed centralized system of religious authority and was able to expand independent of state sponsorship. Although both individuals and organized groups removed themselves from the control of the Mormon priesthood, its hierarchical structure not only remained intact, but became increasingly centralized. Thus while Puritan unity was ultimately based upon political domination, Mormon unity was predicated upon hierocratic domination; and the Mormon priesthood replaced the Puritan state as the fundamental basis of religious order.

Mythological Underpinnings

Mormonism did not persist merely by maintaining claims of religious exclusiveness based on understandings that it monopolized priesthood authority. Its cohesiveness as an institution was in large measure achieved by its leadership employing that authority to organize the membership into a highly structured and compact group. Mormon organizational ability has been commented on by many observers. Thus wrote Richard Ely (1903:668) in 1903, "The organization of the Mormons is the most nearly perfect piece of social mechanism with which I have ever, in any way, come in contact, excepting alone the German army."

Much of this organizational skill was employed to establish covenant networks among Mormons that related individuals to the group as a whole through such basic concerns as economics, ethnic identity, sexuality, family life, and kinship association. Mormons believed the
establishment of such networks to be essential to the Restoration and
the means by which they could escape the destruction of the wicked.
Whatever its motivation, this practice became central to Mormon
solidarity.

Mormons, like the Puritans before them, linked current
covenant making with the events of a mythical past. The dispensation
of the fulness of times was understood as the period in which the
covenantal promises made in previous dispensations were at last to be
fulfilled. The Saints thus saw themselves as participants in a cosmic
drama that had begun in past ages. The Book of Mormon was a key
element in such a conception.

Covenant Myth in the Book of Mormon

It was some two weeks previous to the organization of the
Church that Joseph Smith published the 588-page volume entitled the
Book of Mormon (HC 1:9-18, passim). He maintained that the book was a
translation of ancient records that had been temporarily entrusted to
him by an angel. The work purportedly presented an historical
overview of the rise and decline of an ancient civilization that had
been implanted in the New World by Israelite colonizers. As the first
distinctive Mormon scripture (as well as the earliest LDS
publication), it was regarded by members of the Church as a document
of fundamental importance. Thus in 1841, Joseph Smith declared the
Book of Mormon to be "the most correct of any book on earth, and the
keystone of our religion" (HC 4:261).

Despite the emphasis that Latter-day Saints placed on the Book
of Mormon, various investigators have maintained that its actual
content has had little consequence for the development of Mormonism
(i.e. DePillis 1966:78-80). They reason that the distinctive aspects
of Mormon ideology appear to be derived from revelations that Joseph
Smith received subsequent to the publication of the Book of Mormon and
that such revelations seem to be independent from, and possibly
inconsistent with, the ideas presented in that work. Such a position
may be valid for some aspects of Mormon belief and practice; it does
not hold true, however, for Mormon covenant organization. Basic
Mormon covenant concepts are clearly established in the Book of Mormon. It is true that notions pertaining to an elaborated view of dispensational history, the establishment of a preexistent pattern, eternal marriage, and other understandings that have relevance for Mormon covenant organization, make their appearance subsequent to the publication of the Book of Mormon. Such formulations, however, are logical outgrowths of ideas originally put forth in that volume.

Mark Leone (1979:203) had some insight into the consequence of the Book of Mormon for LDS covenant structure when he wrote that it has provided Mormons with the means to employ "a supposedly objective past to perpetuate present social relations." In making this statement he appears to have been at least partially aware of the book's mythic characteristics. Like myths of primitive societies, it is a narrative of ostensibly past events that is capable of imbuing the present with cosmic significance and endowing it with sacred meaning. Employing Clifford Geertz's (1973:93-94) terminology, the Book of Mormon might appropriately be regarded as a "model for" fundamental aspects of Mormon social reality. Unlike the myths of preliterate peoples, however, it is a written document. As such it is incapable of the elaboration and modification that an orally transmitted recital can undergo. It is consequently not a dynamic "model of" the changing Mormon social universe in a manner akin to various primitive myths. Lacking the ability to effect model modification in this manner, Mormonism employs "continuing revelation" to produce new myths that relate prior mythical formulations to the changing nature of Mormon social life.

The Book of Mormon is replete with covenantal imagery. The morpheme covenant occurs some 145 times within its text while the associated morphemes swear, oath, and promise appear 173 times (Shapiro, R. 1977:216-17, 678, 768, 938, 940). Although these terms are sometimes employed when the text describes the instigation of covenantal relationships among actors in the Book of Mormon narrative, they are most frequently found in passages that might be regarded as prophetic commentary on the Abrahamic covenant. Such commentary is basically concerned with three related issues: (1) the historical process by which the Abrahamic covenant is fulfilled; (2) the
identification and nature of the social categories that participate in that covenant; and (3) the rights and obligations that are associated with these categories.

The Abrahamic covenant as an historical process

The dynamics of the Book of Mormon's Abrahamic covenant clearly manifest fundamental aspects of the historical perspective that early Mormonism shared with the primitive gospel movement: apostasy; restoration; and eschatological fulfillment. The text indicates that God established a covenantal relationship with Abraham that was transmitted by hereditary right to his son Isaac and grandson Jacob. The same covenant was then extended to all the descendants of Jacob, who collectively became known as the "house of Israel." In time the entire house of Israel fell into apostasy. As a result they temporarily became disqualified to receive the divine promises that they might otherwise have claimed by right of descent. They were consequently "scattered upon all the face of the earth, and . . . among all nations." Many eventually forgot that they were members of the house of Israel and ceased to have any knowledge of the provisions of the Abrahamic covenant. To remedy this situation, in the last days "the Lord will proceed to do a marvelous work." As a consequence of this activity, "the covenants of the Father of heaven unto Abraham" will again be made known unto his descendants, many of these will become qualified to receive the covenantal blessings that are theirs by hereditary right, and "all the kindreds of the earth [shall] be blessed" (BM 1 Ne. 22:3-12; see also BM 1 Ne. 10:2-14; 3 Ne. 20:12-21; 29; Mrm. 5:20; Eth. 13:5-11).

Covenantal categories

This basic historical process is reiterated and elaborated at numerous points in the text of the Book of Mormon. As this is done various social categories are identified in terms of their relationship to the Abrahamic covenant. As has already been seen, all biological descendants of the patriarch Jacob are conjointly referred
to as the house of Israel. This category is presented in complementary opposition to the Gentiles, who (because they are not descended from Jacob) have no hereditary rights to the Abrahamic covenant. The house of Israel is in turn subdivided into various categories. The most commonly mentioned of these are the descendants of Jacob's son Judah and of his son Joseph. The descendants of Judah are regarded as essentially identical with the Jewish people (BM 2 Ne. 3:12; 29:5). The identity of the descendants of Joseph is more problematic. The Book of Mormon affirms that the founders of the New World civilization whose history it relates were descendants of Joseph through his son Manasseh (BM 1 Ne. 5:14; Al. 10:3). The American Indians are in turn presented as at least partially descended from these colonizers (1 Ne. 13:12-14; see also HC 1:12; TS 3:707) and in the text are referred to as "Lamanites" (a name derived from "Laman," one of the book's principal actors). The Book of Mormon (2 Ne. 3:7-9, 14-15) further implies that Joseph Smith is a descendant of the biblical Joseph. This suggests the possibility that part of the patriarch Joseph's descendants were "scattered" among the Europeans who colonized America in the seventeenth century.

**Covenantal rights and obligations**

Integral to the Book of Mormon's depiction of the Abrahamic covenant are various "promises" which the Lord has made to those individuals that make up the various covenantal categories. These promises are diverse. Some of the most frequently reiterated are associated with land. These include such promises as being gathered together (BM 1 Ne. 19:15; 20:20; 3 Ne. 20:13), occupying "choice" and "promised lands" (BM 1 Ne. 22:20; 5:5; 7:13; 13:30; 2 Ne. 1:5; 9:2; 10:7; Al. 37:28; 3 Ne. 20:29), and "prospering" in the land (BM 1 Ne. 4:14; 2 Ne. 1:9; Mos. 1:7; 2:22). Other promises appear more religiously oriented. Among these are the following: coming to a correct understanding of God (BM 2 Ne. 10:2; 3 Ne. 20:13); receiving the gospel (BM 1 Ne. 22:11; 3 Ne. 16:12); and becoming a blessing to "all the kindreds of the earth" (BM 1 Ne. 15:18; 3 Ne. 20:25).
Although these promises are presented as rights to which the descendants of Jacob have hereditary claim, they are contingent upon obedience to God's will and extendable to all who will comply with his commandments. The Book of Mormon compares the house of Israel to an olive tree from which all recalcitrant Israelites will eventually be cut off and to which repentant and worthy Gentiles will be "grafted" so that they may become eligible for the Abrahamic promises (BM Jac. 5-6; see also 1 Ne. 14:1-2; 2 Ne. 10:7-10; 3 Ne. 21:20-24). Thus, while the Book of Mormon clearly indicates that covenantal promises can be biologically transmitted, it emphatically maintains that their fulfillment is predicated upon personal worthiness. "For behold, I say unto you that as many of the Gentiles as will repent are the covenant people of the Lord; and as many of the Jews as will not repent shall be cast off; for the Lord covenanteth with none save it be with them that repent and believe in his Son, who is the Holy One of Israel" (BM 2 Ne. 30:2).

Puritan and Book of Mormon
Covenantal Myths Compared

Both Puritan theology and the Book of Mormon narrative present the Abrahamic covenant as the basic paradigm for covenantal organization. In both instances this covenant is presented as a relationship between God and man to which the descendants of Abraham have had hereditary right and in which Gentiles can participate through engrafting. Despite such similarities, however, there is considerable disagreement respecting the nature of that covenant.

First, there is significant discrepancy regarding the divine obligation associated with the Abrahamic covenant. In Puritan thought it is the promise of sanctification by which an individual can escape the condition of natural depravity into which humanity descended when Adam broke the covenant of works. Such a conception is absent from the Book of Mormon. The text of the Book of Mormon has a good deal to say about Adam and about the nature of his transgression (e.g. BM 2 Ne. 2:15-25; Mos. 3:11, 16; A1. 12:22-32; 42:2-14; He. 14:16; Mrm. 9:12), but it nowhere presents the Abrahamic covenant as a means by which man can escape either the consequences of Adam's having broken a
covenant or the effects of the Fall. And although the Book of Mormon discusses sanctification (e.g. Jac. 4:5; Al. 5:54, 13:11-12; He. 3:35; 3 Ne. 27:20; 28:39; Eth. 4:7; Mro. 10:33), this condition is never explicitly linked with the Abrahamic covenant. The divine obligation of the Book of Mormon's Abrahamic covenant consists rather in the fulfillment of the promises discussed above. Since these promises tend to be described in general terms, it is possible to regard various pragmatic conditions as manifestations of their fulfillment. The Book of Mormon's Abrahamic covenant is consequently both more ambiguous and more flexible than the Puritan formulation.

Second, in contrast to Puritan understanding, the Book of Mormon's Abrahamic covenant is fundamentally Arminian in nature: if a man keeps the commandments of God, he can expect to receive the promised blessings; if he fails to do so, he will be rejected of the Lord (e.g. BM Hel. 14:29-31). Essentially absent are the Calvinist notions of predestination, irresistible grace, and the inefficacy of works. Such a change does not eliminate religious uncertainty, but it does shift its focus. While the Puritan might agonize over the issue of whether or not God had predestined him for salvation, a Mormon would be concerned with the degree of righteousness he would have to display before he could gain God's approval.

And third, unlike the Puritan formulation, the Book of Mormon's Abrahamic covenant is presented as a compact that exists primarily between God and the literal descendants of Abraham. Puritans equated the Abrahamic covenant with the generic covenant of grace that God establishes between himself and each individual whom he predestines for salvation. Puritans identified themselves as children of Abraham and a new Israel, not because of any supposed biological connection with the literal descendants of Abraham, but because the Puritans believed themselves, like ancient Israel, to be joined to God through the covenant of grace. The Book of Mormon, on the other hand, is fundamentally concerned with establishing the point that in the last days the literal descendants of Abraham shall receive the promises that were integral to the covenant that God established with their ancestor. Thus the title page of the Book of Mormon states that the book was written "to show unto the remnant of the House of Israel
what great things the Lord hath done for their fathers; and that they may know the covenants of the Lord, that they are not cast off forever." While the work indicates that believing Gentiles are permitted to "come in unto the covenant and be numbered among . . . the remnant of Jacob" (BM 3 Ne. 21:22), it is basically interested in demonstrating how the literal descendants of Abraham will be enabled to participate in the covenant. It thus goes to great pains to establish the identity of various groups as the biological offspring of Abraham and to describe how they will eventually receive the covenantal promises that God made with their fathers.

**Bases of the Relationships**

The publication of the Book of Mormon and the organization of the Mormon church were near coinstantaneous events; and for many Saints, the book and the Church became inextricably linked. Thus the Church with its priesthood power was regarded as the vehicle by which the book's covenantal promises were to be fulfilled, while the covenantal categories textually associated with those promises became the basis for solidarity within the Church.

Book of Mormon covenantal ideology consequently readily became basic to the Latter-day Saint world view. Some appreciation of the degree to which early Mormonism was informed by such concepts can be gained through an examination of the topics discussed in the Church's earliest periodical, the *Evening and the Morning Star*. The complete text of the allegory of the tame and wild olive tree is there reprinted together with comments regarding its significance (EMS 1:4:[26-28]; see also EMS 1:5:[33]). Considerable space is devoted to discussions of the relationship between Gentiles and Israelites and of the means by which they might both become qualified to receive Abrahamic promises (e.g. EMS 1:5:[34]; 2:16:126-27; 2:18:148; 2:23:178; 2:24:188). One article consists of a discussion of the whereabouts of "lost ten tribes" (EMS 1:5:[33-34]), and another attempts to trace the history of the tribe of Joseph (EMS 1:6:[41-43]). One of the most persistent themes of the periodical concerns the "gathering of Israel" in the last days (e.g. EMS

As has already been seen, the Book of Mormon employed two distinctive concepts in its descriptions of the religiously oriented covenant community: biological descent and compliance with divinely decreed regulations. Thus in various passages "God's covenant people" are differentially identified as the literal descendants of Jacob and as all who obey God's commandments. Both notions became basic to Mormon group identity. The pattern that emerged is analyzable in terms of David Schneider's American kinship model. As is the case with Schneider's (1968) depiction of the cultural components of the American relative, there are two fundamental elements in Mormon group identity. The first, which coincides with Schneider's "code of conduct," consists in the acceptance of Church discipline and is symbolized by the ordinance of baptism. The second, which corresponds to Schneider's notion of "shared biological substance," is manifest in the understanding that Mormons should ideally possess "the blood of Israel."

The Baptismal Covenant and the Mormon Code of Conduct

Baptism for Mormons officially had a dual purpose (BM Mos. 18:8-13; Mro. 6; DC 20:37). First, it was the basis for a covenant between the recipient and God: the recipient covenanted with God that he would forsake his sins, take upon him the name of Christ, and henceforth keep the Lord's commandments; the Lord in turn covenanted that if the recipient proved faithful to his baptismal promises he would be forgiven of his sins, receive the Holy Ghost, and be accepted into the kingdom of heaven. And second, baptism was the means by which an individual became a member of the Mormon church, the earthly manifestation of God's kingdom. Through the fusion of these two intentions, Mormon baptism became essentially a boundary mechanism separating a category of individuals who had personally covenanted to
accept the Mormon code of conduct and were ostensibly endeavoring to live it from those who either rejected it or who were regarded as unable to comply with its provisions. Individuals within this covenantal category were bound together through aspects of the Mormon order of law. This can be seen by comparing Puritan and Mormon baptismal beliefs and practices. Puritan baptism gave symbolic expression to various aspects of the Puritan order of nature. First, it was regarded as a "seal" of the covenant of grace. As such it was viewed as a manifestation of at least the hope that God had instigated a process that would eventually transform the recipient's nature to correspond to that of primordial man. Puritans thus conceptualized baptism as the representation of an essentially biological process occurring under the influence of a supernatural agent. And second, baptism was administered to the infant children of church members. This practice was based on the belief that federal holiness was transmitted from parents to children. The children were consequently regarded as having been "born in the covenant" of grace that God had established with their progenitors. This resulted in the understanding that the Puritan church community was essentially bound together by a condition of hereditary charisma.

In contrast, Mormons neither regarded baptism as indexical of an actual biological process nor believed that infants should be baptized. Mormon scripture rejected the idea that original guilt was biologically transmitted (e.g. BM Mro. 8:26; DC 93:38), and its ideology thus had no place for the notion that baptism signaled a process by which God removed an individual from a condition of natural depravity that had resulted from the fall of Adam. Children were thus understood to be born "in a state of innocence" and were not to be baptized until they had matured to the degree that they were morally responsible for their own actions and capable of personally committing themselves to the provisions of the baptismal covenant (DC 20:17). Revelation set the age of eight as the point at which this occurred (DC 68:24-25). (It was believed that all children before that age were incapable of sin and would be automatically saved in the kingdom of God if they should die [BM Mro. 9:14-22; DC 137:10].) While one
might question whether or not the eight-year-old children of Mormon parents actually comprehended the significance of the baptismal covenant to which they were formally committing themselves, the practice of delaying baptism until this time contributed to the Mormon belief that their Church consisted exclusively of individuals who by covenant had committed themselves to comply with the commandments of God. Mormon baptism thus signified a solidarity based on the common acceptance of an exclusive code of conduct rather than a solidarity resulting from particularistic hereditary linkage or distinctive biological condition.

The centrality of code to Mormon solidarity was emphasized in at least two other important ways. First, prospective members were expected to confess and repent of inappropriate behavior before being allowed to make the baptismal covenant (DC 20:37). If their reformation was deemed inadequate, they were denied baptism. For example, in July of 1835 one "Michael H. Barton tried to get into the Church, but he was not willing to confess and forsake all his sins—and he was rejected" (HC 2:235). Although Arminian in emphasis, this procedure was structurally akin to the Puritan requirement that an individual give evidence of sanctification before receiving the church covenant. And second, members judged to be acting contrary to the accepted norms of Mormon behavior were excommunicated from the Church (DC 41:5; 42:20-27). Thus an instructional epistle issued by Joseph Smith in 1834 states that "the Messiah's kingdom on earth is of that kind of government that there has always been numerous apostates, for this very fact, that it admits of no sins unrepented of without excluding the individual from its fellowship" (EMS 2:19:152). An excommunicated member was regarded as having violated his baptismal covenant and thus forfeiting the divine promises that he had received when he experienced that ordinance. After demonstrating repentance, it was possible for him to be readmitted to the Church. In order for this to occur, however, it was necessary for him to once more submit to all the procedures of the baptismal ordinance and thus publicly reaffirm his willingness to obey the Mormon code of conduct.

One of the best ways to gain insight into the precise nature of the Mormon code of conduct is through an examination of the
specific charges brought against members who were tried in Church courts and then excommunicated. The following are charges brought against some twenty-three individuals who were excommunicated prior to the Church's expulsion from Missouri: covenant breaking (HC 2:218, 228, 236); imprudent, improper and un-Christlike conduct (HC 2:18, 54, 241, 444); breaking the Church's health and dietary code known as "the Word of Wisdom" (HC 2:218, 228, 442; 3:18); adultery and immorality (HC 1:352-56; 2:285, 442); neglecting one's family (HC 2:442, 444); neglecting one's duty and calling in the Church (HC 1:327; 3:8); refusing to fulfill a proselyting mission (HC 1:354); treating the Church with contempt (HC 2:2, 444); showing contempt for the authorities of the Church (HC 2:527; 3:8); not believing Joseph Smith to be a prophet (HC 2:2); bringing "unnecessary persecution" upon Joseph Smith (HC 2:442); circulating false and slanderous reports (HC 1:355); "not observing the order of the gospel" (HC 1:355); "holding very incorrect principles" (HC 2:225-26); denying the faith (HC 2:2); "repeated transgressions, and promising to reform, and never fulfilling" (HC 1:469); and "absenting himself from the meetings, and saying that he wanted no more of the Church, and that he desired to be cut off" (HC 1:469-70). Such data indicates that the early Mormon code of conduct placed high emphasis on loyalty to the leadership and institutions of the group and on the maintenance of proper behavior in such areas as sexual expression and family life.

The Gathering of Israel and Biological Substance in Early Mormon Identity

The normative-based solidarity resulting from Mormon belief and practice regarding the baptismal covenant was not particularly different from that found in various religious organizations that emerged during the course of the Second Great Awakening. The distinctiveness of Mormon solidarity resulted rather from the interplay of normative solidarity with that derived from notions of shared biological substance.

As has already been indicated, Book of Mormon commentary on the Abrahamic covenant involves two basic biological categories: the house of Israel, who are identified as descendants of Jacob; and the
Gentiles, who are not. According to the text, a complex relationship exists between these two categories. It predicts that in the last days the Lord will "proceed to do a marvelous work among the Gentiles." This work will result in the house of Israel coming to a correct understanding of their covenant relationship with God and being gathered (BM 1 Ne. 22:8-12). And repentant Gentiles in turn will be "numbered among the house of Israel" and be gathered with them (BM 2 Ne. 10:18; 3 Ne. 16:13; 21:22-25).

Such pronouncements presented early Mormons with a number of issues that they sought to resolve within the context of the historical circumstances in which they found themselves: what was the marvelous work? who were the Israelites and who were the Gentiles? how was the work to go from the Gentiles to the Israelites? how were the Gentiles to be numbered with the Israelites? and what was meant by the gathering? The manner in which the Saints dealt with these questions resulted in a complex descent ideology that became central to the Mormon conception of religious identity.

As might be expected, the "marvelous work" was readily identified as the Mormon restoration, particularly the Book of Mormon (DC 19:26) and the distinctive Mormon gospel (DC 14:10). Mormonism thus came to be regarded as the vehicle by which the house of Israel was to be restored to its proper covenantal relationship with God. This conception was perhaps most explicitly formulated in the understanding that Joseph Smith had received specific priesthood keys to gather Israel and organize them according to the provisions of the Abrahamic covenant. Thus Joseph Smith claimed that on April 3, 1936, while he and Oliver Cowdery were engaged in prayer,

the heavens were . . . opened unto us; and Moses appeared before us, and committed unto us the keys of the gathering of Israel from the four parts of the earth, and the leading of the ten tribes from the land of the north.

After this Elias appeared, and committed the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham, saying that in us and our seed all generations after us should be blessed.

After this vision had closed, another great and glorious vision burst upon us; for Elijah the prophet . . . stood before us and said:
Behold the time has fully come, which was spoken of by the mouth of Malachi—testifying that he [Elijah] should be sent, before the great and dreadful day of the Lord come—

To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers, lest the whole earth be smitten with a curse—

Therefore, the keys of this dispensation are committed into your hands; and by this ye may know that the great and dreadful day of the Lord is near, even at the doors. (DC 110:11-16)

Initial understanding regarding the Gentile-Israelite distinction

Prior to the Missouri expulsion there appears to have been two different understandings regarding the identity of Gentiles and Israelites. The first formulation to emerge was that the Gentiles included all individuals of non-Jewish European descent while the Israelites were composed essentially of three different groups: the Jews; the "Lamanites," or American Indians; and the "ten lost tribes," who at least some Mormons believed were located in an undiscovered region close to the North Pole (DC 109:60-67; 131:26-35; EMS 1:5:[33-34]; 2:13:101; 2:16:126; 2:19:148; MA 2:1:193-94). In terms of this conception, Mormon self-identity was essentially that of repentant Gentiles entrusted with the responsibility of taking the "marvelous work" to the house of Israel and then receiving with them the covenant blessings of the Lord. Thus in February 1835, Joseph Smith declared that the church's newly appointed twelve apostles would be expected "to preside over the churches of the Saints, among the Gentiles . . . [and to] preach among the Gentiles, until the Lord shall command them to go to the Jews" (HC 2:200). And in April of the same year Oliver Cowdery (MA 1:7:111) wrote that

in consequence of the transgression of the Jews at the [first] coming of the Lord, the Gentiles were called into the kingdom, and for this obedience are to be favored with the gospel in its fulness first, in the last days. . . . And for their obedience to the faith they shall see the house of Jacob come with great joy . . . and with him partake of salvation.

Early Mormons seriously accepted the prophetic commission that they were to take knowledge of the Mormon restoration to the biological descendants of Jacob. The Church had scarcely been
organized before "a great desire was manifest by several of the Elders respecting the remnants of the house of Joseph, the Lamanites, residing in the west--knowing that the purposes of God were great respecting that people, and hoping that the time had come when the promises of the Almighty in regard to them were about to be accomplished" (HC 1:118). In response to this interest, a revelation was produced commissioning Oliver Cowdery and three other Mormon elders to go "into the wilderness among the Lamanites" (DC 32:2), and in October 1830 the group began a journey of some fifteen hundred miles to declare Mormonism to Indians then being relocated in eastern Kansas as a result of the Indian Removal Act (Pratt, Parley P. 1979:47-57).

The Mormons also made some attempt to help the Jews fulfill their covenantal destiny. About 1832 Orson Hyde received a blessing from Joseph Smith in which he was informed that "in due time thou shalt go to Jerusalem, . . . and be a watchman unto the house of Israel; and by thy hands shall the Most High do a great work, which shall prepare the way and greatly facilitate the gathering together of that people" (HC 4:375). In response to this directive, Hyde left for Europe in 1840, where he made contact with various Jewish leaders and then proceeded on to Jerusalem, where he dedicated Palestine for the return of the Jews (HC 4:106, 112-14, 274, 372-79, 384-88, 454-59; Barron 1977:109-35).

The Saints anticipated that in fulfillment of Book of Mormon prophecy and their personal labor as God's agents, large numbers of Jews and American Indians would accept the message of the Mormon restoration and participate in the Mormon conception of the Abrahamic covenant. Thus in December 1833 Oliver Cowdery rhetorically asked, "Who . . . can doubt for a moment the near approach of that day when Israel shall be gathered to his own land, and the captivity of Jacob's tents return? when the seed of Abraham shall possess their promised inheritance in the choice country that once flowed with milk and honey?" (EMS 2:15:113). In April of 1835 he indicated that the restoration of the gospel was to be followed in "quick succession" by the gathering of Jacob's descendants (MA 1:7:109). And in October of the same year William W. Phelps wrote that "the Indians are the people
of the Lord; they are of the tribes of Israel; the blood of Joseph . . . and the hour is nigh when they will come flooding into the kingdom of God" (MA 2:1:193).

But while impressive numbers of Anglo-Americans (and after 1837 British and other Europeans) were converting to Mormonism, virtually no Jews or American Indians were accepting baptism into the Church. This situation could well have resulted in Mormon group identity being patterned in a manner that was inconsistent with the covenantal ideology of the Book of Mormon. The reason that this did not happen was in large measure due to the emergence of a second formulation regarding the identity of Gentiles and Israelites. Although not inconsistent with the first conception, this formulation was based on the understanding that many seemingly Gentile converts to Mormonism were in reality the descendants of Jacob.

Patriarchal blessings and the growing identification with Israel

Early identification with Israel

It is difficult to reconstruct the various steps by which early Mormons came to regard themselves as the biological offspring of Abraham. As has already been indicated, the Book of Mormon states that the house of Israel were scattered among all nations (BM 2 Ne. 10:6) and strongly suggests that Joseph Smith was a descendant of the biblical patriarch Joseph (BM 2 Ne. 3:11-16). Soon after the Church was organized, various indications began appearing that other Saints were likewise part of scattered Israel. A revelation recorded in November of 1831 states that "literal descendants of Aaron . . . have a legal right" to be bishops in the Church and that descent from Aaron can be ascertained "by revelation under the hands . . . of the First Presidency of the Melchizedek Priesthood" (DC 68:14-21). In November of 1832 William W. Phelps wrote that the American Indians were but one "branch of the tribe of Joseph" and declared that other "branches" of that tribe were "wandering among the nations" EMS 1:6:[43]). A revelation received in December of the same year addresses unspecified individuals as persons "with whom the priesthood hath continued
through the lineage of your fathers--for ye are lawful heirs, according to the flesh . . . therefore . . . the priesthood . . . must needs remain through you and your lineage until the restoration of all things" (DC 86:8-10). A June 1833 revelation identifies John Johnson as "a descendant of . . . Joseph and a partaker of the blessings of the promise made unto his fathers" (DC 96:7). And in February of 1834 a revelation addressed to the general membership of the Church declares, "Ye are the children of Israel, and of the seed of Abraham: (DC 103:17).

The office of patriarch

Statements such as these established a nebulous link between the ancient house of Israel and the membership of the Mormon church. This connection became much more patent to individual Saints through "patriarchal blessings." During the first years of the Church's existence, the understanding developed that Mormon priesthood holders, like the biblical patriarchs of former dispensations, should be able to bestow patriarchal blessings on their posterity. This belief presented at least two problems: by what authority were these blessings to be given; and how could such blessings be received by Church members whose biological fathers were either deceased or not part of the Mormon community. Both these issues were resolved when Joseph Smith, Sr., on 18 January 1833, was ordained a "patriarch" by his son.

The words of the ordination are extremely important, for they introduce into Mormonism a mythological pattern which would become fundamental to the Mormon covenantal system. Oliver Cowdery, who participated with Joseph Smith in the ordination, recorded the blessing as follows:

Thus spake the Seer, and these are the words which fell from his lips, while the visions of the Almighty were open to his view saying: Blessed of the Lord is my father, for he . . . shall be numbered among those who hold the right of Patriarchal Priesthood, even the keys of that ministry; for he shall assemble together his posterity like unto Adam; and the assembly which he called shall be an ensample for my father, for thus it is written of him, "Three years previous to the death of Adam, he called . . . his posterity who were righteous into the valley of Adam-ondi-Ahman,
and there bestowed upon them his last blessing. And the Lord appeared unto them, and they rose up and blessed Adam, and called him Michael, the Prince, the Archangel; and the Lord administered comfort unto Adam, and said unto him, "I have set thee to be at the head; a multitude of nations shall come of thee, and thou art a Prince over them forever." So shall it be with my father: he shall be called a prince over his posterity, holding the keys of the Patriarchal Priesthood over the kingdom of God on earth, even the Church of the Latter-day Saints, and he shall sit in the general assembly of Patriarchs, even in council with the Ancient of Days when he shall sit and all the Patriarchs with him and shall enjoy his right and authority under the direction of the Ancient of Days. (Smith, Joseph 1976:38-39; Smith, Joseph Fielding, Jr. 1953 1:473-74)

The full significance of this blessing will be discussed in the next chapter. It should here be noted, however, that the blessing refers to the existence of a patriarchal order that was established in the days of Adam and of a patriarchal priesthood by which men can preside over their posterity and confer hereditary blessings. It was believed that by virtue of his ordination to the office of patriarch, Joseph Smith, Sr., received keys both to preside over his own posterity and to give patriarchal blessings to all who requested them. He thus became a patriarch, not only to his own family, but to the Church in general.

Almost immediately after his ordination, Joseph Smith, Sr., began giving patriarchal blessings. As the Church grew in size, other Church patriarchs were called to do likewise. It appears that, originally, Church patriarchs gave blessings only to orphans or to Saints whose biological fathers were not members of the Church (and thus not religiously qualified to bestow such blessings) (Johnson, Joel n.d.:10; MA 1:10:146-47; Smith, Joseph Fielding 1953 1:473; Snow, Erastus, ms a; Tullidge 1877:96; Williams, Nancy C. 1951:89). Soon, however, even Saints whose fathers were active Church members began receiving patriarchal blessings from Church patriarchs (Barron, Howard 1977:315; Kingsbury, Joseph C., ms a, blessing of Dorcas A. Moor). A scribe would be present to record each blessing (Huntington, O.B. 1893:345-46; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 23 Jan. 1836). One copy of the blessing would be presented to the recipient and another retained by the patriarch to be preserved in the archives of the Church. Such blessings were often given in special "blessing meetings," where
interested individuals could witness friends and relatives receiving blessings from an ordained patriarch. Thus Wilford Woodruff records that on 1 December 1836 "a number of saints met in the house of the Lord . . . to receive from under the hands of Father Joseph Smith their patriarchal blessings. I went up to the temple to witness the scene and to hear the promises made" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 1 Dec. 1836; see also Arrington, Leonard 1976:66; Huntington, O.B. 1893:345; Johnson, Benjamin F. 1947:19; HC 2:301, 346-47, 387-89; Smith, Eliza R. Snow 1884:9-10; Stevenson, Edward 1894:9-10).

It was believed that patriarchal blessings were given "by the spirit of revelation and prophecy" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 1 Dec. 1836), and both recipients of blessings and witnesses to the spectacle often experienced a sense of religious awe. Edward Stevenson (1894:552) later recalled that at such meetings "the power of his priesthood rested mightily upon Father Smith. It appeared as though the veil which separated us from the eternal world became so thin that heaven itself was right in our midst." And to Eliza R. Snow, Joseph Smith, Sr., seemed "the veritable personification of my idea of the ancient Father Abraham" (Tullidge, Edward 1877:97). Caroline Crosby (ms a) writes that the blessings she and her husband received "cheered and rejoiced our hearts exceedingly. I truly felt humble before the Lord and felt to exclaim like one of old 'Lord what am I or what my father's house, that thou are thus mindful of us.'" Newel Knight (ms a) records in his autobiography that after his wife received her patriarchal blessing,

"Lydia and myself went into the house of the Lord and retired to a secret chamber to there . . . offer up our prayers to God. . . . This is a Sabbath long to be remembered by me and may the Lord preserve us henceforth and his Holy Spirit guide and enlarge our understanding . . . that we may in the end of our probation receive an inheritance with all the sanctified."

Wilford Woodruff (ms a, 15 Apr. 1837) viewed his patriarchal blessing within the context of a cosmic sweep of Mormon time from the "day when God spake and chaos heard and this world came into order . . . [to] the last dispensation of the gospel of Jesus Christ." And some forty-five years later he was to reminisce that when Joseph Smith, Sr., "put his hands on the head of a person to bless him, it seemed as
though the heavens were opened, and he could reveal the whole life of that person" (Woodruff, Wilford 1882:94).

Hereditary promises. A typical blessing consisted primarily in a series of promises that the patriarch felt inspired to make to the recipient. Such promises were often presented as hereditary prerogatives that were transferable from generation to generation. The following are excerpts from patriarchal blessings given by Joseph Smith, Sr., in the years 1834-37: "The blessings of the fathers shall rest upon thee. Thy seed shall be blessed and thy seed's seed, after thee, till the last generation" (Smith, Ruby K. 1953:41). "I seal upon thee the blessings of a father that thou mayest claim an inheritance with thy brethren, for thyself and for descendants after thee" (Williams, Nancy C. 1951:88). "I give unto thee a Father's Blessing—a blessing that shall reach thy posterity. Thou and thy posterity shall have inheritance in Zion. Thy children shall be great in the earth" (Barron, Howard 1977:314). "Thou shalt be blessed and thy posterity after thee" (Kingsbury, Joseph C., ms a). "I seal a Father's blessing upon thee and for thy posterity for thou shalt be a mother to many children and thou shalt teach them righteousness and have power to keep them from the power of the destroyer" (Knight, Newel, ms a). "I lay my hands upon thy head and confirm the blessings of a father upon thee and for thy posterity also, for thou shalt raise up children and the Lord will bless them and they shall be kept in the covenant of Abraham" (Crosby, Caroline, ms a). "I lay my hands on thy head and seal a blessing on thy head which shall reach thy posterity" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a).

Declarations of lineage. It was often indicated that the recipient was entitled to such hereditary prerogatives because he was a descendant of a biblical patriarch to whom the promises had initially been made. In the blessing of Joseph Smith, Sr., to his son Hyrum, he stated, "I now ask my heavenly Father to bless thee with the same blessing with which Jacob blessed his son Joseph, for thou art his true descendant, and thy posterity shall be numbered with
the house of Ephraim" (Smith, Hyrum M. and Sjodahl, Janne 1965:23).
And to Johnathan Crosby he said, "Thou art of the seed of Israel, even an Ephraimite" (Crosby, Caroline, ms a.)

The practice of declaring the recipient to be the descendant of biblical patriarchs appears to have become increasingly prevalent as the Church developed. An analysis of data contained in the LDS church archives' patriarchal blessing index yields the following results. Among a sample of fifty-four patriarchal blessings given by Church patriarchs before 1839, 46 percent indicate that the recipients were descendants of biblical patriarchs. When this sample is broken down by years, the following pattern develops: in 1834 only 31 percent of the blessings indicated descent from biblical patriarchs; in 1835 this increased to 32 percent; in 1836 to 66 percent; in 1837 to 74 percent; and in 1838 to 100 percent.

The fact that a particular patriarchal blessing failed to indicate that the recipient was a descendant of biblical patriarchs was evidently not regarded as evidence that he was not. And various members of the Church who received early blessings in which no lineage was given, were later given patriarchal blessings in which they were assured that they were indeed descendants of Old Testament characters. Thus Joseph Smith, Sr., made no mention of "lineage" in the patriarchal blessing he gave to Joseph Kingsbury in 1835. In 1844, however, Kingsbury received another patriarchal blessing. Kingsbury was now informed that "thou art entitled to all the blessings which the servants of God sealed upon their children in ancient days. . . . Thou art a lawful heir to these things because thou are a son of Joseph the son of Jacob, who was sold into Egypt" (Kingsbury, Joseph C., ms a).

There appears to have been little variation among the biblical patriarchs from whom descent was claimed: all were evidently pivotal figures in the establishment of the biblical house of Israel. The patriarchal blessing index sample of pre-Illinois blessings indicates that when biblical lineage was given, some 20 percent of the recipients were designated as descendants of Jacob, 20 percent as descendants of Joseph, and 60 percent as descendants of Ephraim. Such identification with the tribe of Ephraim was consistent with Mormon
belief that Ephraim had anciently received the "birthright blessing" among the twelve tribes and that it was to have an essential role to play in the gathering of Israel in the last days. Thus an 1831 revelation indicated that the lost ten tribes returning from the "north countries" shall bring forth their rich treasures unto the children of Ephraim, my servants. And the boundaries of the everlasting hills shall tremble at their presence. And there shall they fall down and be crowned with glory, even in Zion by the hands of the . . . children of Ephraim. . . . Behold this is the blessing of the everlasting God upon the tribes of Israel, and the richer blessing upon the head of Ephraim and his fellows. (DC 133:26, 30-34)

And the following year, William W. Phelps was to write, "Ephraim is the first born, the Lord's dear son" (EMS 1:6:[42]).

Federal holiness and the Mormon concept of descent

The Mormon belief that an individual had special rights to blessings that had been divinely bestowed upon one or more of his ancestors had some affinity to the Puritan concept of federal holiness. In both instances the basis for such hereditary prerogatives was conceptualized as residing at least partially within the order of nature. In Mormonism this is brought out in statements indicating that an individual has rights to blessings bestowed upon his progenitors because of the sharing of common blood. Joseph Smith, Sr., thus informed Wilford Woodruff (ms a, 15 Apr. 1837) that "as Melchizedek blessed Abram when he returned from the slaughter of ten kings, I confer on thee all the blessings of Abram. . . . God has looked on thee from all eternity and has known thy blood. Thou art a descendant of Joseph. . . . Thou art of the blood of Ephraim." And to Erastus Snow he exclaimed, "Thou art an Ephraimite, a son of Joseph that was sold into Egypt; and thou hast claim by blood to the priesthood and also to an inheritance in Zion among thy brethren" (Snow, Erastus, ms a).

In a manner somewhat reminiscent of their Puritan ancestors, Mormons furthermore believed that aspects of an individual's biological makeup might be modified as a consequence of supernatural
intervention. Formal Mormon ideology held that such transformations accompany divine cursings and blessings and that they are genetically transferable. The Book of Mormon thus teaches that because of their wickedness the Lord cursed the early Lamanites and "did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them" (BM 2 Ne. 5:21). This condition was to be perpetuated among their descendants until they repented and returned to their proper relationship with the Lord. When this happened, they were to again become "a white and delightsome people" (BM 2 Ne. 30:6, 1948 ed.). The Lamanites were not unique in having the color of their skin changed: Joseph Smith's "inspired version" of the Bible (transcribed between December 1830 and July 1833) indicates that the descendants of both Cain, the son of Adam, and of Canaan, the son of Ham, experienced similar pigmentation transformations (JST Gen. 7:10, 29; 9:30).

By the mid-1830s at least some Mormons assumed that dark skin evidenced apostasy. Thus in 1835 William W. Phelps both genealogically linked the black descendants of Ham with the black descendants of Cain and suggested that darker pigmentation was prima facie evidence of spiritual deterioration:

Is it or is it not apparent from reason and analogy as drawn from a careful reading of the scriptures, that God causes the saints, or people that fall away from his church to be cursed in time, with a black skin? Was or was not Cain, being marked, obliged to inherit the curse, he and his children forever? And if so, as Ham, like other sons of God, might break the rule of God, by marrying out of the church, did or did he not, have a Canaanite wife, whereby some of the black seed was preserved through the flood? . . . Are or are not the Indians a sample of marking with blackness for rebellion against God's holy word and holy order? And can or can we not observe in the countenances of almost all nations, except the Gentile, a dark, sallow hue, that they have fallen or changed from the original beauty and grace of father Adam? (MA 1:83)

Prior to the expulsion of the Saints from Missouri statements dealing with divinely instigated biological transformations were concerned with skin pigmentation rather than with blood. The notion was clearly present in Mormon thought, however, that there was a connection between an individual's relationship to God and aspects of his biological condition. It could thus be inferred that by having
blood in common with Abraham or some other biblical patriarch, one somehow shared with him a favored relationship with God. However, as with many other early Mormon concepts, the implications of such a perspective were not to be worked out until a later time.

But while there were certain similarities between Puritan and Mormon understandings regarding hereditary charisma, there were also marked differences. First, while Puritans narrowly equated the endowment of federal holiness with increased susceptibility to the covenant of grace, a Mormon possessed of the blood of Abraham might be eligible for a wide range of blessings. Joseph Smith, Sr., thus conferred on Wilford Woodruff (ms a, 15 Apr. 1837) "all the blessings of Abram, Isaac and Jacob which includes all blessings both temporal and spiritual, the blessings of heaven and the blessings of earth. Thou shalt have all the power and authority of the Melchizedek Priesthood." The fact that many of the hereditary promises to which Mormons laid claim had nothing to do with natural or biological conditions indicates that the Mormon concept of hereditary charisma did not lie completely within the order of nature.

Second, there was no Mormon equivalent to the Puritan dual order of nature. By rejecting the idea that the fall of Adam resulted in a condition of genetically transmitted depravity, there was no place for the concept that through the proper covenant relationship with God an individual's natural state might be transformed to resemble that of primordial man prior to the Fall. Thus an 1833 revelation declared, "Every spirit of man was innocent in the beginning; and God having redeemed man from the fall, men became again in their infant state, innocent before God" (DC 93:38). Thus although Mormons believed that various blessings and cursings had biological correlates that could be genetically transmitted, such natural divisions did not separate the degenerate from the sanctified.

And third, while many Puritans had difficulty in extending claims to hereditary sanctity beyond one or two generations, Mormons believed themselves entitled to blessings that had been promised to putative ancestors thousands of years before. By being able to make such a genealogical leap, Mormons could regard themselves, not as a mere "surrogate" Israel, but as biologically qualified legal heirs to
the Abrahamic covenant. The self-conception of many Mormons became not that of Gentiles who had been permitted to be "numbered with the house of Israel," but rather as the literal descendants of Jacob who were gathering again after their long dispersion.

The Interrelationship between Code and Substance

Code and substance provided the conceptual bases for solidarity within two distinct but overlapping social categories. The existence of each category was understood to be predicated upon the establishment of different covenants between God and man. The first category, including all who had accepted and at least nominally fulfilled the baptismal covenant, was a well-defined group with precise boundaries: the Church was composed exclusively of individuals who had committed themselves to its code by publicly participating in the ordinance of baptism; the rest of mankind consisted of all who had either never committed themselves through baptism to the Mormon code or who had been excluded from the Church group as a consequence of their apparent failure to abide by the covenant that they had made at the time of their baptism into the Church. The social category whose solidarity was based on substance was much more nebulous. It had its supposed origin in hereditary covenants that God had established with the founding patriarchs of the house of Israel and theoretically included all their descendants. Individuals both within and without the Church were understood to belong to this category. While Mormons could often receive assurance that they belonged to this category by receiving patriarchal blessings indicating that this was the case, they believed that non-Mormon Lamanites and Jews were likewise included in this grouping. And one need not even by a Mormon to receive a patriarchal blessing (e.g. Johnson, Benjamin F. 1947:19). In order to be included in the category based on code it was essential that one do something. On the other hand, one had to be something to be regarded as part of the category based on substance.
Categories of identity

The juxtaposition of these two covenantal categories resulted in the existence of four basic types of culturally constructed persons: baptized Israelites, nonbaptized Israelites, baptized Gentiles, and nonbaptized Gentiles. Each type was to have important consequences for Mormon concepts of group identity and solidarity. Among the four, only baptized Israelites combined both code and substance and were thus linked to the Mormon group through two patterns of solidarity. Such persons were regarded as possessing all the essential aspects of Mormonness. At the other extreme were nonbaptized Gentiles who possessed neither code nor substance. This type of person came to be seen as the embodiment of apostasy, as one devoid of any covenant relationship with God. The sectarian conflict and social chaos of antebellum America were regarded as the work of such individuals. Thus wrote Joseph Smith in 1833:

After this chosen family [the biblical Israelites] had rejected Christ and His proposals, the heralds of salvation said to them, "Lo, we turn unto the Gentiles"; and the Gentiles received the covenant, and were grafted in from whence the chosen family were broken off; but the Gentiles have not continued in the goodness of God, but have departed from the faith... and have broken the covenant in which their fathers were established...; and have become high-minded and have not feared; therefore, but few of them will be gathered with the chosen family. Have not the pride, high-mindedness, and unbelief of the Gentiles, provoked the Holy One of Israel to withdraw His Holy Spirit from them, and send forth His judgments to scourge them for their wickedness? (HC 1:313-14)

And Sidney Rigdon declared in 1836 that before the second coming of Christ, "Gentile sectarianism shall fall like a tottering fabric, the foundation of which has given way" (MA 1:3:40). Nonbaptized Israelites, on the other hand, were viewed as kinsmen to Mormon Israelites and as individuals who had hereditary claim to the blessings restored during the final dispensation. The most ambiguous of the types were baptized Gentiles. These were individuals who were linked to the Mormon group by code but not by substance. During the earliest years of the Church's existence, this type of person seems to have presented few problems for Mormon group identity and solidarity. Most Mormon Israelites were just beginning to perceive their own
Abrahamic heritage, and there was as yet no well-developed concepts regarding either the identity of Mormons devoid of the blood of Israel nor the consequences that that condition might have for their position within the Church. This situation was to later change. While Mormon understandings regarding all four types were to experience considerable elaboration during the course of the Church's history, their basic structural interrelationship was clearly established prior to the establishment of Nauvoo.

It seems apparent that normative solidarity was more fundamental to Mormon group unity than perceived biological solidarity. This might be demonstrated in two ways. First, a baptized Gentile was regarded as part of the Mormon group, but not an unbaptized Israelite. And second, excommunication placed an individual outside the Mormon group regardless of what claims he might make regarding his Israelite ancestry or his biological relationship to fellow Mormons; thus "blood ties" were not regarded as indivisible so far as Mormon group solidarity was concerned.

**Baptism as adoption**

But despite the centrality of normative solidarity to Mormon group unity, the Saints came increasingly to view themselves as a sort of kinship group. This was in part due to the fact that baptism was understood as a ritual of "adoption." Mormons regarded baptism as a "rebirth" by which they became "heirs" to the kingdom of God. Thus an 1830 revelation discusses baptism (which was always performed by immersion) as a symbolic recapitulation of the process of physical birth:

> Inasmuch as ye were born into the world by water, and blood, and the spirit, which I have made, and so became of dust a living soul, even so ye must be born again into the kingdom of heaven of water, and of the Spirit, and be cleansed by ... the blood of mine Only Begotten. . . .

> For by the water ye keep the commandment; by the Spirit ye are justified, and by the blood ye are sanctified. (PGP Mses. 6:59-60)

This theme was later extensively elaborated by Parley P. Pratt (1837) in his *Voice of Warning*, a publication that was to play a decisive role in the subsequent development of Mormon ideology. Pratt there
regards God's "organized government of earth" (1837:96) as a "kingdom" in which there are "no natural born subjects" (1837:104). He then indicates that citizenship in this kingdom can only be achieved by "the law of adoption" and develops the concept that baptism is the procedure by which this law is executed (1837:103-10). He thus writes that "baptism [is] the initiating ordinance, by which all those who believe . . . and repent . . . [are] received and adopted into the Church or Kingdom of God" (1837:109). In this manner Mormonism employed a kinship idiom to discuss the normative solidarity associated with the baptismal covenant.

**Ordering of Relationships and the Structure of Encompassment**

While the baptismal covenant was expressive of Mormon normative solidarity, it was apparently not regarded by early Mormons as adequate to create the moral unity that they felt should characterize the covenant people of God. Baptism related each separate believer to God and to the group as a whole, but in so doing produced only a collectivity of Mormons at large. The Mormon perception of a covenantal community entailed much more than this. What was called for was a method to unify the individual members of the group through a network of explicit covenantal ties.

The basic elements of this covenantal network emerged during the first sixteen months of the Church's existence. An extension of Mormon understandings regarding normative and biological solidarity, it was based on the interrelationship between two basic forms of social interaction: locality as expressed in the endeavor to establish the "City of Zion" and economic cooperation as detailed in the "law of consecration and stewardship." The result was a pattern of social organization that was calculated to unite Mormons in an exclusive and interdependent body.
The City of Zion

The founding of the New Jerusalem

Basic to the Book of Mormon depiction of the Abrahamic covenant are various promises that the Lord has made with his chosen people. Among these is the assurance that in the last days the righteous will be "gathered together" in a "choice land" and there establish a holy city called "the New Jerusalem," where they will dwell in peace awaiting the second coming of the Lord (BM 3 Ne. 21:22-24; Eth. 13:4-8). A similar promise was made to the Mormon people during the early months of the Church's existence. On 2 January 1831, Joseph Smith dictated a revelation which stated, "I hold forth and deign to give unto you . . . a land of promise, a land . . . upon which there shall be no curse when the Lord cometh. And I will give it unto you for your inheritance, if you seek it with all your hearts (DC 38:18-19). This promise caught the attention of early Mormons and its fulfillment came to be regarded as one of the principal reasons for which the Church had been restored. Thus four days after the above revelation was received, Lucy Mack Smith (ms a) wrote to her brother Solomon to give him information regarding the Church that her son had recently organized. In attempting to provide him with the reasons for this new religious organization she appears to have paraphrased parts of the January 2 revelation. She wrote that God has now established His Church upon the earth as it was in the days of the Apostles. He has made a new and everlasting covenant, and all that will hear His voice and enter, He says they shall be gathered together into a land of promise, and He Himself will come and reign on earth with them a thousand years.

Identification of the site of the New Jerusalem was closely associated with the Church's first mission to the Lamanites. Approximately a month before Oliver Cowdery and other missionaries were called to go "into the wilderness among the Lamanites" (DC 32:2), a revelation was received stating that the City of Zion would be built "on the borders by the Lamanites" (DC 28:9); and there is indication that the missionaries hoped to determine the location of the city as well as preach to Indians (Howe, E.D. 1834:215-16). While enroute to
the Indians in the West, these missionaries converted a large group of people in and around the town of Kirtland, Ohio. In December of 1830, the entire Church population in the New York area were commanded by revelation to migrate to Ohio and there await the return of Oliver Cowdery from his mission among the Indians (DC 37:3). On 7 March 1831 the elders of the Church (which by now was centered at Kirtland) were commanded to "go . . . forth into the western countries" (DC 45:64). In compliance with this revelation, Joseph Smith and a number of other Saints left Kirtland in June (HC 1:188). Their destination was Independence, Jackson County, Missouri, Oliver Cowdery's headquarters during his attempt to convert the Lamanites. Upon his arrival at Independence, Joseph Smith dictated a revelation declaring that "the land of Missouri . . . is the land which I have appointed and consecrated for the gathering of the saints. Wherefore, this is the land of promise, and the place for the city of Zion. And . . . the place which is now called Independence is the center place" (DC 57:1-3).

Having at last determined the site of the New Jerusalem, the Mormons commenced the establishment of their sacred city. On August 2, Sidney Rigdon (one of Joseph Smith's closest associates) stood before an assembly of Saints and asked:

Do you receive this land for the land of your inheritance with thankful hearts from the Lord? Answer from all, We do. Do you pledge yourselves to keep the laws of God on this land which you never have kept in your own land? We do.

Do you pledge yourselves to see that others of your brethren who shall come hither do keep the laws of God? We do. After prayer he arose and said, I now pronounce this land consecrated and dedicated to the Lord for a possession and inheritance for the Saints, (in the name of Jesus Christ, having authority from him.) And for all the faithful servants of the Lord to the remotest ages of time. Amen." (Whitmer, John 1966:6)

On the same day the physical construction of the Mormon Zion was begun when twelve men "in honor of the twelve tribes of Israel" set in place the first log of the first Mormon cabin to be built in western Missouri (HC 1:196). Thus the Mormon Zion began.
Although the terms "New Jerusalem" and "City of Zion" were sometimes used interchangeably in early Mormon writings, they seem to have expressed somewhat different concepts. The New Jerusalem was to be built at the "center place," which revelation had located within the boundaries of the frontier settlement of Independence, Jackson County, Missouri. According to Joseph Smith, this city was to be one mile square, be surrounded by agricultural land, and have a population of between fifteen and twenty thousand people. Once this center-place city had been established and fully populated, another mile square was to be organized "in the same way, and so fill up the world in these last days; and let every man live in the city, for this is the city of Zion" (HC 1:358). Thus the New Jerusalem was the original square to be organized in Jackson County, while the City of Zion would eventually include the New Jerusalem at the center place as well as the additional satellite cities that were to be organized on the same principles. "The Land of Zion" in turn was "the promised land" upon which the New Jerusalem and at least some of its satellite cities were to be built.

The purposes for the City of Zion

According to Mormon understanding, the City of Zion was to have two interrelated purposes: first, it was to be a refuge from the wicked and from the judgments of God that were to precede Christ's millennial reign; and second, it was to provide the basis for the gathering of Israel. The first of these purposes is clearly laid out in Mormon scripture. Thus a revelation received in March of 1831 describes the projected city as

a place of safety for the saints of the Most High God. And the glory of the Lord shall be there, and the terror of the Lord also shall be there, insomuch that the wicked will not come unto it, and it shall be called Zion. And it shall come to pass among the wicked, that every man that will not take his sword against his neighbor must needs flee unto Zion for safety. (DC 45:66-68; see also Howe 1834:180)
Such a perspective became basic to the message of Mormon missionaries. Thus in April of 1832, a citizen of Lyman, New Hampshire observed that there has been in this town and vicinity, for about a week, two young men... who are Mormonites. They say they are commanded by God to preach to this generation, and say to them, that all who do not embrace their faith, and mode of worship, forsake their friends, houses, and lands, and go with them to a place of safety, which is in the state of Missouri, where they are about building a city, will be destroyed by the sword, famine, pestilence, earthquakes &c, and that reformation, repentance, and faith, unless it be accompanied with a speedy removal to their city of refuge, will be of no avail. (Mulder and Mortensen 1973:72)

The City of Zion, however, was not regarded only as a place of refuge, but also a means for the reconstitution of the House of Israel. It was believed that in the last days there was to be an actual physical gathering together of Israel. Unless this gathering occurred, the descendants of Jacob could not be saved. This wrote Sidney Rigdon in 1835:

It was the judgments of God which scattered [Israel] and while they continue in their present scattered condition, the judgment of God rests upon them and whenever the mercy of God returns to them, they will also return from the dispersion and be gathered from all countries whithersoever they have been scattered or else... Israel will never be saved. (MA 1:2:18)

Mormons believed that there were to be two focal points for this gathering: the old Jerusalem in Palestine and the "New Jerusalem" in Missouri (EMS 1:9:[67]; MA 2:2:216). While Judah was to return to Palestine, the other tribes were to be gathered in western Missouri. By also gathering to this New Jerusalem, believing Gentiles would be "numbered among" the house of Israel and thus become eligible for the promises associated with the Abrahamic covenant (BM 3 Ne. 21:21-24).

Since the site of the New Jerusalem was but a short distance from where many of the Lamanites (the descendants of Joseph) were being relocated as a consequence of the Indian Removal Act, the logic behind its location was apparent to the Saints. They indeed regarded the action of the federal government as an important element in the
gathering of Israel and the establishment of the New Jerusalem. Thus wrote William W. Phelps from Independence in June of 1833:

In the forepart of last month, about three hundred and sixty Indians... pitched their tents on the east before this town. ... They were on their way to the place assigned them for the land of their inheritance, being gathered by the government of the United States, fulfilling [the] scripture... From Arkansas to the Missouri, the remnants are gathering together in rapid succession... and it affords us great joy to see the work... going on so rapidly. In fact, thus far the gathering of the remnants of Joseph, have far exceeded our expectations, and it is much more than that of the Gentiles; but God is merciful, and we hope and pray, that while he is pleading with the inhabitants of the earth, with judgments, that thousands will repent and live. The time is short for the Gentiles; not a moment is to be lost. (EMS 2:13:101)

The Law of Consecration and Stewardship

When on 2 August 1831, the Saints who had assembled at Independence, Missouri, pledged to "keep the law of God," they were covenanted to adhere to a specific revelation given in February of 1831 and referred to by early Mormons as "the law for the government of the church" (Book of Commandments 1833:89). It was believed that the principles underlying this law were identical to those which governed the highest kingdom of heaven (the celestial kingdom) and that only through strict adherence to the provisions of the law could the inhabitants of the City of Zion create the type of society that would result in its fulfilling its prophetic destiny. Thus declared an 1834 revelation, "Zion cannot be built up unless it is by the principles of the law of the celestial kingdom, otherwise I cannot receive her unto myself" (DC 105:5). And as William W. Phelps explained in January of 1833, "While the gathering is sounded, that Israel may come in from his long dispersion, and also, as many of the Gentiles as will, the invitation is free, but unless the articles and covenants, the law and regulation; yea verily all the commandments, are kept, all is vain (EMS 1:8:61).

Much of "the law for the government of the church" consists in a catalog of commandments consistent with biblical precepts. Basic to the law, however, is a plan for economic action that has become known
as "the law of consecration and stewardship." As originally published, the text of this economic law reads as follows:

If thou loveth me, that shalt serve me and keep all my commandments; and behold, thou shalt consecrate all thy properties, that which thou hast unto me, with a covenant and a deed which cannot be broken; and they shall be laid before the bishop of my church, and two of the elders, such as he shall appoint and set apart for that purpose. And it shall come to pass, that the bishop of my church, after that he has received the properties of my church, that it cannot be taken from the church, he shall appoint every man a steward over his own property, or that which he has received, inasmuch as shall be sufficient for himself and family; and the residue shall be kept to administer to him who has not, that every man may receive according as he stands in need; and the residue shall be kept in my storehouse, to administer to the poor and needy, as shall be appointed by the elders of the church and the bishop; and for the purpose of purchasing lands, and the building up of the New Jerusalem, which is hereafter to be revealed; that my covenant people may be gathered in one, in the day that I shall come to my temple: And this I do for the salvation of my people. And it shall come to pass, that he that sinneth and repenteth not shall be cast out, and shall not receive again that which he has consecrated unto me: For it shall come to pass, that which I spake by the mouths of my prophets shall be fulfilled; for I will consecrate the riches of the Gentiles, unto my people which are of the house of Israel. (EMS 1:2:9; also Book of Commandments 1833:92-93)

One week after the land of Zion had been consecrated, Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, and other leading elders of the Church left Independence to return to Church headquarters at Kirtland. Those Mormons remaining in Jackson County were expected to begin immediately to abide by the "law for the government of the church," and to make preparations for the expected arrival of large numbers of Saints who would be migrating to the area to receive their "inheritance in Zion," and build up the New Jerusalem. Implementation of those aspects of the law dealing with consecration and stewardship were the responsibility of Edward Partridge, the newly appointed "bishop of the Church." Partridge devised a printed form to facilitate this objective. There were two basic parts to this form: a consecration agreement and a stewardship agreement. The consecration agreement reads as follows:

BE IT KNOWN THAT I, __________, of Jackson county, and state of Missouri, having become a member of the church of Christ,
organized according to law, and established by the revelations of
the Lord, on the sixth day of April, 1830, do of my own free will
and accord, having first paid my just debts, grant and hereby give
unto ___B___ of Jackson county, and state of Missouri, bishop of
said church, the following described property, viz:_____

For the purpose of purchasing lands and building up the New
Jerusalem, even Zion, and for relieving the wants of the poor and
needy. For which I the said ___A___ do covenant and bind myself
and my heirs forever, to release all my right and interest to the
above described property, unto him the said ___B___ bishop of said
church. And I the said ___B___ bishop of said church, having
received the above described property of the said ___A___ do bind
myself, that I will cause the same to be expended for the above
mentioned purposes of the said ___A___ in the satisfaction of said
church; and in case I should be removed from the office of bishop
of said church, by death or otherwise, I hereby bind myself and my
heirs forever, to make over to my successor in office, for the
benefits of said church, all the above described property, which
may then be in my possession.

In testimony whereof, WE have hereunto set our hands and seals
this ___day of ___ in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight
hundred and thirty____

IN PRESENCE OF

[SEAL]

[SEAL]

(Arrington, Fox, and May 1976:28)

And the stewardship agreement was as follows:

BE IT KNOWN THAT I, ___B___ of Jackson county, and state of
Missouri, bishop of the church of Christ organized according to
law, and established by the revelations of the Lord, on the 6th of
April, 1830, have leased, and by these presents do lease unto
___A___ of Jackson county, and state of Missouri, a member of said
church the following described piece or parcel of land, being a
part of section No.___ township No.___ range No.___ situated in
Jackson county, and state of Missouri, and is bounded as follows,
viz:_____. And also have loaned the following described
property, viz:_____.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the above described property, by him the
said ___A___ to be used and occupied as to him shall seem most
proper. And as a consideration for the use of the above described
property, I the said ___A___ do bind myself to pay the taxes, and
also to pay yearly unto said ___B___ bishop of said church, or
his successor in office, for the benefit of said church, all that
I shall make or accumulate more than is needful for the support
and comfort of myself and family. And it is agreed by the
parties, that this lease and loan shall be binding during the life
of the said ___A___ unless he transgress, and is not deemed worthy
by the authority of the church, according to its laws, to belong
to the church. And in that case I the said ___A___ do acknowledge
that I forfeit all claim to the above described leased and loaned
property, and hereby bind myself to give back the leased, and also pay an equivalent for the loaned, for the benefit of said church, unto the said Bishop of said church, or his successor in office. And further, in case of said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administer to their necessities out of any funds in my hands appropriated for that purpose, not otherwise disposed of, to the satisfaction of the church. And further, in case of the death of the said Bishop of said church, do bind myself to administ
remained a member in good standing within the organization. If he was
excommunicated for violating Church regulations, he would both lose
his stewardship property and not be able to regain possession of the
property that he had originally consecrated. The faithful widow and
minor children of a deceased steward could retain rights in usufruct
over his property. The orphans, however, would lose such rights at
the time they reached adulthood. They would then, however, become
eligible to receive their own stewardships.

Given such provisions, it is easy to understand why Ezra Booth
cynically described the attempt to establish the New Jerusalem as "the
cunning artifice of crafty impostors, designed to allure the credulous
and the unsuspecting into a state of unqualified vassalage" (Howe
1834:195). For believing Mormons, on the other hand, the law of
consecration and stewardship was regarded as a revealed plan that
would allow them as a people to become the elect of God. Whatever the
motives for which Joseph Smith attempted to establish a community
based upon such procedures, much of the endeavor's theoretical
interest lies in the manner in which it employs economic organization
as a mechanism which simultaneously organizes its participants into a
covenantal network of interdependency and isolated them from external
influence.

**Structural aspects of the law of
consecration and stewardship**

**Economic equality and
spiritual unity**

According to Mormon belief, a chief purpose of the law for the
government of the Church was to create a condition of righteousness
and spiritual unity among the inhabitants of the New Jerusalem. It
was believed that such a condition was essential before the city would
be acceptable to the Lord. Thus an 1830 revelation indicates that a
people would be designated by the Lord as "Zion" only when they were
"of one heart and one mind and dwelt in righteousness" (PGP Mses.
7:18), while in a January 1831 revelation the Lord commands Mormons
who are anticipating the establishment of the New Jerusalem to "be
one" and then adds, "if ye are not one ye are not mine" (DC 38:27).
The intended contribution of the law of consecration and stewardship to the achievement of such unity was based on the assumption that economic equality is conducive to spiritual unity, while economic inequality produces inequality and social chaos. The Book of Mormon is replete with examples illustrating this philosophical position. The book of "4th Nephi" presents an excellent overview of this theme. In its opening verses the actors in the narrative are portrayed both as having "all things in common" and as having achieved a high degree of spiritual unity (BM 4 Ne. 1:3). As the story continues, however, a number of individuals become prideful and set their hearts upon "the fine things of the world" (4 Ne. 1:23-25). As a consequence, the system of having goods in common is abandoned (4 Ne. 1:25). This results in the people being "divided into classes" (4 Ne. 1:26). And this development in turn is followed by apostasy, sectarian conflict, and social chaos (4 Ne. 1:26-46). Various of the early revelations of Joseph Smith reiterate the same philosophy. Thus a March 1831 revelation states that "it is not given that one man should possess that which is above another, wherefore the whole world lieth in sin" (DC 29:20), while a revelation received the following year declares that "if ye are not equal in earthly things ye cannot be equal in obtaining heavenly things" (DC 76:6; see also DC 38:24-27; 51:9; 70:14-16; 82:17).

Such a formulation stands in marked contrast to the Puritan position that

God Almighty in his most holy and wise providence hath soe disposed of the Condition of mankinde, as in all times some must be rich some poore, some highe and eminent in power and dignite, others meane and in subjection . . . that every man might have need of other, and from hence they might be all knitt more nearly together in the Bond of brotherly affeccion. (Winthrop, John 1964:190-91)

The early Mormon view on the relationship between economic equality and spiritual unity, however, is not inconsistent with that of various utopian movements that were flourishing in the early decades of the nineteenth century, and some attempt has been made to compare Mormon economic theory with that of such groups as the Shakers, the Rappites, the Owenite Socialites, the Harmonists, and the followers of Jemima

By providing each household head with a stewardship that was deemed "sufficient for himself and family" and then by not permitting him to accumulate and use investment capital derived from that stewardship, the law of consecration and stewardship was calculated to establish and maintain a condition of essential economic parity among the inhabitants of Zion. As William W. Phelps explained in December of 1832, in Zion "one cannot be above another in wealth, nor below another for want of means, for the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. Neither shall men labor for the Lord for wages. . . . But the laborer in Zion, shall labor for Zion; for if they labor for money, they shall perish" (EMS 1:7:[54]).

Household organization and domestic inequality

But while the law of consecration and stewardship was designed to produce a condition of economic equality among the inhabitants of Zion, it established each household as a discrete economic entity in which the wife and children were dependent upon the male head for economic maintenance. This was done by granting each household a separate stewardship and placing that stewardship under the management and control of the household's male head.

It has been postulated that such an arrangement resulted from Joseph Smith's experience with a utopian experiment in the Kirtland area (DePillis 1960:59-119). Prior to their conversion to Mormonism, many in the Kirtland area had organized themselves into a "common stock association" which they referred to as the "Family" or the "Social Union." The association was continued for a time after they joined the Mormon church; and according to John Whitmer (1966:2), by the time Joseph Smith arrived at Kirtland in early February of 1831, the Saints in that area "were going to destruction very fast as to temporal things, for they considered from reading the scripture that what belonged to one brother, belonged to any of the brethren, therefore they would take each other's clothes and other property and use it without leave, which brought on confusion and disappointment."
Whatever the motivation, within ten days of his arrival in Kirtland, Joseph Smith had dictated the revelation outlining the law of consecration and stewardship and in so doing had established the economic independence of individual households within the New Jerusalem.

Comparisons between Puritan and Mormon domestic orders. The basic pattern of domestic organization mandated by the law of consecration and stewardship was consistent with the Puritan concept of the ideal household. As has already been seen, Puritan ideology maintained that there is a divinely established pattern for domestic relationships by virtue of which husbands have jurisdiction over wives, parents over children, and masters over servants and slaves. The same scheme was regarded as normative by many Americans during the early days of the republic. Social and economic changes associated with the Second Great Awakening, however, militated against its implementation; and during the 1830s many regarded American domestic organization to be in general disarray (Berthoff, Rowland 1971:204-17; Gordon, Michael 1978; Kett, Joseph 1977; Rosenberg, Carroll Smith 1971; 1972; Sklar, Kathryn).

Underlying the position of the household in the law of consecration and stewardship was the implicit assumption that despite current social changes, the Puritan pattern of domestic inequality was the ideal form for familial and household organization. This is illustrated by various statements made by Mormon leaders regarding proper domestic relationships. One such example is an 1835 directive issued by Joseph Smith regarding the preaching of Mormonism to prospective converts. According to these instructions, minor children should never be taught the Mormon gospel without the consent of their parents, wives without the consent of their husbands, nor servants or slaves without the consent of their masters.

But if the master of that house give consent, that thou mayest preach to his family, his wife, his children, and his servants, or his slaves, then it should be the duty of the elder to stand up boldly for the cause of Christ . . . always commanding them in the name of the Lord . . . to be kindly affected one toward another; that the fathers should be kind to their children, husbands to
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their wives; masters to their slaves or servants; children
obedient to their parents, wives to their husbands and slaves or
servants to their masters. (MA 2:2:217; see also DC 60:4, 1835 ed.)

Essentially the same pattern is presented in an 1838 article dealing
with the order of relationships that should obtain within the Mormon
household:

It is the place of the man, to stand at the head of his family,
and be lord of his own house, not to rule over his wife as a
tyrant, neither as one who is fearful that his wife will get out
of her place and prevent him from exercising his authority. It is
his duty to be a man of God... ready at all times to obtain
from the scriptures, the revelations, and from on high, such
instructions as are necessary for the edification, and salvation
of his household. And on the other hand, it is the duty of the
wife, to be in subjection to her husband at all times, not as a
servant neither as one who fears a tyrant, or a master, but as one
who, in meekness, and the love of God regards the laws and
instructions of Heaven, looks up to her husband for instruction,
edification and comfort. (EJ 1:4:81-82)

Although the concept was not as well developed as it would
later become in Nauvoo, there is good evidence that during the 1830s
Mormons came to regard the Puritan pattern of domestic inequality as
basic to the Abrahamic covenant. This is indicated by patriarchal
blessings of the period. As has already been shown, such blessings
often declared that children participated in the covenant that God had
established with their progenitors and thus implied a covenantal
pattern of filial subordination. Various patriarchal blessings of the
period also indicated that wives participated in the covenants that
had been established with their husbands. Husbands and wives often
came together to receive patriarchal blessings. On such occasions it
was common practice to first give the husband his patriarchal blessing
and then to state in the wife's blessing that she participated in the
promises already made to her husband. Thus Joseph Smith, Sr., gave
first a blessing to his son Samuel and then to his daughter-in-law,
Mary Baily Smith. In this second blessing he stated, "Thou shalt be
blessed with my son [Samuel]" (Smith, Ruby K. 1953:43). On a similar
occasion he declared to Marinda Nancy Hyde, "I... pronounce on thy
head a father's blessing in common with thy husband" (Barron, Howard
1977:315). And under like circumstance, Caroline Barnes Crosby (ms a)
received a blessing which stated, "I seal blessings for thee in common with thy husband. Thy life shall be as his life and thy years as his years." Such blessings implied a divinely ordered hierarchical pattern in which women were covenantally subordinate to their husbands and children to their parents.

Although the Puritan pattern of domestic organization was integral to the law of consecration and stewardship and was emerging as a central element in the Mormon conception of the Abrahamic covenant, Mormon ideology of the 1830s regarding the family was not an exact replication of Puritan understandings. The notions of domestic inequality that the Saints shared with their Puritan ancestors were being reformulated through interaction with distinctively Mormon perceptions. This resulted in various ambiguities that would be pragmatically resolved as the Mormon group developed. This might be seen by comparing Puritan and Mormon understandings regarding family organization in terms of the interaction between the orders of nature and law.

As in Puritanism, the Mormon parent-child bond of the 1830s appears to have been a relationship that existed essentially within the order of nature. This is indicated both by statements made in patriarchal blessings indicating that children had rights to blessings promised their progenitors because they were of the same blood and by the belief that such rights could be transmitted without any priesthood ordinance calculated to establish explicit covenantal ties between parents and children. The transmission of hereditary promises, however, was regarded as the consequence of explicit covenants whose fulfillment, unlike the Puritan covenant of grace, were not within the domain of nature. Thus, as was pointed out earlier, the Mormon concept of descent included an element that cannot be readily regarded as an aspect of nature.

The introduction of priesthood-based marriage. A related problem is associated with the proper basis for the relationship between husband and wife. During the 1830s leaders of the Church simultaneously promulgated two distinct formulations regarding the ideal Mormon conjugal bond. The first of these was similar to that of
Puritans and most mainline American Protestants. Marriage was regarded essentially as a legal contract established under the auspices of the state. Marriages performed by non-Mormons were regarded as having as much efficacy as those performed by Mormon elders, and thus "all legal contracts of marriage made before a person is baptized into the church, should be held sacred and fulfilled" (DC 51:4, 1835 ed.). There appears to be little problem regarding such a conception of marriage as within the order of law. The second formulation, however, held that a special form of marriage could be established by Mormon priesthood holders independent of the state and irregardless of the existence of conflicting civil marriage contracts. Since this concept of marriage was to have considerable importance for the subsequent development of Mormon covenant organization, it will be useful to say something about its origin.

During the years that Kirtland, Ohio, was the ecclesiastical headquarters of the Church (1831-38), the position that marriage should be regulated by the state presented the Mormon group with at least two difficulties: first, the county in which Kirtland was located would not authorize Mormons to perform legal marriages; and second, certain Mormons who had separated from their spouses without obtaining legal divorces desired to remarry (Brodie 1971:183; HC 2:408; Knight, Newel, ms a; Larsen, Herbert Ray 1954:121-66). Both of these problems were at least partially resolved when the marriage between Newel Knight and Lydia Goldthwait was solemnized. Sometime previous to her conversion to Mormonism, Lydia Goldthwait had separated from her husband, Calvin Baily, but had never obtained a legal divorce. After joining the Church and moving to Kirtland, she received a marriage proposal from fellow Mormon Newel Knight. Although she desired to be married to Knight, she felt that such an arrangement would be improper and immoral. When they requested that Joseph Smith solve the problem, he stated that it was right that they should marry and that he would perform the ceremony himself. The marriage was held as planned on 24 November 1835. In the course of the ceremony Joseph Smith remarked that "marriage was an institution of heaven, instituted in the garden of Eden; [and] that it was
necessary it should be solemnized by the authority of the everlasting Priesthood" (HC 2:320). A few days later Joseph Smith stated that

"he had married Brother Newel Knight to Lydia Baily . . . although the laws of Ohio had not yet granted him the right to marry. But said he 'I have done it by the authority of the holy priesthood, and the Gentile law has no power to call me to an account for it. It is my religious privilege and even the congress of the United States has no power to make a law that would abridge the rights of my religion. I have done as I was commanded, and I know the kingdom of God will prevail and that the Saints will triumph over their adversaries. (Knight, Newel, ms a)

The introduction into Mormonism of marriage "by the authority of the priesthood" produced various ideological problems: what was the precise nature of marriage by priesthood authority, and how did such marriage differ from that performed by the state? what was the relationship between priesthood marriage and civil marriage? and, since it was "necessary" that marriage "be solemnized by the authority of the everlasting Priesthood," what was the status of civil marriage in the eyes of God?

Mormonism made little attempt to resolve such issues before the settlement of Nauvoo. The chief importance of marriage as a priesthood ordinance prior to that time appears to have been its contribution to the understanding that the ideal Mormon conjugal relationship was established through a power independent of and more significant than the legal authority of the state. While it can be argued that such power was still within the Mormon order of law, it was clearly based on the concept of law that transcended mere human convention. Such a perception might be best understood if it is assumed that there existed two analytical suborders within the Mormon order of law: the suborder of human law and the suborder of priesthood or divine law. It could then be posited that ambiguities centering on the relationship between civil and priesthood authority resulted from the fact that Mormons recognized two suborders of law but had yet to determine fully those aspects of human organization to which each applied.

In summary, it appears that the Mormon familial order of the 1830s in most respects resembled that of Puritanism. Both had the same basic pattern of inequality and both were built upon the
interaction between a conjugal union within the order of law and a filial tie within the order of nature. Upon this basic form, however, Mormonism imposed an additional element: both conjugal and filial ties were understood to be predicated upon a bond associated with priesthood power. While the precise nature of this priesthood bond did not become explicit until the 1840s, understandings regarding its characteristics contributed to the prominence that domestic organization assumed in Mormon covenant organization of the 1830s.

Structural isolation of the consecration community

The consecration community that emerged from the implementation of the law of consecration and stewardship shared at least three structural similarities with Puritan church covenant groups: restrictive admittance procedures; involvement of membership in a unique covenant; and the understanding that the members of the group possessed distinctive religious qualifications not shared by the general church population. Each of these factors contributed to the structural isolation of the consecration covenant community.

Restrictive admittance procedures. An individual was required to receive written authorization from local priesthood leaders before being permitted to "go up unto Zion" and there commence living the law of consecration and stewardship (DC 72:24-26; EMS 1:1:[2]). It was believed that such authorization should be given only after the leadership had received revelation affirming that this was the proper thing to do. Thus during a Church conference held at Hiram, Ohio, on 11 November 1831, "Reynolds Cahoon . . . said that the question which he wanted settled was whether it was the will of the Lord that he should go to Zion in the Spring." After discussion of this issue, the determination was made that it was "the mind of the conference that our Brother Reynolds is not yet commanded to go to Zion. . . . Therefore voted that our Brother Reynolds be not sent up to Zion in the coming spring" (CM, 11 Nov. 1831). While one rationale for this procedure was to regulate the speed of gathering (EMS 1:2:[13]), there is indication that those not regarded as capable of abiding by the
laws of Zion had difficulty in receiving certificates of authorization (EMS 1:8:[6]).

**The consecration covenant.** As has already been indicated, upon commencing to live the law of consecration and stewardship, an individual was required to consecrate all his property to the Lord "with a covenant and a deed which cannot be broken." While the formal consecration agreement fulfilled the condition that the consecration transaction be established by deed, the consecration covenant entailed much more than the provisions of the printed form. Although the various aspects of this covenant were apparently never concisely articulated, it is clear that it was regarded as the basis for a distinctive relationship between the consecrator and both the Lord and his earthly representatives--the Mormon hierocracy.

The relationship thus created between the consecrator and the hierocracy is perhaps best understood in economic terms. By voluntarily surrendering rights in fee simple over all his property to the bishop (the agent of the hierocracy), the consecrator placed himself in a situation of perpetual economic dependency on the hierocracy. Since rights in usufruct over stewardship property were granted by the bishop and an individual could retain such rights only so long as he adhered to the requirements of the hierocracy, religious and economic domination were conjoined. It might consequently be said that households participating in the law of consecration and stewardship were encompassed by the hierocratic organization of the Church: thus continuance of the economically based authority structure within the household was dependent upon the covenantal relationship between the household head and the hierocracy. The economic dependency resulting from the consecration covenant, however, was fully consistent with the more general Mormon understanding that the hierocracy was God's government on earth and that the faithful should be regulated by such authority. The law of consecration and stewardship thus provided an economic basis for the development of the Mormon structure of religious authority.

Upon making the consecration covenant, an individual was evidently covenanting with the Lord to abide by the various provisions
of the law for the government of the Church. What the Lord was believed to have covenanted in return is perhaps best summarized in the 2 January 1831 revelation:

And this shall be my covenant with you, ye shall have [the land of Zion] for the land of your inheritance, and for the inheritance of your children forever, while the earth shall stand, and ye shall possess it again in eternity, no more to pass away. But, verily I say unto you that in time ye shall have no king nor ruler, for I will be your king and watch over you. Wherefore, hear my voice and follow me, and you shall be a free people, and ye shall have no laws but my laws when I come, for I am your lawgiver, and what can stay my hand? (DC 38:20-22)

The promise thus seems to be that those living the law of consecration shall have the land of Zion for an eternal inheritance and that they will eventually be free from all other peoples and forms of government. The promise of such independence is reiterated in other early Mormon writings. Joseph Smith thus declares that in instigating the law of consecration and stewardship, "It was my endeavor to so organize the Church that the brethren might eventually be independent of every encumbrance beneath the celestial kingdom, by bonds and covenants of mutual friendship and mutual love" (HC 1:269).

But while it was held that through faithful adherence to the consecration covenant a Saint could receive great blessings from the Lord, it was also maintained that failure to abide by the conditions of the covenant would result in God-inflicted calamity. An individual who violated his covenant could expect not only to lose his stewardship and be excommunicated from the Church, but also to be "delivered over to the buffetings of Satan until the day of redemption" (DC 78:12; see also DC 85:9). And it was believed that if the Saints in Zion did not collectively live up to their covenants, they would jointly experience the wrath of God. Thus an 1832 revelation declares that

vanity and unbelief have brought the whole church under condemnation. And this condemnation resteth upon the children of Zion, even all. And they shall remain under this condemnation until they repent and remember the new covenant, even the Book of Mormon and the former commandments which I have given them, not only to say, but to do according to that which I have written--
That they may bring forth fruit meet for their Father's kingdom; otherwise there remaineth a scourge and judgment to be poured out upon the children of Zion. For shall the children of the kingdom pollute my holy land? Verily, I say unto you, Nay. (DC 84:55-59)

The belief that the violation of the consecration covenant would result in divine condemnation was closely akin to understandings associated with the so-called "national covenant" of the Puritans. Thus, as was stated in chapter 2, John Winthrop explained to his fellow passengers aboard the Arabella:

Thus stands the cause between God and us, wee are entered into Covenant with him for this worke, . . . the Lord hath given us leave to drawe out our owne Articles. . . . If wee shall neglect the observacion of these Articles . . . the Lord will surely breake out in wrathe against us be revenged of such a perjured people and make us knowe the price of the breache of such a Covenant. (Winthrop, John 1964:202-203)

Fear that the Saints in Jackson County were not fully keeping their covenants resulted in Mormon leaders issuing chastising warnings closely akin to the jeremiads of their Puritan ancestors. Thus the following is contained in a letter sent from leading elders in Kirtland to "the inhabitants of Zion":

Brother Gilbert's letter of December 10th, has been received and read attentively, and the low, dark, and blind insinuations, which were in it, were not received by us as from the foundation of light, though his claims and pretensions to holiness were great. . . . Brother Phelps letter of December 15th is also received and carefully read, and it betrays a lightness of spirit that ill becomes a man placed in the important and responsible station that he is placed in. . . . We have the best of feelings, and the feelings of the greatest anxiety for the welfare of Zion: we feel more like weeping over Zion than we do like rejoicing over her, for we know that the judgments of God hang over her, and will fall upon her except she repent, and purify herself before the Lord, and put away from her every foul spirit. We now say to Zion, this once, in the name of the Lord, Repent! repent! awake, awake, put on thy beautiful garments, before you are made to feel the chastening rod of Him whose anger is kindled against you. Let not Satan tempt you to think we want to make you bow to us, to domineer over you, for God knows this is not the case; our eyes are watered with tears, and our hearts are poured out to God in prayer for you, that He will spare you, and turn away His anger from you. (HC 1:319-20)
Such fears were apparently shared by the Saints residing in Zion. The anxiety they felt regarding the proper keeping of their covenants is illustrated by an incident related in Newel Knight's autobiography (ms a). During the early 1830s he was in charge of a small branch of Saints living under the law of consecration and residing in Kaw Township, Jackson County. From time to time he would receive copies of revelations given by Joseph Smith. These he would read to the congregation and then interpret them. On one occasion a Sister Peck took issue with his interpretation.

She arose and contradicted the revelation saying that it must be taken in a spiritual light. She went to such a length that I felt constrained to rebuke her by the authority of the priesthood in which I was called to act. At this she was angry and from that time sought to influence all who would listen to her. The result was a division of feeling in the church. . . . Sister Peck at length began to feel the weight of what she had done but she could not recall it. [She consequently began to experience physical and emotional decline.] I felt impressed to call the branch together. . . . I was enabled to make plain to the understanding of all present the cause of Sister Peck's present situation, that she had risen in opposition to the priesthood which had been placed over the branch of the Church and contradicted the revelation of God, that by the sympathies shown her, division in feelings had gained advantage over them until Sister Peck had fallen completely into the power of Satan and could not extricate herself from that power. I told the Brethren and Sisters if they would repent of what they had done and renew their covenant with one another and with the Lord to uphold the authorities placed over them and also the revelations which the Lord had given unto us it would be all right with Sister Peck, for this would break the bands of Satan and make us all free. I no sooner closed my remark than with one united voice all came forward and agreed to do so. . . . Union again prevailed and we all felt that we had learned a lesson that would be of lasting benefit to us.

Distinctive religious qualifications. The relationship that the consecration covenant was believed to establish between the consecrator and the Lord was closely associated with the understanding that it was possible for a mortal to be "sealed up unto eternal life." The link between these two concepts is apparent in the minutes of a Church conference in which various elders covenanted to live the law of consecration and stewardship. In the course of the meeting
Brother Sidney Rigdon said, "I bear testimony that God will have a pure people who will give up all for Christ's sake, and when this is done, they will be sealed up unto eternal life. . . . Brother Sylvester Smith said that he had a testimony to the effect that it was the will of the Lord to seal his Saints and also covenanted to give all to the Lord. . . . Brother John Smith said that he felt through grace to do the will of the Lord notwithstanding his extreme old age, also felt to covenant to give all to the Lord. Brother Daniel Stant said that he had a long time since covenanted to do the will of God in all things and remarked that it was his desire to be sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. . . . Brother Joseph Smith, Jr., said . . . until we have perfect love we are liable to fall and when we have a testimony that our names are sealed in the Lamb's book of life we have perfect love and then it is impossible for false Christs to deceive us . . . and except the church receive the fulness of the scriptures that they will yet fall." (CM, 25 Oct. 1831)

The manner in which early Mormons linked the consecration covenant with the promise of being sealed up to eternal life appears to have been derived from the assumption that the act of consecration and the economic quality that it entailed would engender and manifest a condition of "perfect love" toward God and one's fellows. And once an individual was possessed of such love, God would reward him with eternal life. Thus wrote William W. Phelps in January 1833, "Every soul that is saved in the celestial kingdom will be saved by its own faith and works. . . . If any should ask what is my duty? Let him read: To love the Lord supremely: To love his neighbor as himself: To consecrate all to the Lord: To be faithful to the end, and, above all, to have charity" (EMS 1:8:[61]). Economic consecration was thus seen as vital for the achievement of the altruism that would enable one to attain eternal life. Saints who covenanted to live the law of consecration thus expected that God would ultimately grant them entrance to the celestial kingdom if they could but continue faithful to the covenants that they had made. As Mormons of the 1830s were taught, "When a man has offered in sacrifice all that he has . . . he does know most assuredly, that God does and will accept his sacrifice and offering and that he has not nor will not seek his face in vain" (DC pp. 50-51, 1835 ed.).

Given such assumptions, it became easy to conclude that those who failed to make the consecration covenant would not be religiously
qualified to obtain eternal life. Thus wrote Joseph Smith in November of 1832:

It is the duty of the Lord's clerk . . . to keep a history . . . of all things that transpire in Zion, and of all those who consecrate properties and receive inheritances. . . . It is contrary to the will and commandment of God, that those who receive not their inheritance by consecration . . . should have their names enrolled with the people of God; neither is their genealogy to be kept. . . . And they . . . whose names are not found written in the book of the law, or that are found to have apostatized, or to have been cut out of the church . . . shall not find an inheritance among the saints of the most high: therefore, it shall be done unto him as unto the children of the priests, as it is written in the second chapter, and 61st and 62nd verses in Ezra: These sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found: therefore were they as polluted, put from the priesthood. (EMS 1:8:[61]; also DC 85:1, 3-4, 11-12; HC 1:298-99)

The implication is that all who do not faithfully abide by the law of consecration and stewardship will eventually be regarded as "polluted" and not be permitted to dwell eternally in the presence of God. As an 1832 revelation declares, "He who is not able to abide the law of a celestial kingdom cannot abide a celestial glory" (DC 88:22).

It thus appears that like Puritan church covenant groups, the Mormon consecration community was regarded as more religiously qualified to inherit eternal life than other members of the Church. There were of course marked differences in the concept of salvation associated with the two groupings. Puritans believed that members of church covenant groups participated in the covenant of grace which God unilaterally established with the elect. While it was believed that one could witness the unfolding of this covenant in his life, he could do nothing to influence its development. Salvation associated with the Mormon consecration covenant, on the other hand, was essentially Arminian in nature. While admittance to the consecration community was based on revelation, one could still refuse to make the consecration covenant. And membership in the consecration community gave no complete assurance that one was indeed sealed up to eternal life: It was still necessary to fulfill the various provisions of the covenant, develop "perfect love," and remain faithful to the end.
Having discussed the various aspects of pre-Nauvoo Mormon covenant organization, it will now be useful to examine such organization as an integrated system. This will be done by making general comparison between aspects of the Puritan and early Mormon covenant systems.

Mythological underpinnings

Associated with both Puritan and Mormon covenant organization was a mythological narrative dealing with the establishment of a covenant relationship between Abraham and the Lord. Many of the covenantal practices of both groups were explained and justified in terms of this myth, and it thus became the ideological "model" for many aspects of the two covenant systems.

There was, however, considerable difference in the manner in which the two groups interpreted the Abrahamic myth. Puritans associated it with biblical myths dealing with the fall and redemption of man, and it thus became for them the pattern by which an individual may become sanctified and united with God. Mormons, on the other hand, linked it with Book of Mormon eschatological myths; and it became for them a basic element in a pattern dealing with the gathering of the righteous in the last days. These distinctive employments of the Abrahamic myth were fully consistent with the manifest objectives of the covenantal procedures of the two groups: the Puritans desired to create a commonwealth under the control of and existing for the benefit of the sanctified; the Mormons, on the other hand, sought to organize a community that would be prepared to meet Christ at his second coming.

Bases of the relationships

Both Puritan and Mormon systems of covenant organization substantiate Schneider's position that American culture in general is characterized by a basic division between the orders of nature and law. The basic nature-law distinction of American culture was
elaborated in the covenantal ideology of both groups in a manner congruous with the form of covenant organization each was attempting to institute. Puritan development of the nature-law theme implied the existence of two suborders of nature. Such a formulation was essential for Puritan understanding regarding the covenant of grace as a process by which an individual's depraved nature is transformed to correspond more closely to man's original state within a primordial order of nature. Mormon amplification, on the other hand, inferred the existence of two suborders of law: one based on divine and the other on human authority. Such a development was consistent with the Mormon concept of priesthood existing independent of human convention and is perhaps most clearly manifest in the two forms of marriage that simultaneously existed within the early Mormon group, one based on civil and the other on priesthood authority. Once such elaboration is perceived, it becomes possible to describe virtually all covenantal relationships in both systems in terms of the interface between aspects of nature and law.

In Puritanism the basic distinction between the orders of nature and law and the interrelation between the two suborders within the order of nature are both clearly articulated within the household. Regardless of the religious qualification of its members, solidarity within each regularly constituted Massachusetts household was based upon the interface between the order of law, as expressed in the conjugal relationship, and the order of nature as manifest in the parent-child bond. In religiously qualified households, where children were being born in the covenant, however, the parent-child bond included an additional element. This element was a form of hereditary charisma by virtue of which the condition of federal holiness could be transmitted from parent to child. Associated with the Puritan concept of sanctification, federal holiness implied the existence of both a degenerate and perfect order of nature.

Congregational and commonwealth solidarity were likewise based on the interrelationship between the orders of nature and law. Thus baptism, the seal of the covenant of grace, was generally administered only to individuals who had been born in the covenant and were consequently perceived as endowed with federal holiness. By owning
the covenant one formally committed himself to abide by the church congregation's code of conduct; and before one could become a covenant member of the congregation, he had to give evidence that he had become regenerate as a result of having become a recipient of the covenant of grace. Solidarity within the commonwealth as a whole was essentially isomorphic with congregational solidarity: all within the commonwealth were required to obey a code of conduct; among male citizens, however, there was a basic division between freemen, who were covenant members of church congregations and nonfreemen, who were not. Since hereditarily acquired federal holiness was regarded as virtually a prerequisite for both covenant church membership and freemanship, there was an essential unity among household, congregational, and commonwealth solidarity.

Solidarity within the pre-Nauvoo Mormon household was also based on the interface between the orders of nature and law. The conjugal relationship was thus derived from a covenant established either by civil or by priesthood authority, while unity between parents and children was perceived in terms of the interrelationship between sharing common blood and a still ill-defined notion of unity associated with order of divine law.

Mormon group solidarity had marked similarities to that within the ideal Mormon household. All members of the Church were required to ascribe to the code of conduct associated with the baptismal covenant and participate in the ordinance of baptism. Devoid of the ambiguities associated with the marriage ceremony, baptism was unequivocally a priesthood ordinance and thus a manifestation of the Mormon suborder of divine law. Unlike the recruitment process in the Mormon family, birth to Mormon parents did not confer Church membership on an individual. Mormons, however, regarded the Church as a mechanism for the gathering of scattered Israel; and because of the content of various prophetic utterances and the lineage declarations of patriarchal blessings, the Saints came to believe that most members of the Church shared common descent from Abraham. Since the baptismal ordinance and the priesthood-performed marriage ceremony were both executed by authority derived from the suborder of divine law and since the putative Abrahamic descent of Church members and the
parent-child bond within the ideal Mormon family were both regarded as a product of the interaction between common blood and an aspect of the suborder of divine law, solidarity within the Mormon group as a whole and within its separate households was based on essentially the same principles.

The Puritan suborder of primordial nature and the Mormon suborder of divine law provided the basis for much of the structural isolation in the two groups. Thus Puritan families capable of hereditarily transmitting federal holiness were distinctive from families devoid of that capacity; church members possessed of federal holiness were distinctive from those lacking this quality; sanctified church covenant members were in turn distinctive from members regarded as endowed only with federal holiness; and visible Saints qua freemen, as the only fully politically qualified citizens, were distinctive from all other inhabitants of the commonwealth. Mormon families that had been established by authority of the priesthood were distinctive in some still undefined way from those who had not; Mormons who had participated in the ordinance of baptism were distinctive from the rest of mankind who remained outside that covenant; and Mormons who had entered the consecration covenant were in turn distinctive from the general Church membership. Thus, although solidarity in both groups was based on the interface between law and nature, Puritan distinctiveness appears to have been oriented more toward the order of nature and Mormon distinctiveness more toward the order of law.

Ordering of the relationships

Covenant making in both Puritanism and Mormonism established a complex network of both asymmetric and symmetric relationships. The basic pattern for the Puritan covenantal network was in large measure derived from conjoining the scholastic concept of hierarchy with the Ramist relate. The result was a formalized system of social inequality involving most realms of social organization. Within the household the wife was subordinate to her husband, children to their parents, and servants to their master's; in the church the congregation was subordinate to the minister; and in the state citizens were
subordinate to magistrates. The Puritan system, however, did yield certain symmetric relationships. Most of these were the de facto result of individuals who were not formally bound to each other by covenant, but who shared a common structural opposition to a particular social category. For example, a condition of formal equality might be said to have existed among nonfreemen by virtue of their common structural opposition to freemen. In the case of the church covenant group, however, the enactment of formal covenants itself was predicated upon the equality of participants. It appears to have been the only covenant that resulted in the formation of explicit symmetric relationships. It is significant that it was restricted to those who had achieved a state of sanctification and whose identification appears to have been central to the operation of the entire system.

Asymmetric relationships were likewise basic to the Mormon covenantal network. These were most highly developed within the household and hierocracy. The formal structure of inequality within the household was consistent with the Puritan pattern of domestic order, while inequality within the hierocracy centered upon the office of the president of the Church and was based upon understandings regarding the delegation of priesthood keys. Household and hierocratic inequality were formally conjoined by the relationship that the consecration covenant established between the household head and the bishop.

While as in Puritanism, various de facto symmetric relationships were produced by the structural opposition of various social categories, there were two instances in which the enactment of formal covenants resulted in the establishment of symmetric relations. The first was the baptismal covenant in terms of which all Mormons were united and separated from the world. The second was the consecration covenant by means of which the more dedicated of the Saints sought to achieve spiritual unity and ultimate salvation. In a manner analogous to the church covenant group within Puritanism, the consecration group appears to have been central to the Mormon covenant system and its establishment a chief reason for which the entire apparatus existed.
Encompassment

A process of encompassment, by which one covenantal institution was subsumed by another, was common to both Puritan and Mormon covenantal organization. This process was most elaborated within Puritanism. Encompassment occurred at two critical junctures in the system: households were encompassed by church congregations and church congregations by the state. In early Mormonism encompassment occurred primarily within the context of the law of consecration and stewardship: by virtue of the consecration covenant the household was encompassed by the hierocracy.

Locus of power

Power within the Puritan system was divided between the local church covenant groups (which established qualifications by which individuals were admitted to their ranks) and the state (which regulated religious conformity within the entire commonwealth). Because the male members of the church covenant groups were identical with the freemen who controlled political power within the state apparatus, power was a monopoly of visible saints. Since the continuance of the system as a unified whole, however, was dependent upon visible saints maintaining political control, ultimate power was vested in the state rather than in the local congregation.

Although there is some indication that power in Mormonism was originally intended to be divided between the hierocracy and the group as a whole, the hierocracy soon came to monopolize power. Their ability to do so was based on the understanding that they were exclusively endowed with divine priesthood authority. Since the hierocracy technically included all who held the priesthood and since it became common practice to ordain virtually all male Mormons to office in the priesthood, the Mormon hierocracy as a body shared certain formal properties with the aggregate of freemen in the Puritan commonwealth. But while the freemen were able to elect the governor and other political officers, the president of the Mormon church was believed to hold his position by divine appointment and to have control over the delegation of all priesthood keys. Thus ultimate
power within the Mormon group was vested in the office of the president of the Church.

The Deterioration of Early Mormon Covenant Organization within the Context of Jacksonian Democracy

As was pointed out in chapter 2, the Second Great Awakening occurred during a period of American history in which there was rapid social change and dislocation. To once again quote Gordon Wood (1980:361), the various aspects of the Second Great Awakening were essentially responses to the great democratic changes taking place in America between the Revolution and the Age of Jackson. The remains of older eighteenth-century hierarchies fell away, and hundreds of thousands of common people were cut loose from all sorts of traditional bonds and found themselves freer, more independent, more unconstrained than ever before in their history.

The emergence of religious voluntaristic pluralism, the condition that has generally been most closely linked with the Second Great Awakening, was but one aspect of the social transformation that was occurring in the new republic. Perhaps even more significant were economic change, large-scale migration, and the alteration of political process associated with the successful conclusion of the revolution. These and other factors had the effect of disrupting long-established patterns of social interaction. The product of such developments has been referred to by Alice Felt Tyler (1962) as "freedom's ferment" (Berthoff 1971; Littell 1962; Wye 1960; Somkin 1967; Wood 1980).

As detailed in chapter 1, Joseph Smith, Jr., experienced much of the so-called "freedom's ferment" characteristic of the early decades of the nineteenth century. Uprooted from his native New England at the age of ten, he grew to maturity amid the rapid economic change and intense revivalism of New York's Burned-over District. Then in 1830 he organized a new church. While aspects of this church's theology were consistent with some of the more optimistic forms of religion that were emerging during the period, at its core was a covenantal system that in many ways was reminiscent of the
religious doctrine and practices of Joseph Smith's Puritan ancestors. And as the new church began to grow in numbers, most of its converts, like Joseph Smith, were individuals of New England stock who had become dissatisfied with the evangelical revivalism of the Second Great Awakening.

While various aspects of Mormon covenant structure had correlates in seventeenth-century Puritan social organization, these elements were modified and combined in such a way that the system as a whole was pertinent to the social milieu in which it emerged. It might indeed be interpreted as an attempt to counter some of the more disruptive social conditions of the early nineteenth century. At its foundation was a system of exclusive religious authority that was believed to exist independent of human convention and to have power to establish divinely sanctioned covenants. On the basis of such authority Mormons perceived their religious organization as the one true and living church, existing apart from the contending sects that characterized American voluntaristic pluralism. While American social institutions and mobility produced a milieu in which, to quote de Tocqueville (1969:507), "the woof of time is ever being broken and the track of past generations lost," Mormons fixed their position in history and linked themselves to biblical patriarchs through the reception of patriarchal blessings. And while economic development, migration, settlement, and family organization in America at large were being subjected in varying degrees to the chaos of "freedom's ferment," the Saints endeavored to regulate and order such concerns by bringing them under the aegis of priesthood authority and by making them integral to their system of covenant organization.

Thus, as has already been suggested, Mormonism might well have represented for its membership a refuge from the "freedom's ferment" that surrounded them, and its covenant system as a means for creating this refuge. De Tocqueville (1969:508) has written that "aristocracy links everybody, from peasant to king, in one long chain. Democracy breaks the chain and frees each link." By such a perception, Mormonism might be seen essentially as an "aristocratic" religion that developed as a response to the increasing democratization of America. As Gordon Wood (1980:378-79) has demonstrated, Mormonism was not the
only religious organization of the period that evidenced these reactionary tendencies, and it would be preposterous to assume that Mormonism in some sense was a lone citadel of order amid the chaos of American democracy. It appears, however, that there was an essential incongruity between the basic nature of Mormon covenant organization and the predominant trend within American society.

One year before the Mormon church was organized, Andrew Jackson was inaugurated president of the United States. His administration has often been regarded as a response to the social changes that had occurred during the early years of the republic's existence. It has been viewed as a triumph of individualism during which time various political, economic, and religious institutions began to stabilize, placing primary emphasis on the individual as an autonomous unit in society. While it is possible to stress unduly the revolutionary nature of the "Age of Jackson," there is good indication that the individual was more central to the institutional structure of American society during the 1840s than had been the case at the beginning of the century. Thus during the very years that Mormon group orientation was being given its initial expression in the form of early Mormon covenant organization, basic American institutions were being significantly modified in the direction of democratic individualism (Fish 1927; Pessen 1969; 1971; Remini 1977; Schliessinger 1945).

As has already been seen, much of Mormon identity was based upon the interrelationship between acceptance of the baptismal covenant and putative Abrahamic descent. The development of Mormon solidarity upon these two principles alone would not necessarily have resulted in any fundamental incompatibility between Mormon group orientation and the increasing democratization of Jacksonian America. Mormon understandings respecting the nature both of the baptismal covenant and of Abrahamic descent were sufficiently flexible to permit pragmatic adaptation to changing circumstances. For example, when virtually no converts to Mormonism came from social categories initially regarded as comprising the house of Israel, it was not difficult for ostensibly "Gentile" Saints to begin to perceive themselves as actually descendants of Abraham and thus they became the
embodiment of the Book of Mormon depiction of the latter-day covenant people as gathered Israel.

The Mormon blueprint for group solidarity, however, rapidly came to include the gathering of the elect to the New Jerusalem, where they would be governed by the law for the government of the Church, including the law of consecration and stewardship. Complete actualization of this plan would necessitate that the Saints exclusively occupy the geographic space designated as the site of the New Jerusalem, that they have the means to enforce the law for the government of the Church within that space and to expel from the city all who failed to comply with its requirements, that they have the ability to gain control over large tracts of agricultural land, and that they possess the power and authority to establish and perpetuate an economic system that recognizes no rights in fee simple.

Much of the activity of the Mormon group from early 1831 through fall of 1838 centered upon the attempt to establish the New Jerusalem and to implement the law of consecration and stewardship. As might be expected, the endeavor was characterized by internal dissension and external persecution (Bushman, Richard L. 1955; 1960; Gentry, Leland Homer 1965; Jennings, Warren 1962; 1973; McKiernan, F. Mark; Parkin, Max H. 1966). As difficulties persisted and intensified, various aspects of the scheme were either modified or abolished. And by the time the Saints were expelled from Missouri in the winter of 1838-39, much of the initial Mormon covenant system had deteriorated.

1831-1833

It was only from August of 1831 to November of 1833 that the Mormons made a concerted effort to bring the New Jerusalem into actual existence. In attempting to transform ideology into reality they were confronted with numerous difficulties, and they ultimately found it impossible to create the type of society that they had envisioned.
Internal difficulties

One basic difficulty concerned the problem of regulation. Although the hierocratic structure of religious authority was fundamental to Mormon solidarity, it was never optimally applied to the management of Zion. This difficulty in large measure resulted from the fact that throughout the time that the Saints were endeavoring to build the New Jerusalem, the ecclesiastical headquarters of the Church remained at Kirtland, Ohio. As a result, while Bishop Partridge and the Mormons in Missouri were involved in the actual creation of the type of social order outlined in the law for the government of the Church, they were required to rely on the directives of Joseph Smith and other leaders of the hierocracy who were geographically far removed from the field of operation. And by the time that Partridge could get an answer from Kirtland about a particular problem, the situation could change dramatically. Although it is uncertain whether or not Joseph Smith's continued presence in Jackson County would have significantly altered the course of events, his absence unquestionably militated against a speedy resolution of the difficulties that were encountered.

One of the first practical problems that the Church faced in attempting to establish the New Jerusalem resulted from its inability to regulate in any meaningful way the rate of migration to Jackson County. For example, Reynolds Cahoon (ms a), who had responsibility for issuing recommendations to Saints in the Kirtland area which would officially entitle them to go to Jackson County and receive stewardships, records in his journal under date of April 1832 that various Church members had "gone without any recommendation to Zion for which we fear the Lord will not be well pleased with them." As might be expected, those most anxious to go were the economically less fortunate. Thus John Corrill (1839:19), who during this time was one of the leading Church officials in Jackson County, later recalled that "the church got crazy to go up to Zion . . . and the poor crowded up in numbers, without having any places provided, contrary to the advice of the bishop."
Such unregulated migration of the poor taxed the ability of the bishop to provide adequate stewardships for all who had entered the consecration covenant. In an endeavor to alleviate this situation, the Church asked unconsecrated members still in the East to contribute to the Jackson County stewardship fund. There was apparently little response. John Corrill (1839:19) indicated that "the rich were afraid to send up their money to purchase lands." And Brigham Young, employing his typical rhetorical hyperbole, in 1873 recalled that he had been "present at the time the revelation came for the brethren to give their surplus property . . . for the building up of Zion, but I never knew a man yet who had a dollar of surplus property. No matter how much one might have he wanted all he had for himself, for his children, his grand-children, and so forth" (JD 16:11).

As a result, the stewardships that members received were often inadequate for their economic needs. Ezra Booth indicates that each steward was provided with less than thirty acres of land, "and thirty acres in that county, is little enough for wood and timber land" (Howe, E. D. 1834:196). As a result many of the Saints in Jackson County had to seek employment from Gentiles (EMS 2:110; Pixley 1973:75). At least in economic terms there was thus little evidence that the law of consecration and stewardship was enabling the Church to become independent of the world.

Potentially even more disruptive to the covenantal system was the issue of the distribution of rights over stewardship property. As has already been seen, the consecration and stewardship deeds utilized by Bishop Partridge indicated that the Church as a corporation maintained rights in fee simple over all property that had been consecrated, while individuals were granted only nontransferable rights in usufruct over their individual stewardships. This procedure appears to have been fully consistent with the law for the government of the Church, which stated that consecrated properties "cannot be taken from the church" (Book of Commandments 1833:92). It ran counter, however, to the deeply rooted American tradition of private ownership. As Mario DePillis (1960:200) has stated in somewhat
exaggerated terms, "in fighting fee simple Joseph was fighting the ethos of the whole frontier."

The practice generated dissatisfaction and conflict among Church members as well as raising serious legal issues. As Arrington, Fox, and May (1976:252) have indicated, "Judges on the frontier viewed properties held in trust with noticeable disfavor." The issue was finally resolved by a directive Joseph Smith sent to Bishop Partridge on 3 May 1833:

You are bound by the law of the Lord to give a deed, securing to him who receives inheritances, his inheritance for an everlasting inheritance, or in other words to be his individual property, his private stewardship, and if he is found a transgressor and should be cut off, out of the church, his inheritance is his still, and he is delivered over to the buffetings of Satan till the day of redemption. But the property which he consecrated to the poor, for their benefit and inheritance and stewardship, he cannot obtain again. (Whitney, Orson F. 1884:7)

Bishop Partridge evidently immediately began to implement the instructions that he had received. Thus the June 1833 issue of the Evening and the Morning Star (2:100) indicates that upon receiving his stewardship, "each man receives a warranty deed securing to himself and heirs, his inheritance in fee simple forever." And the following issue states that "members of the church have, or will have, 'deeds' in their own name" (EMS 2:110).

The new policy became formalized as official Church doctrine when revelations received before that time were rewritten to reflect the change (Arrington, Fox and May 1978:433–34, note 39). It appears, however, that Church leaders believed that the granting of rights in fee simple over stewardship property had been necessitated by the pragmatics of American legal procedures. Thus in 1835 Oliver Cowdery was to write, "The church at Jerusalem in the days of the apostles, had their earthly goods in common; the Nephites [in the Book of Mormon], after the appearance of Christ, held theirs in the same way; but each government was differently organized from ours; and could admit of such a course when ours cannot" (Arrington, Fox, and May 1978:26).

The granting of rights in fee simple over stewardship property had the potential to undermine critical aspects of the Mormon covenant
system. As has already been discussed, solidarity within the covenant community was primarily structured in terms of economic relationships. With each household holding its stewardship as private property, such relationships could not be maintained. First, the individual household would cease to be encompassed by the hierocracy. Second, there would be no practical way to enforce the requirement that households turn over their surplus to the bishop. As a result economic equality among households could not be perpetuated, and the means by which the bishop was to secure funds for additional stewardships would be placed upon extremely insecure foundations. And third, with apostates being able to continue to maintain control over the property that they had received as stewardships, there would be no obvious way to remove the wicked from the City of Zion.

The whole consecration process was made to appear even more unfeasible when a member by the name of Bates sued in court to regain possession of money that he had consecrated to Bishop Partridge and then won the judgment (EMS 2:110). The rights of the Church even to control consecration property before dispensing it among members as stewardships was consequently brought into serious question. Whatever its objectives, the Mormon law of consecration and stewardship thus appears to have been incompatible with Jacksonian America.

**External difficulties**

**The expulsion from Jackson County**

There is no way to determine the ultimate form that the law of consecration and stewardship might have assumed had the Saints in Jackson County been able to peacefully continue in their attempt to establish the New Jerusalem: before Bishop Partridge was even able to implement fully the directives that he had received in May 1833, armed mobs had forced the Mormons from the county.

Joseph Smith had located the New Jerusalem in an already partially populated area. Independence itself had been settled some four years before the Saints arrival and by 1831 was something of a boom town (Brodie 1977:109). Although the Saints were commanded by revelation "to purchase this whole region of county" (DC 58:52), they
were not able even to come close to achieving this objective; and they probably never comprised more than about one-third of the total population of Jackson County (Allen and Leonard 1976:82). The non-Mormon "settlers were primarily from the mountainous portions of the border states" (Jennings, Warren 1973:100) and appear to have been imbued with the individualism that has been regarded as characteristic of that area of the county. The frontier conditions of western Missouri evidently intensified this trait. Thus the Missouri Intelligence and Boon's Lick Advertiser of 16 November 1833 states that "Jackson County is situated on the very extremity of civilization on our western frontier, and the inhabitants have, we believe, the character . . . of being very turbulent and lawless."

Difficulties between Mormons and Gentiles appear to have commenced with the initial Mormon settlement. On 31 July 1831 (two days before the Saints began the formal construction of their New Jerusalem), Delilah Lykins wrote her father, Isaac McCoy, informing him that "the Mormonites are about to take the county" (Jennings 1966:65). During the next few weeks her misgivings evidently increased to the degree that she felt that Mormons must somehow be stopped. In a letter written to her father on September 6 she thus declared that "a fresh cargo of Mormonites arrived in our neighborhood yesterday, between seventy and 100. I think that they will take possession of this county for a while. They are crowding in as near the state line as they can get. . . . I do think that they ought to be punished" (Jennings 1966:65-66).

Throughout 1832 Gentile opposition to Mormon settlement in Jackson County appears to have increased. According to the petition that the Saints sent Governor Dunklin in September 1833,

In the spring of 1832, some persons . . . commenced stoning or brick-battling some of our houses. . . . Some few days after they called a county meeting to consult measures to remove us but . . . dispersed with doing no more than threatening, on that day. In the fall of the same year, they . . . burned a large quantity of hay in stack; and soon after commenced shooting into some of our houses, and at many times insulting with abusive language. (EMS 2:114)
By the summer of 1833 Gentile opposition to Mormon settlement had become more organized. In mid-July a document known as the "secret constitution" was signed by some eighty prominent Gentile residents of Jackson County: it listed various grievances against the Mormons; called for their removal; and indicated that there would be a general meeting on July 20 at the courthouse in Independence. On that date between four and five hundred non-Mormons gathered in Independence. During the course of the day the Mormon press was destroyed, the Mormon store was broken into, and Edward Partridge was tarred and feathered. On July 23, the mob reconvened and forced Mormon leaders to sign an agreement that the Saints would leave Jackson County before the following April.

When Church leaders in Kirtland were advised of the situation, they sent word that the Saints in Jackson County were neither to sell their lands nor to move from the county (HC 1:417). When the Missouri Mormons took measures to maintain their presence, Gentile pressure increased; and early in November 1833 approximately twelve hundred Mormon inhabitants of the City of Zion were forced from Jackson County by armed mobs.

Reasons for the expulsion

Although the full reasons for mob activity are often difficult to determine, it appears that at the root of the conflict was the perceived incompatibility of Mormon solidarity with Gentile individualism. Apprehension of the unity of the ever increasing Mormon group is manifest in many of the statements made by Gentile residents of Jackson County. Thus the "secret constitution" states that "the arts of a few designing leaders amongst them have thus far succeeded in holding them together as a society, and since the arrival of the first of them they have daily been increasing in size" (EMS 2:114). In December of 1833 Isaac McCoy wrote that Mormons "were introducing a state of society which would eventually become intolerable to others and would rid the county of all who did not belong" (Missouri Republican, 20 Dec. 1833). And John McCoy was to later state that the only alternatives for the Gentiles of Jackson
County were "fight, flight, or submission to a fanatical hierarchy" (Kansas City Journal, 24 Apr. 1881).

At least some of the consequences that Gentiles feared would result from the Mormon presence appear to have been unfounded. The proximate cause of the "secret constitution" appears to have been an article in the July issue of the Evening and the Morning Star (2:109) which detailed the legal procedures that free blacks and mulattoes would have to follow if they wished to migrate to Missouri. Although there were only a handful of blacks in the Church at the time, Gentiles regarded the article as evidence that the Mormons were planning to induce large numbers of free blacks to migrate to Jackson County. Thus the "secret constitution" states that in a late number of the Star, published in Independence by the leaders of the sect, there is an article inviting free negroes and mulattoes from other states to become mormons and remove and settle among us. ... It manifests a desire on the part of their society, to inflict on our society an injury that they know would be to us entirely insupportable, and one of the surest means of driving us from the county; for ... the introduction of such a cast amongst us, would corrupt our blacks and instigate them to bloodshed. (EMS 2:114)

The Gentiles likewise feared that Mormons might induce Indians to war against whites. Although there is no evidence that the Saints undertook to proselyte Indians after the first abortive attempt in 1830, LDS publications continued to indicate that the Indians would eventually become part of the Mormon covenant community, and the text of the Book of Mormon holds out the possibility that Lamanites would one day go among the unrepentant Gentiles "as a young lion among the flocks of sheep" (BM 3 Ne. 21:12). Such statements might well have appeared ominous to settlers who lived close to Indian territory and who were still frightened by the Indian outbreaks that had recently occurred in neighboring Illinois in conjunction with the Black Hawk War. Although the "secret constitution" makes no mention of Mormon relations with Indians, a communication written by Jackson County Gentiles on 8 November 1833 states that "we have too much reason to suspect them of using their influence to corrupt ... the Indians" (Jenning 1966:75), and Isaac McCoy writes that just prior to their expulsion from Jackson County, the Mormons "became strongly suspected
of tampering with the Neighboring Indians, to induce them to aid them in event of open hostilities" (Missouri Republican, 20 Dec. 1833).

Although fears that the Saints would induce blacks and Indians to rebellion appear to have had little or no basis in fact, at least part of Gentile opposition appears to have been based on an essentially accurate perception of what an expanding Mormon population would entail. One such fear was that Mormon unity would translate into Mormon political domination. Thus in August of 1833 anti-Mormons in Jackson County wrote that "when we reflect on the extensive field in which the sect is operating . . . it requires no gift of prophecy to tell that the day is not far distant when the civil government of the county will be in their hands" (HC 1:397). And John McCoy was later to state that "already in 1833 the Mormons more than held the balance of power between the two political parties" (Kansas City Journal, 24 Apr. 1881). Such fears might in part explain the large number of government office holders that in one way or another were connected with mob activity.

Another fear centered upon the impact that Mormon settlement might have on the economy of the area. Arrington and Bitton (1979:49) have written that some of the most prominent spokesmen against the Mormons were the merchants of Independence. It might be expected that such men would regard the Mormons as a boon, an additional pool of hundreds of customers. But the fact was that the Mormons traded almost entirely through the store of Sidney Gilbert, a church member. In effect, they had pooled their meager resources and were functioning as a cooperative community. From the outside the Mormons, however destitute individually, must have looked like a fairly powerful economic bloc, with resources far exceeding those of any one individual. Such an economic unity would be seen as operating in restraint of trade.

A related economic issue was the inflationary impact that the Mormon attempt to purchase large tracts of agricultural land had upon the land market. As Arrington and Bitton (1979:49) indicate, "the land market . . . was thrown into an unnatural upward spiral, much to the disgust of prospective purchasers, who had to compete with the Mormons." As John McCoy recalled in 1881, "No one but a Mormon could
be induced to buy land to settle upon, and they in the few purchases by them fixed ruinous prices" (Kansas City Journal, 24 Apr. 1881).

It thus appears that the individualistic Gentiles of Jackson County regarded the Mormon group as a monolithic menace. This perception generated various fears. Some, like beliefs that Mormons would incite slaves and Indians to rebellion, were probably unfounded. Others, such as the perceptions that the ever increasing size of the Mormon group would eventually result in political and economic domination might well have proved to be accurate. But whether Gentile fears were justified or not, the expulsion of the Mormons from Jackson County adequately illustrates the incompatibility of collectivist territorial domination with Jacksonian America.

1834-1838

From December of 1833 until the winter of 1838 the Mormon church operated under the assumption that in the near future the Saints would be able to regain possession of their stewardships in Jackson County and commence once again to establish the New Jerusalem. When the Mormons were expelled from Jackson County in November of 1833, they found temporary refuge in neighboring Clay County and there awaited direction from Kirtland. On December 16, Joseph Smith issued a revelation stating that the Saints had been driven from their land of inheritance because they had violated the commandments with which the inhabitants of Zion were required to comply:

I, the Lord, have suffered the affliction to come upon them . . . in consequence of their transgression. . . . Behold, I say unto you, there were jarrings, and contentions, and envyings, and strifes, and lustful and covetous desires among them; therefore by these things they polluted their inheritances. (DC 101:2, 6)

Despite the extreme anti-Mormon sentiment in Jackson County, the site of the New Jerusalem was not to be changed: "Zion shall not be moved out of her place, notwithstanding her children are scattered" (DC 101:17). The hope was given, however, that if the Saints repented, they would regain possession of their stewardships in Jackson County: "They that remain and are pure in heart, shall return, and come to
their inheritances . . . to build up the waste places of Zion" (DC 101:18). To expedite the anticipated return they were to "importune at the feet of the governor; and if the governor heed them not, let them importune at the feet of the president; and if the president heed them not, then will the Lord arise and come forth out of his hiding place, and in his fury vex the nation" (DC 101:87-89).

Appeals to civil government

In accordance with these instructions the Saints wrote both Governor Dunklin of Missouri and President Andrew Jackson, asking them to take measures that would permit them to regain possession of their lands in Jackson County. The response from President Jackson came by way of Lewis Cass, the Secretary of War:

Gentlemen:--The President has referred to this department the memorial and letter addressed to him . . . requesting his interposition in order to protect your persons and property.

In answer, I am instructed to inform you that the offences of which you complain are violations of the laws of the State of Missouri, and not of the laws of the United States. . . . The President cannot call out a military force to aid in the execution of State Laws, until the proper requisition is made upon him by the constituted authorities. (TS 6:1073)

The position taken by Secretary Cass was fully consistent with the states' rights doctrine advocated by Andrew Jackson. Under this policy the concept of individualism became a guiding principle in relationships between federal and state government.

The response from Governor Dunklin appeared more hopeful. On 4 February 1834 he wrote: "I am very sensible indeed of the injuries you people complain of, and should consider myself very remiss in the discharge of my duties were I not to do everything in my power consistent with the legal exercise of them, to afford your society the redress to which they seem entitled" (HC 1:476). He indicated that he would provide them with a "military guard" to escort them back to their holdings in Jackson County. He stated, however, that the state could not maintain a permanent military force in Jackson County to ensure that the Saints would not again be driven from their lands. Yet he did indicate that the Mormons themselves would have the right
to protect their holdings: "Should your men organize according to law . . . and apply for public arms, the Executive could not distinguish between their right to have them, and the right of every other description of people similarly situated" (HC 1:476).

Zion's Camp

As a result of this communication the Mormons evidently came to believe that Governor Dunklin would call up the state militia to escort the Saints back to Jackson County and then allow them to employ arms to protect their holdings. To provide the Saints in Missouri with additional military support, Joseph Smith mustered Mormons in the Kirtland area into a militia called "Zion's Camp" and marched with them to western Missouri. Upon the arrival of Zion's Camp, however, Dunklin refused to call up the state militia; and on June 7 he wrote that "the citizens of Jackson county have a right to arm themselves and parade for military duty in their own county independent of the commander-in-chief" (HC 2:86) but that "the Mormons have no right to march to Jackson county in arms, unless by order or permission of the commander-in-chief" (HC 2:86). Such permission was never given.

Dunklin's action probably prevented additional armed conflict between Gentiles and Mormons at that time. It did, however, illustrate a widespread problem that existed in the western states prior to the civil war: the inability or unwillingness of state officials to prevent citizens from employing extralegal means to achieve objectives for which there was popular support. This difficulty is another manifestation of the centrality of individualism in American society of the period, and it explains part of the problem that the Mormons faced in their attempt to establish a social order that was opposed by the surrounding population.

Sixteen days after Dunklin issued his communique, Joseph Smith received a revelation stating that the Mormons were not to fight to regain possession of their lands in Jackson County, that "the redemption of Zion" would have to "wait for a little season," and that until that occurred commandments pertaining to the governing of the New Jerusalem (including the law of consecration and stewardship) were
to be suspended (DC 105:13-14, 34). Thus the endeavor to establish the New Jerusalem and the law of consecration and stewardship, two of the fundamental elements of Mormon covenant organization, were put in abeyance.

The Church in expectant exile

There is little indication that the Saints were immediately concerned with the impact that these changes might have on the development of the Church. This is probably due in part to the fact that the expectation was still high that within a short time the way would be opened for the Mormons to once more continue their colonization of Jackson County. For example, on June 23 various leading elders who had settled in Jackson County were authorized to return to the Kirtland area "until Zion is redeemed" (CM, 23 June 1834). In anticipation of the return to Jackson County, stewardship lands there were not to be sold and Mormons were to continue to migrate to western Missouri. Thus in the same June 23 meeting, Edward Partridge was commissioned to continue to "stand in his office as bishop to purchase lands in the land of Missouri."

There was some feeling, however, that the Mormon people were in an anomalous state because they were neither actively building up the New Jerusalem nor living the law of consecration and stewardship. Thus in April of 1837 Lyman Wight was reported to have stated that the Church was currently "under a telestial law, because God does not whip ... under a celestial law, therefore he took ... the church out doors to whip us as a parent takes his children out of doors to chasten them and book of covenants and doctrine [i.e. the Doctrine and Covenants, containing Joseph Smith's revelations and printed at Kirtland in 1835] was a telestial law and the Book of Commandments [the first compilation of Joseph's revelations and printed in Jackson County] was a celestial law" (CM, 24 Apr. 1837).

Whatever the Saints' attitudes regarding the expulsion from Jackson County and the suspension of the law of consecration and stewardship might have been, there is clear evidence that unity within the Church progressively deteriorated between the time that Zion's
Camp was disbanded in June of 1834 and the eventual expulsion of the Mormons from Missouri. It might thus be argued that by at least temporarily abandoning two of the principal bases for solidarity within the covenant structure, Mormon group cohesiveness was seriously undermined.

The organization of Caldwell County

From 1834 through 1836 the Mormons in Missouri were chiefly located in Clay County. At first Gentiles of the county were willing to allow the Saints refuge. When the Mormons showed no sign of departing and their numbers steadily increased, the Gentiles of Clay County became alarmed and formally requested the Mormons to leave (HC 2:448-55). The Mormons petitioned the state legislature to establish a new county in an unsettled region of the state where they might settle as a body (HC 2:458). In response, in the winter of 1836-37, Caldwell County was organized in a virtually unpopulated area of the state (Missouri House Journal, 1836-37:188). There was apparently a tacit understanding that the Mormons would be left alone if they restricted their colonizing efforts exclusively to that county (Allen and Leonard 1976:106-7).

Some ten thousand Mormons moved to Caldwell County during 1837 and there attempted to establish a semicommunal economic order that embodied some of the principles of the law of consecration and stewardship (Arrington, Fox, and May 1976:34-38). Throughout 1837 the Mormons in Missouri lived in relative peace, and the plan to establish a separate county for their occupancy appeared to be working. The year 1838, however, proved to be the most disruptive in the entire history of the Church; and before it was over the Saints were fleeing the state under fear of extermination. A basic cause of this reversal was the Mormon hierocracy's continuing endeavor to maintain economic and territorial control despite the exile from Jackson County and the abandonment of the law of consecration and stewardship.

When Joseph Smith returned to Kirtland from the abortive 1834 Zion's Camp expedition, his credibility as a prophet had diminished for a number of Church members (HC 2:142-46). He was, however, at
least ostensibly able to refute charges made against him; and during the next few years the Church in the Kirtland area flourished. In 1837, however, Joseph Smith became involved in an ill-advised scheme to establish an "anti-banking society" among the Mormons in the Kirtland area (HC 2:470-73). The project was not presented as reflective of celestial principles nor linked to a covenant order designed to produce a perfect society. Many Saints, however, felt that the society had been organized as a result of divine revelation; and they invested money with the conviction that they were following the will of Heaven (Sampson and Wimmer 1972; Partridge 1972). When the bank failed amid the general economic collapse that accompanied the panic of 1837, a number of Saints suffered considerable financial loss. Many Mormons in the Kirtland area began to regard Joseph as a "fallen prophet," and attempts were made to remove him from the leadership of the Church (Parkin 1966). Opposition intensified to the degree that on 12 January 1838, he had to flee Kirtland for fear of his life (HC 3:1).

After leaving Kirtland, Joseph Smith established residence at Far West, the principal Mormon settlement in Caldwell County. Once there he and various of his loyal followers began to take strong measures to establish a higher degree of unity within the Mormon group. Excommunication trials were held for prominent Saints then living in Missouri who were showing opposition to various Church policies. Charges made in these trials evidence that at least part of the disharmony resulted from unwillingness of such individuals to follow Church directions regarding economic matters. For example, the following are among the accusations made against Oliver Cowdery:

for virtually denying the faith by declaring that he would not be governed by any ecclesiastical authority or revelation whatever, in his temporal affairs; . . . for selling his lands in Jackson county, contrary to revelation; . . . [and] for leaving his calling to which God had appointed him by revelation, for the sake of filthy lucre, and turning to the practice of the law. (HC 3:16)

In responding to these charges Oliver Cowdery wrote that

the three great principles of English liberty, . . . are "the right of personal security, the right of personal liberty, and the right of private property." . . . Those maxims . . . are so
interwoven in my nature . . . that I am wholly unwilling to exchange them for anything less liberal, less benevolent, or less free.

The very principle of which I conceive to be couched in an attempt to set up a kind of petty government, controlled and dictated by ecclesiastical influence, in the midst of this national and state government. . . .

This attempt to control me in my temporal interests, I conceive to be a disposition to take from me a portion of my Constitutional privileges and inherent right—I only, respectfully, ask leave, therefore, to withdraw from a society assuming they have such rights. (HC 3:18)

Both the Kirtland Anti-Banking Society and the Far West trials evidence the continuing attempt of the Mormon hierocracy to supervise the economic affairs of its membership, its inability to do so, and the dissension that this failure generated. Oliver Cowdery and many others desired to pursue their individual economic interests and could find no justification for the continued attempt of the hierocracy to regulate the Mormon economy when this endeavor existed independent of the law of consecration and stewardship.

The endeavor to maintain unity also included a concerted attempt to exercise territorial control through purging Caldwell county of Mormon dissenters and protecting the areas of LDS settlement from hostile Gentiles. During the spring of 1838 a number of antagonistic excommunicated Mormons were highly visible in the Far West area. They were evidently attempting to frustrate the purposes of the Church by instigating law suits and by vociferously denouncing the actions of leading members of the hierocracy. According to John Corrill (1839:31):

The church, it was said, would never become pure unless these dissenters were routed from among them. Moreover, if they were suffered to remain, they would destroy the church. Secret meetings were held, and plans contrived, how to get rid of them. Some had one plan, and some another, but there was a backwardness in bringing it about, until President Rigdon delivered from the pulpit what I call the salt sermon: "If the salt have lost its savour, it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under the feet of men," was his text, and although he did not call names in his sermon, yet it was plainly understood that he meant that dissenters, or those who had denied the faith, ought to be cast out, and literally trodden under foot. . . . This sermon had the desired effect.
Shortly after Rigdon had delivered the "salt sermon," a document was signed by eighty-four Mormon residents of Caldwell County ordering leading dissenters to leave the area:

The citizens of Caldwell county have borne with the abuse received from you at different times and on different occasions, until it is no longer to be endured. . . . There are no threats from you--no fear of losing our lives by you, nor anything you can say or do, will restrain us; for out of the county you shall go, and no power can save you. (Gentry 1974:424)

About the same time a secret society known as the Danites was organized among the Mormons (Gentry 1974). Its initial purpose was evidently to employ extra-legal means to rid the county of dissenters; it was apparently shortly thereafter also used to intimidate Gentiles. Although there is no good evidence that Joseph Smith approved of the Danites, they apparently received some backing from Sidney Rigdon.

The extermination order and the expulsion from Missouri

While the Church was attempting to cope with internal disunity, it once more became involved in conflicts with Gentiles. There were two primary causes of these difficulties: (1) Mormon settlements had begun to extend beyond the borders of Caldwell County; and (2) statements being made by dissenters had greatly increased anti-Mormon sentiment in the area.

When verbally threatened by unfriendly Gentiles, Mormons vowed to fight back. In a Fourth of July oration, Sidney Rigdon (1838:12) declared:

We take God and all the holy angels to witness this day, that we warn all men in the name of Jesus Christ to come on us no more forever. . . . Our rights shall no more be trampled on with impunity. The man or the set of men who attempts it, does it at the expense of their lives. And the mob that comes on us to disturb us; it shall be between us and them a war of extermination, for we will follow them, till the last drop of their blood is spilled, or else they will have to exterminate us.

Actual fighting between Gentiles and Mormons began on August 6 when some of the Saints attempted to vote in an election being held at Gallatin, Daviess County (HC 3:56-58). Within a short time open
warfare was under way. On October 27, Governor Boggs issued his infamous "extermination order": "The Mormons must be treated as enemies and must be exterminated or driven from the state, if necessary, for the public good" (HC 3:175). By the first week of November Joseph Smith and other leaders of the Church were under arrest and Far West was occupied by the state militia (HC 3:149-95). The Mormons were forced to deliver up their arms, to sign over their property to pay for the war, and to promise to leave the state as quickly as possible (HC 3:203).

On November 6, General Clark addressed the Saints at Far West as follows:

If I am called here again, in case of non-compliance of a treaty made, ... you need not expect any mercy but extermination. ... As for your leaders, do not once think ... that they will be delivered, or that you will see their faces again, for their fate is fixed ... their doom is sealed. ... I would advise you to scatter abroad, and never again organize yourselves with Bishops, Presidents, etc., lest you excite the jealousies of the people, and subject yourselves to the same calamities that have now come upon you. ... My advice is that you become as other citizens, lest by a recurrence of these events you bring upon yourselves irretrievable ruin. (HC 3:203-4)

While the difficulties that the Mormons faced in Missouri were the result of many factors, they seem to provide ample evidence of the difficulty of an American religious organization achieving any lasting form of solidarity through the attempt to establish economic and territorial domination. While the hierocracy and concepts of identity based on the baptismal covenant and the notion of Abrahamic descent remained essentially in place, most of the internal dynamics of the Mormon covenant structure had collapsed by the winter of 1838-39. Indeed the very survival of the Mormon church appeared highly unlikely. As Joseph Smith cried out from his prison cell in Liberty, Missouri, "O God, where art thou? And where is the pavilion that covereth thy hiding place?" (DC 121:1).
CHAPTER V

THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE PATRIARCHAL ORDER

The order of God's government, both in time and in eternity is patriarchal: that is, it is a fatherly government. Each father who is raised from the dead and made a partaker of the celestial glory in its fulness, will hold lawful jurisdiction over his own children, and over all the families which spring of them to all generations, for ever and ever. —Parley P. Pratt (MS 5:189)

From December of 1838 to April of 1839 between twelve and fifteen thousand Mormons left the state of Missouri (Allen and Leonard 1976:128-29, 134). Despite recent difficulties, the Mormon people as a whole continued to follow the directives of the hierocracy and to evidence a high degree of solidarity. With Joseph Smith in prison, the logistics of the removal became the responsibility of Brigham Young, the senior apostle. By this time, covenant making had evidently become accepted as a central element in the Mormon social order, for Young employed a covenant to bind the fleeing Saints together into relationships of mutual responsibility. Thus in January of 1839 numerous Saints in Far West signed a document which stated:

We, whose names are hereunder written, do for ourselves individually hereby covenant to stand by and assist one another, to the utmost of our ability, in removing from this state in compliance with the authority of the state; and we do hereby acknowledge ourselves firmly bound to extent of all our available property, to be disposed of by a committee who shall be appointed for the purpose of providing means for the removing from this state of the poor and destitute who shall be considered worthy, till there shall not be one left who desires to remove from the state. (HC 3:251)

Many Saints sought refuge in Adams County, Illinois; and Quincy, its largest city, became the temporary headquarters of the Church. During the winter and early spring all Mormons who had been taken prisoner by the Missouri militia either escaped from their
captors or were released. And on April 22, Joseph Smith arrived at Quincy after having escaped with the connivance of his guard (HC 3:320-21, 327).

Beginning in late April 1839, the Church entered agreements to purchase large tracts of land along the Mississippi waterfront in Hancock County, Illinois (Allen and Leonard 1976:141-42; Flanders, Robert 1965:25-42; HC 3:342). There they laid out a city which Joseph Smith named Nauvoo, and which he designated as the new center of gathering for the Saints. Drawing Mormon converts from throughout the United States and from Canada and Britain, Nauvoo was destined to increase in size until it became one of the largest cities in Illinois and then to be rapidly reduced to a sleepy river town when it was abandoned by the Mormons in the early months of 1846.

It seems apparent that by the time Nauvoo was established, Joseph Smith had become painfully aware of at least some of the difficulties that had been generated by his attempt to unify the Mormon group through locality and economic ties. The expulsion from Missouri coupled with the states' rights doctrine of the period precluded any possibility that construction on the New Jerusalem in Jackson County could be resumed any time within the foreseeable future. And the practical difficulties that had resulted from the attempt to instigate the law of consecration and stewardship, together with the economic chaos that had accompanied the various Mormon geographic dislocations, gave clear evidence of the instability of covenantal relationships based primarily upon economic rights and duties.

During his years at Nauvoo, Joseph Smith took active measures to decrease the importance to Mormon ideology of both the New Jerusalem and the law of consecration and stewardship. The centrality of the New Jerusalem in Mormon thought was weakened through two associated developments. First, the commandment to build the New Jerusalem was indefinitely suspended. A January 1841 revelation thus declares:

When I give a commandment to any of the sons of men to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might and with all they have to perform that work . . . and their enemies
come upon them and hinder them from performing that work, behold, it behooveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offerings... Therefore, for this cause have I accepted the offerings of those whom I commanded to build up a city... unto my name, in Jackson county, and were hindered by their enemies, saith the Lord your God. (DC 124:49, 51)

The understanding persisted that at some unknown future time the way would be open for the Saints to return to Jackson County and build their city. But they no longer had the responsibility to actively pursue this objective, and their attention could now be directed towards other endeavors.

Second, the concept of Zion was generalized. This development appears to have begun while Joseph Smith was still a prisoner in Missouri. In a letter he addresses to Heber C. Kimball and Brigham Young in January of 1839, the geographic Zion appears to be taking dimensions much larger than previously understood. They are thus informed that while "the gathering of necessity [has] stopped,... America will be a Zion to all that choose to come to it" (Smith, Joseph, ms b). And evidently as early as July of 1840, Joseph Smith was publicly preaching that "the Land of Zion... consists of all North and South America [and] that any place the Saints gather is Zion" (Coray, Martha Jane, ms a, sermon 19, July 1840). With the "Land of Zion" broadened to include all North and South America and "Zion" regarded as anywhere the Saints might happen to gather, locality ceased to be an essential component of Mormon identity and the Saints were set free to establish their kingdom wherever circumstances might lead them.

As has already been seen, the de-emphasis of the law of consecration and stewardship in Mormon ideology had already begun when the Saints failed to recolonize Jackson County in the spring of 1834. This tendency, however, greatly increased during the Nauvoo period. Thus although the exiled Saints in Missouri had practiced a modified form of the law of consecration and stewardship, Joseph Smith took measures to prevent any such attempts once the Church had become centered at Nauvoo. For example, in March of 1840 when certain Saints expressed the desire to reinstitute some form of the law of
consecration and stewardship, Joseph Smith declared that "the law of consecration could not be kept here, and that it was the will of the Lord that we should desist from trying to keep it; and if persisted in, it would produce a perfect defeat of its object, and that he assumed the whole responsibility of not keeping it until proposed by himself" (HC 4:93). And his diary under date of 24 September 1843 states: "I preached about one hour on the 2nd chapter of Acts, designing to show the folly of common stock. In Nauvoo every one is steward over his own" (HC 6:37-38).

According to Arrington, Fox, and May (1976:38), while the Church was centered at Nauvoo:

The stewardship phase of "the Lord's law" lapsed into an informal, voluntary, less-than-universal arrangement in which the faithful were urged to regard their property rights, however legal, as something less than absolute, and as subject to a measure of control by the priesthood. Church revenues came to depend to a considerable extent upon sources other than consecrations, such as borrowings, capitalistic business enterprises, and profit-making sales of property. In an account of the history and doctrines of the Latter-day Saints prepared shortly before his death, Joseph Smith made no mention whatever of the law of consecration and stewardship.

Joseph Smith's practical abandonment of attempts to establish the New Jerusalem and instigate the law of consecration and stewardship, although necessitated by historical circumstances, could well have had disastrous consequences for the group identity and solidarity of his followers. Prior to the settlement of Nauvoo, the utopian self-conception of the Mormon church was that of the covenant people of God gathering to the New Jerusalem, where they were to achieve unity and perfection through living the law of consecration and stewardship while awaiting the imminent return of the Savior. It is true that the existential realization of this aspiration had been temporarily frustrated in 1833 when mobs drove the Saints from their promised land. In the mid- and late-1830s, however, it had been possible to wait for "a little season" in northern Missouri before the plan could become reality. But during the early 1840s the fundamentals of the plan were declared inoperative by the prophet through whose revelations they had been initially articulated. While
Mormons continued to believe that at some future time the New Jerusalem would be built and the law of consecration and stewardship reestablished, it is questionable that such expectations would have provided the Church with sufficient raison d'être to ensure its continued existence as a viable institution.

The fact that Mormonism remained an expansive organization can be attributed in part to the fact that at the same time Joseph Smith was issuing statements that effectively disassociated Mormon identity and solidarity from the attempt to establish the New Jerusalem and comply with the law of consecration and stewardship, he was engaged in the construction of a new covenantal system in terms of which to unite the Saints. Although not formally inconsistent with Mormon covenant organization of the 1830s, it replaced solidarity based on territoriality and economic ties with that established upon a distinctive conception of kinship association. Associated with this development were a number of beliefs and practices that first became part of the Mormon gospel during the 1840s. The result, which will hereafter be referred to as "the patriarchal order," was a covenantal pattern that was capable of adaptation and modification and yet able to maintain its essential unity. From the mid-1840s to the present it has remained fundamental to Mormon group identity and solidarity.

Although while at Nauvoo the Church ceased actively to pursue the erection of the New Jerusalem and the law of consecration and stewardship and also developed a new form of covenant organization based primarily on kinship association, it did not discontinue all attempts to establish territorial and economic control. Indeed, much of the subsequent history of the Mormon people to at least the year 1890 can be interpreted as an endeavor to achieve this objective (see Arrington 1958; Hansen, Klus 1974; Larson, Gustive 1971). A divine imperative to do so, however, was no longer basic to Mormon ideology, and when the Church eventually discontinued much of its attempt to maintain economic and territorial control, it did so without a fundamental loss in its sense of mission (Arrington and Bitton 1979:243-335; Leone, Mark 1979; Shipps, Jan 1983). At least part of the reason that it was able to make this transition was that
territoriality and economic ties had long since ceased to be integral to the essential covenantal system of the Church.

This and the following two chapters will examine the patriarchal order in detail. In the present chapter the basic structural aspects of the system will be analyzed in terms of three of the analytical categories presented in the introductory chapter: mythological underpinnings, bases of relationships, and ordering of relationships. Understandings regarding these aspects of the system have developed through time. For the sake of clarity, however, the analysis presented in this chapter will be essentially synchronic in nature. Where significant modifications in these concepts have occurred over time, some mention of these developments will be made.

The next two chapters will be concerned with the changing consequences that the patriarchal order has had for the development and preservation of Mormon group identity and solidarity. Since modifications in the distribution of power and changes in the pattern of encompassment have been basic to this process, an analysis of the patriarchal order in terms of these two analytical categories will be deferred until these chapters. Reference will also be made to modifications in other aspects of the system when these have had important consequences for the development of Mormon group cohesiveness. Chapter 6 will deal with the relationship between the patriarchal order and Mormon group identity and solidarity prior to the exodus of 1846. Chapter 7 will be concerned with the same topic during the ensuing years.

Mythological Elaborations

In the years following the expulsion from Missouri, Mormon covenantal myth underwent considerable expansion. Whereas Mormon covenantal myth of the 1830s had been concerned primarily with a covenantal pattern resulting from the relationship established between God and Abraham, mythical developments of the following decade centered upon a covenantal order that predated mortal existence, that had been instigated upon earth in the days of Adam, and that would exist eternally in the celestial kingdom.
The Preexistence

As indicated in chapter 2, Puritan theologians held that before the creation of the visible universe, God had established a hierarchically ordered "preexisting platform" that provided an "archetypal" pattern for relationships among created beings. Mormon doctrine of the 1830s contained a few concepts that might be regarded as broadly supportive of such a formulation. Basic to these was an 1830 revelation stating that God had created all men, animals, and plants "spiritually before they were naturally upon the face of the earth" (PGP Mses. 3:5). Before the settlement of Nauvoo, however, such teachings had little impact on Mormon covenant organization.

During the 1840s and after, however, the notion of premortal organization was to receive considerable elaboration. This amplification centered upon two concepts: (1) that the preexistent spirits of mortal men were hierarchically ordered and (2) that prior to the creation of the physical earth they had been organized into a pattern to which they should ideally conform while in mortality. Thus divinely ordained hierarchy and correspondence between preexistent archetype and existent entype, two of the fundamental aspects of the Puritan concept of cosmic order, were rearticulated in Mormon ideology. Mormon thinking on these subjects, however, deviated considerably from that of their Puritan ancestors.

The hierarchy of the gods

The notion that the spirits of men were hierarchically ordered was evidently first introduced into Mormonism within the context of a revelatory text that Joseph Smith held to be the writings of Abraham and which he published in March of 1842 as the Book of Abraham (TS 3:704-6, 719-22). In this document the Lord declares the following to Abraham: "If two things exist, and there be one above the other, there shall be greater things above them. . . . These two facts do exist, that there are two spirits, one being more intelligent than the other; there shall be another being more intelligent than they (PGP Abr. 3:16, 19)."
Joseph Smith appears to have interpreted this statement in part to mean the following: within each order of species, individual organisms are hierarchically ordered upon the basis of biological or spiritual connection; and men and gods are thus linked in an infinite hierarchy. In June of 1844 he declared:

I learned a testimony concerning Abraham and he reasoned concerning the God of heaven. "In order to do that," said he, "suppose we have two facts: that supposes another fact may exist--two men on the earth, one wiser than the other, would logically show that another who is wiser than the wisest may exist. Intelligences exist one above another, so that there is no end to them."

If Abraham reasoned thus--If Jesus Christ was the Son of God, . . . you may suppose that He had a Father also. Where was there ever a son without a father? And where was there ever a father without first being a son? Whenever did a tree or anything spring into existence without a progenitor? And everything comes this way. Paul says that which is earthly is in the likeness of that which is heavenly, Hence if Jesus had a Father, can we not believe that He had a Father also? (HC 6:476).

Joseph Smith taught that within the context of this divine hierarchy, individuals were capable of progressing from the status of men to that of Gods. The Father of human spirits had himself once been mortal, and humans could some day become like their divine parent:

God himself was once as we are now, and is an exalted man. . . . If you were to see him today, you would see him like a man in form--like yourselves in all person, image, and very form as a man. . . . We have imagined and supposed that God was God from all eternity. I will refute that idea. . . . He was once a man like us . . . and you have got to learn how to be gods yourselves, and to be kings and priests to God, the same as all the gods have done before you, namely, by going from one small degree to another, and from a small capacity to a great one; from grace to grace, from exaltation to exaltation, until you attain to the resurrection of the dead, and are able to dwell in everlasting burning, and to sit in glory, as do those who sit enthroned in everlasting power. (HC 6:305-6)

Joseph Smith's stress on the actual parenthood of God led many of his followers to believe that there was a Heavenly Mother as well as a Heavenly Father and that the spirits of men were their joint offspring (see Wilcox 1980). Thus on 31 December 1844 Brigham Young spoke to a gathering of Saints "of the relationship we held to our father in heaven and our mother the Queen" (Hovey, Joseph, ms a). The
following year, Eliza R. Snow, plural wife and loyal follower of Joseph Smith published a poem entitled "My Father in Heaven," in which she declared:

I had learn'd to call thee father
   Through thy spirit from on high;
But until the key of knowledge
   Was restor'd, I knew not why.
In the heav'ns are parents single?
   No, the thought makes reason stare;
Truth is reason—truth eternal
   Tells me I've a mother there.

When I leave this frail existence—
   When I lay this mortal by,
Father, mother, may I meet you
   In your royal court on high?
Then, at length, when I've completed
   All you sent me forth to do.
With your mutual approbation
   Let me come and dwell with you.
(TS 6:1039)

The grand council in heaven

According to Joseph Smith, mortal existence was designed as a probationary state in which men could prove whether or not they were worthy of godhood and prepare for that form of existence. Joseph Smith's Abrahamic text thus has the preexistent Jesus Christ declare to an assemblage of "noble and great" spirits:

We will go down, for these is space there, and we will take of these materials, and we will make an earth whereon these may dwell; And we will prove them herewith to see if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them; ... and they who keep their second estate shall have glory added upon their heads for ever and ever. (PGP Abr. 3:24-26)

In order to prepare the spirit offspring of God for mortal existence, a "grand council" was held prior to the creation of the physical earth (HC 3:387; 6:307-8, 314; DC 76:25-28; PGP Mses. 4:1-4; Abr. 3:22-28). All preexistent spirits who were to become mortal men on this earth were in attendance. The purpose of the council was to formulate plans by which the spirits would be organized while in mortality. During the course of the council, the individual who would serve as savior of the world had to be selected. There were two
candidates for the office. The first was the preexistent Jesus Christ, the first spirit offspring of the Father. He said that he would teach mortals the way to live, let them choose their own course, and then serve as a ransom for those who repented and desired to return to the presence of the Father. The second candidate was Lucifer, a spirit "who was in authority in the presence of God" (DC 76:25). He proposed to save all mortals by compelling them to be good. The council was divided over who should be the savior. Two-thirds sided with Jesus Christ and one-third with Lucifer. A war broke out among the spirits attending the council. The party in favor of Jesus Christ was led by Michael the Archangel. Eventually Lucifer and those who favored him were cast out of heaven. They became evil spirits, and they are currently on the earth attempting to gain possession of the bodies of mortal men and tempting them to sin.

After Lucifer and his followers were cast out of heaven, the grand council continued. According to their spiritual intelligence and the degree of valor that they had demonstrated during the war, various preexistent spirits were "foreordained" to the positions that they were to occupy while in mortality. As Joseph Smith explained in May of 1844: "Every man who has a calling to minister to the inhabitants of the world was ordained to that very purpose in the Grand Council of heaven before the world was" (HC 6:364).

There is some evidence that Joseph Smith taught that at least some familial and kinship ties were foreordained in the preexistence. Thus Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner (ms a), one of Joseph Smith's plural wives, later recalled that he had told her that "I was his before I came here." Subsequent to his death, some of Joseph Smith's closest lieutenants referred to a general preexistent kinship network in terms of which spirits were organized in anticipation of their mortal existence. Brigham Young (1971:530), who became president of the Church following the death of Joseph Smith, recorded in his journal that on 23 February 1847 he was visited in dream by the now deceased Joseph Smith who instructed him to

> Be sure to tell the people to keep the Spirit of the Lord; and if they will they will find themselves just as they were organized by our Father in Heaven before they came into the world. Our Father
in Heaven organized the human family, but they are all disorganized and in great confusion.

Brigham Young evidently was referring to this dream when he declared in 1868 that

I have looked upon the community of the Latter-day Saints in vision and beheld them organized as one great family of heaven, each person performing his several duties in his line of industry, working more for the good of the whole than for individual aggrandizement; and in this I have beheld the most beautiful order that the mind of man can contemplate. (JD 12:153)

John Taylor, who in 1880 was to become the third president of the Church, held that premortal familial organization included specific husband-wife and parent-child selections. In an 1857 article addressed to a woman who wrote asking, "Where did I come from?" he replied:

Knowest thou not that eternities ago thy spirit . . . dwelt in thy Heavenly Father's bosom and in His presence, and with thy mother, one of the Queens of heaven, surrounded by thy brother and sister spirits in the spirit world, among the Gods? That . . . growing in intelligence, thou sawest worlds upon worlds organized and peopled with thy kindred spirits, took upon them tabernacles, died, were resurrected, and received their exaltation . . . . Thou being willing and anxious to imitate them . . . made a covenant . . . with two others, male and female spirits, that thou wouldest come and take a tabernacle through their lineage, and become one of their offspring. You also chose a kindred spirit whom you loved in the spirit world . . . to be your head, stay, husband and protector on earth and to exalt you in eternal worlds. All these were arranged, likewise the spirits that should tabernacle through your lineage. Thou longed, thou sighed and thou prayed to thy Father in heaven for the time to arrive when thou couldest come to this earth . . . . At length the time arrived, and thou heard the voice of thy Father saying, "go daughter to yonder lower world, and take upon thee a tabernacle, and work out thy probation with fear and trembling and rise to exaltation." (Mormon 3:28:[2])

The Adamic Order

As has already been indicated, when Joseph Smith ordained his father to the office of patriarch in January of 1833, he made reference to a patriarchal order that had been established in the days of Adam. During his years at Nauvoo, he provided more detail respecting the nature of this order and presented it as a root paradigm for the Mormon concept of dispensational history.
According to Joseph Smith's teachings (HC 3:385-90; 4:207-9; Smith, Joseph 1980:13), as the preexistent Michael the Archangel, Adam had been foreordained to preside over the human race under direction and guidance from Jesus Christ. As the first mortal man, he entered a covenant relationship with God, underwent the saving ordinances, and received all the keys of the priesthood. As a compassionate and loving parent, he desired to use his priesthood power to save his descendants and bring them into a proper relationship with their Heavenly Father. He ordained various of his righteous descendants to the priesthood and, as presiding high priest, directed their affairs. Then three years before his death, he called a family council of all his righteous posterity at a place known as the Valley of Adam-ondi-Ahman. He there employed his priesthood to bestow on them patriarchal blessings. His purpose in doing so was to bring them into the presence of God. His desire was fulfilled, because the Lord appeared to them in the valley. When this happened, the gathered descendants of Adam "rose up and blessed Adam and called him Michael, the prince, the archangel. And the Lord administered comfort unto Adam, and said unto him: I have set thee to be at the head; a multitude of nations shall come of thee, and thou art a prince over them forever" (DC 107:54-55).

Since that time Adam has continued to preside over his descendants. He remains concerned for their welfare, and his "bowels yearn over" them (HC 3:389). When apostasy has necessitated the instigation of a new dispensation, the restoration of priesthood keys has always been accomplished under the supervision of Adam. Thus when divine messengers gave priesthood keys to Joseph Smith, they did so at the direction of Adam, the grand patriarch and presiding high priest of the human race. Although Joseph Smith heads the dispensation of the fulness of times, Adam continues to maintain control of the keys of that dispensation.

The Patriarchal Organization of the Celestial Kingdom

At some future day, Adam will again call a meeting of his righteous posterity at the Valley of Adam-ondi-Ahman. The purpose of
this council will be to prepare for the second coming of Christ. All who have received keys in the various gospel dispensations will there return them to Adam. Christ will then appear to those assembled. Adam will give Christ an account of his stewardship and will then be permitted to retain eternally his position as head of the human family.

Growing out of this future Adamic council will be the instigation of a form of patriarchal organization that will exist eternally among the righteous in the celestial kingdom. Shortly after the death of Joseph Smith, Apostle Parley P. Pratt (MS 5:191) provided a description of this event:

First: His most gracious and venerable majesty king Adam, with his royal consort queen Eve, will appear at the head of the whole great family of the redeemed, and will be crowned in their midst as a king and priest for ever after the order of the Son of God. . . .

This venerable patriarch and sovereign will hold lawful jurisdiction over Able, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, the prophets, apostles, and saints of all ages and dispensations, who will all reverence and obey him as their venerable father and lawful sovereign.

They will then be organized, each over his own department of the government according to their birthright and office, in their families, generations and nations. Each one will obey and be obeyed according to the connexion which he sustains as a member of the great celestial family.

Thus the gradation will descend in regular degree from the throne of the Ancient of days with his innumerable subjects, down to the least and last saint of the last days, who may be counted worthy of a throne and sceptre, although his kingdom may, perhaps, only consist of a wife and single child.

This organizational pattern will have the same form as that which was established in the preexistent council in heaven and introduced among mortals in the days of Adam. In Puritan parlance, its instigation will result in a condition of perfect isomorphism finally existing between archetype and entype. Thus the "restoration" will at last be complete.

Such mythological teachings established a quadruple support for a covenantal order based on kinship association. First, men were seen as part of a deific hierarchy in which gods and the spirits of men were united through a type of biological connection. Second, prior to mortal existence humanity was organized into a pattern which
included a form of lineage and perhaps familial association. Third, in the days of Adam a patriarchal order was established by virtue of which Adam was given everlasting supervision over all his posterity. And fourth, this form of patriarchal organization would exist eternally in the celestial kingdom.

Such concepts were to provide mythological justification for the Mormon covenant order that emerged during the 1840s. The basic raison d'être of the Mormon church was to become the establishment among the righteous of this same organizational pattern. Thus while describing his 23 February 1847 vision of Joseph Smith, Brigham Young (1971:530) was to write:

Joseph . . . showed me the pattern, how . . . the human family was in the beginning. This I cannot describe, but I saw it, and saw where the Priesthood had been taken from the earth, and how it must be joined together, so that there would be a perfect chain from Father Adam to his latest posterity.

The Introduction of New Covenantai Ordinances

Coincidental with the mythological elaborations of the Nauvoo period was the introduction of new covenantal ordinances. There were four basic ordinances: baptism for the dead; eternal marriage; the endowment; and the second anointing. When considered together, such ordinances might be understood both as the ritual enactment of the new mythology and as the means by which relationships and roles identified in that mythology might be established. In the parlance of Brigham Young, they provided the way in which the human family might once again be organized according to the preexistent pattern that had been established in heaven.

Elijah the Prophet and the Sealing Power

Early development of the concept of sealing

Each of the rituals introduced during the Nauvoo period is in one way or another associated in Mormon ideology with what is termed the sealing power of Elijah. As indicated in chapter 4, during the early years of the Church's existence the term seal came to denote
the act by which covenantal promises were ratified. As such it had both a general and a restricted meaning. In its more general sense it was the process by which a priesthood officiator extended various promises to a recipient. In its more restricted sense it was the act by which an individual's salvation became secured. At least four additional terms were employed to describe sealing in this second sense: (1) being sealed up to eternal life; (2) having one's calling and election made sure, (3) receiving the Second Comforter; and (4) obtaining the more sure word of prophecy. Although each of these expressions has a slightly different connotation, for the sake of simplicity this dissertation will refer to sealing in this second sense as "being sealed up to eternal life."

The practice of giving patriarchal blessings appears to have begun a process by which the concept of sealing in both its connotations began to be meshed with kinship. Two developments contributed to this. First, the patriarch generally indicated that he was "sealing" various blessings upon the individual receiving the blessing. Among such promises was often the assurance that the recipient was "sealed up to eternal life" (i.e. Barron 1977:317, 316; Crosby, Caraline, ms a; Knight, Newel, ms a; Mills, H.W. 1917:92; Smith, Ruby 1953:43; Snow, Erastus, ms a; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 15 Apr. 1837). Second, as has already been discussed in chapter 4, the wording of patriarchal blessings often indicated that promises sealed upon an individual could be transferred both cross-generationally and from a male recipient to his wife. Children thus participated in the blessings sealed upon their parents and women in the blessings sealed upon their husbands. Such an understanding was in part the basis for the Mormons' desire to be descended from biblical patriarchs who had special promises sealed upon them.

The coming of Elijah

The concept of sealing was given more precision and also became more firmly linked with kinship through its identification with specific priesthood keys believed to have been restored to earth through an 1830s visitation of the biblical prophet Elijah. As
already indicated in chapter 4, Joseph Smith maintained that on 3 April 1836 he and Oliver Cowdery received various keys from immortal beings: from Moses they received keys for the gathering of Israel, from "Elias" the keys of the dispensation of Abraham, and from Elijah the keys "to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the hearts of the children to the fathers" (DC 110:11-16). When taken together, these keys might be understood as the ability to gather Israel and organize them according to the provisions of the Abrahamic covenant.

Of the three sets of keys restored on 3 April 1836, those delivered by Elijah were regarded as the most powerful. Their restoration is viewed by Mormons as a direct fulfillment of the prophecy found in the closing lines of the book of Malachi. Joseph Smith, however, rendered this prophecy somewhat differently from that found in his Bible. The transformation resulted in the prophecy becoming more applicable to Mormon ideology. The King James text:

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord:
And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse. (Mal. 4:5-6)

was modified to read:

Behold, I will reveal unto you the Priesthood, by the hand of Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.
And he shall plant in the hearts of the children the promises made to the fathers, and the hearts of the children shall turn to their fathers.
If it were not so, the whole earth would be utterly wasted at his coming. (DC 2)

This rendition of Malachi's prophecy presented Mormons with a number of issues that were resolved through the ideological and ritual innovations of the 1840s: (1) what was the priesthood that Elijah revealed to Joseph Smith? (2) what were the promises made to the fathers? (3) how were these promises to be planted in the hearts of the children? (4) in what way were the hearts of the children to turn to their fathers? and (5) how was this process to prevent them from being destroyed during the "great and dreadful day of the Lord"?
In their broadest application, the keys restored by Elijah are believed by Mormons to consist in the power to have sealed in heaven that which is sealed on earth. As Joseph Smith wrote in September of 1842:

Now, the nature of this ordinance consists in the power of the priesthood, by the revelation of Jesus Christ, wherein it is granted that whatsoever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. . . .

It may seem to some to be a very bold doctrine that we talk of—a power which records or binds on earth and binds in heaven. Nevertheless, in all ages of the world, whenever the Lord has given a dispensation of the priesthood to any man by actual revelation, or any set of men, this power has always been given. Hence, whatsoever those men did in authority, in the name of the Lord, and did it truly, and faithfully, and kept a proper and faithful record of the same, it becomes a law on earth and in heaven, and could not be annulled, according to the decrees of the great Jehovah. (DC 128:8-9)

In their more restricted sense, these keys are understood within the context of the Malachian prophecy regarding Elijah turning the hearts of the children to their fathers. As such they are regarded as the power to establish familial ties on earth that will exist in heaven. Individuals thus united are said to be "sealed" to one another. It is in terms of this second sense that Mormons believe the sealing keys of Elijah empower them to establish the patriarchal order described in the mythological developments of the Nauvoo period. It was in this context that Joseph Smith wrote about the sealing powers of Elijah in the following terms:

the earth will be smitten with a curse unless there is a welding link . . . between the fathers and the children. . . . For we without them cannot be made perfect; neither can they without us be made perfect. Neither can they nor we be made perfect without those who have died in the gospel also; for it is necessary in the ushering in of the dispensation of the fulness of times . . . that a whole and complete and perfect union, and welding together of dispensations, and keys, and powers, and glories should take place, and be revealed from the days of Adam even to the present time. (DC 128:18)
Temple building

The rituals associated with the sealing power of Elijah were to be performed in sacred temples that had been constructed for that purpose. Joseph Smith had discussed temple building prior to the settlement of Nauvoo, had completed such a building at Kirtland, Ohio, and had planned for others to be built at Independence, Far West, and Adam-ondi-Ahman in Missouri. After the settlement of Nauvoo, however, the rationale for temple building was greatly expanded. In a revelation dated 19 January 1841 the Saints are commanded to build a temple at Nauvoo for the purpose of performing rituals that differed from those enacted in the Kirtland Temple:

Let all my saints come from afar . . . and build a house to my name, for the Most High to dwell therein. For there is not a place found on earth that he may come to restore again that which was lost unto you, even the fulness of the priesthood. . . . For therein are the keys of the holy priesthood ordained, that you may receive honor and glory. . . . For, for this cause I commanded Moses that he should build a tabernacle, that they should bear it with them in the wilderness, and to build a house in the land of promise, that those ordinances might be revealed which had been hid from before the world was. Therefore, verily I say unto you, that your anointings and your washings, and your baptisms for the dead, and your solemn assemblies, and your memorials for your sacrifices by the sons of Levi, and your oracles in your most holy places wherein you receive conversations, and your statues and judgments, for the beginning of the revelations and foundation of Zion, and for the glory, honor, and endowment of all her municipals, are ordained by the ordinances of my holy house, which my people are always commanded to build unto my holy name. And verily I say unto you, let this house be built unto my name, that I may reveal mine ordinances therein unto my people. For I deign to reveal unto my church things which have been kept hid from before the foundation of the world, things that pertain to the dispensation of the fulness of times. And I will show unto my servant Joseph all things pertaining to this house, and the priesthood thereof. (DC 124:25, 27, 28, 34, 38-42)

Coincident with this expanded view of the temple, the purpose for the gathering of Israel was redefined. The primary purpose for the gathering was no longer viewed as that of building a holy city or receiving inheritances in Zion, but of receiving sacred ordinances within a temple. In a discourse delivered 11 June 1843 Joseph Smith thus rhetorically asked:
What was the object of gathering the Jews, or the people of God in any age of the world? . . . The main object was to build unto the Lord a house whereby He could reveal unto His people the ordinances of His house and the glories of His kingdom, and teach the people the way of salvation; for there are certain ordinances and principles that, when they are taught and practiced, must be done in a place or house built for that purpose. (HC 5:423)

Building the temple and performing vital rituals within its walls became of critical importance to the Saints at Nauvoo. They regarded both their own salvation and the salvation of their ancestors to be dependent upon accomplishing this goal. The January 1841 revelation clearly stated: "I grant unto you a sufficient time to build a house unto me. . . . But behold, at the end of this appointment . . . if you do not these things . . . ye shall be rejected as a church with your dead, saith the Lord your God (DC 124:31-32).

Baptism for the Dead

Baptism for the dead was the first ritual that Joseph Smith introduced at Nauvoo which was explicitly linked with the sealing power of Elijah. He began to discuss this topic even before he received the revelation commanding him to build the Nauvoo Temple. In August 1840 he taught that Mormons might assist in the salvation of their deceased relatives by undergoing the ordinance of baptism in their behalf. He declared that individuals who had not had the opportunity to embrace the Mormon gospel in mortality would have it preached to them in "spirit prison." Baptism, however, could only be performed by mortals. Thus the dead who accepted the gospel were ultimately dependent upon the living for their salvation. As he explained in October of 1840:

The Saints have the privilege of being baptized for those of their relatives who are dead, whom they believe would have embraced the Gospel, if they had been privileged with hearing it, and who have received the Gospel in the spirit [sic], through the instrumentality of those who have been commissioned to preach to them while in prison. (HC 4:231)

By somehow performing baptism in behalf of all his deceased ancestors back to the days of Adam, an individual might be instrumental in
bringing them into a proper relationship with the Lord and thus welding them together as fellow citizens in the kingdom of God. By so doing he became a "savior" for his ancestors, or as Joseph Smith termed it, "a savior upon Mount Zion" (HC 6:184; TS 3:761).

Almost immediately after Joseph Smith's August 1840 discourse on the subject, his followers began to perform baptisms for the dead in the Mississippi River. The January 1841 revelation on temple building, however, stated that as soon as a baptismal font could be constructed in the new temple, this ritual should be performed exclusively in that location:

For this ordinance belongeth to my house, and cannot be acceptable to me, only in the days of your poverty, wherein ye are not able to build a house unto me; . . . and I grant unto you a sufficient time to build a house unto me; and during this time your baptism shall be acceptable unto me. But behold at the end of this appointment your baptisms for your dead cannot be acceptable unto me. (DC 124:30-32)

The practice of baptism for the dead provided Mormons with the answer to a perplexing question: if baptism by the authority of the Mormon priesthood is a prerequisite for salvation, what will become of those who lived when that priesthood was not upon the earth? It helped the Church substantiate its universal claims: although the priesthood had only been restored in 1829, the way was provided by which all who had ever lived upon the earth might come under its jurisdiction.

Joseph Smith, however, did not regard baptism for the dead merely as a way to bring deceased ancestors into the Mormon covenant. He also described it as a means to link individuals cross-generationally. Thus in 1842, after citing the prophecy of Malachi regarding the coming of Elijah, he commented upon this scripture by stating: "The earth will be smitten with a curse unless there is a welding link of some kind between the fathers and the children, upon some subject or other--and behold what is that subject? It is baptism for the dead" (DC 128:18).

The assumption seemed to be that individuals who become saviors to their ancestors by performing baptisms in their behalf become linked to them through bonds of eternal solidarity. Since
Joseph Smith held that such bonds must extend all the way back to Adam (DC 128:18) baptism was put forth as a basis for the "welding links" necessary to reestablish the Adamic order. Thus baptism, by which an individual might simultaneously become a member of the Mormon church, and an adopted citizen of the kingdom of God, was now presented as the means by which one could become ensured of a position within the Adamic order.

Despite such teachings, the practice of baptism for the dead was not destined to remain the primary means by which Mormons sought to establish relationships within the Adamic order. Part of the reason for this might have been due to the fact that it does not seem well adapted to create the sense of union between two actors that the Adamic pattern entailed. As has already been seen, during the 1830s baptism had been instigated as the means to establish an individual as a Church member at large and not as a basis for establishing a particular relationship between two individuals within the Church.

Whatever the reason, Joseph Smith soon introduced new rituals that were regarded as essential for the eternal perpetuation of relationships between individuals within the Adamic order. Such rituals did not do away with the practice of baptism for the dead; it remains an important practice in the Mormon church. Baptism for the dead, however, might be seen in part as a precursor to these other rituals. They became the means for establishing relationships initially linked to baptism for the dead. And when they were introduced it was with the assumption that they, like baptism, could be performed in behalf of the dead. They thus were conceptualized as the means of linking the entire human family into a covenantal network based on the Adamic pattern. Thus baptism was established as the means by which an individual, whether living or dead, could gain admittance into the kingdom of heaven, while other rituals established his personal relationship to others within that kingdom. The belief persisted, however, that the act of being baptized in behalf of the dead established a strong affective tie between the proxy and the deceased individual for whom he was baptized. The dead were waiting with anticipation to be redeemed by proxy baptism, and they would
certainly be eternally grateful to the individual who was unselfishly baptized in their behalf.

The Eternal Marriage Covenant

Eternal marriage, the endowment, and the second anointing might best be regarded as components of a unified ritual complex. Each assumes the existence of the other two in such a way that it is difficult to discuss the telic purpose of any one without doing so in terms of its relationship to the others. Like baptism for the dead, they were ordinances that were to be performed in the temple, and like baptism for the dead, they were introduced prior to the completion of the temple.

Unlike baptism for the dead, however, these rituals were always practiced in secret, and those who participated in them were placed under sacred obligations not to discuss their details in public. This procedure has persisted to the present time. Such a policy creates certain difficulties for anyone attempting to discuss their significance. Analyses of these rituals found in this dissertation are based on material found in printed sources or in publicly available theses and dissertations. An attempt has been made not to discuss anything that might be regarded as violating the private nature of these practices.

As has already been seen, by early in the Nauvoo period, the term seal had developed a number of rather divergent connotations: it was the process by which authoritative priesthood blessings were conferred; it was the basis by which priesthood transactions performed on earth might have eternal validity in heaven; it was associated with the assurance one might receive that his eternal salvation was secure; and it was linked to keys restored by Elijah whose utilization would result in the promises made to the fathers being implanted in the children and the hearts of the children being turned to their fathers. All of these meanings were interrelated in the ordinances of eternal marriage, the endowment, and the second anointing.

Although the concept of being sealed up to eternal life had been of some importance in Mormon ideology of the 1830s, it received
increased attention after the Missouri exodus. In his first recorded
discourse after settling at Nauvoo, Joseph Smith preached upon this
subject:

After a person has faith in Christ, repents of his sins, and is
baptized for the remission of his sins and receives the Holy Ghost
... then let him continue to humble himself before God,
hungering and thirsting after righteousness, and living by every
word of God, and the Lord will soon say unto him, Son, thou shalt
be exalted. When the Lord has thoroughly proved him, and finds
that the man is determined to serve Him at all hazards, then the
man will find his calling and his election made sure. (HC 3:380)

Consistent with this statement, Joseph would designate various
individuals whom he felt met this criteria, and they were consequently
sealed up to eternal life. William Clayton (1982:40) records in his
journal that while Joseph Smith was conversing with him and Benjamin
F. Johnson

He put his hand on my knee and says, "your life is hid with Christ
in God, and so is many others." Addressing Benjamin says he
"nothing but the unpardonable sin can prevent him (me) from
inheriting eternal glory for he is sealed up by the power of the
priesthood unto eternal life having taken the step which is
necessary for that purpose."

In one sense eternal marriage, the endowment, and the second
anointing might be understood as the ritualized process by which one
becomes sealed up to eternal life. Such a condition, however, was
inextricably linked to the other connotations that the term sealing
was acquiring during the Nauvoo period.

The revelation on eternal
marriage

On 12 July 1843 Joseph Smith dictated a revelation to William
Clayton in which the act of being sealed up to eternal life is linked
to the concept of godhood that Joseph Smith was developing during the
Nauvoo period and to a form of eternal marriage that can be
established by the sealing power of the priesthood (DC 132; Clayton,
William 1982:20). In a general sense this revelation might be
regarded as an outgrowth and elaboration of Joseph Smith's 1835
statement that marriage "should be solemnized by the authority of the everlasting Priesthood" (HC 2:320).

The contents of the revelation were not made public until 1852, and the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (an organization begun in the early 1850s by a group of Mormons who refused to accept the leadership of Brigham Young and today constitute the second largest of the various religious bodies who claim succession from Joseph Smith) maintains that the revelation was fabricated after the death of Joseph Smith. There appears to be little doubt, however, that Joseph Smith did dictate this revelation; and this dissertation will proceed on that assumption. For discussions of the evidence linking the revelation to Joseph Smith, see Bachman 1975 and Foster 1981:121-80.

Although the revelation as it now stands was evidently first written on 12 July 1843, there is good evidence that parts of it took shape as early as 1831 (Bachman 1978). It is clear that some Mormons in the 1830s anticipated that the marital relationship might be perpetuated beyond the grave. Thus on 26 May 1835 William W. Phelps wrote to his wife, Sally, that "if you and I continue faithful to the end we are certain to be one in the Lord throughout eternity" (Bachman 1978:28), and in 1836 Jonathan Crosby received a patriarchal blessing which stated, "Thou shalt rise and meet thy God in the Air. And thy thousands shalt be with thee. Thy family also, and thy posterity also" (Crosby, Caroline, ms a). But while some Mormons during the 1830s entertained the idea that marital relationships could be perpetuated eternally, this concept was not systematically developed and integrated with basic aspects of Mormon ideology until the 1840s. And there is no good evidence that Joseph Smith performed an eternal marriage until after the settlement of Nauvoo.

In the opening paragraphs of the revelation the point is made that all relationships and obligations not instigated under the direction of authorized agents of God and "sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise" will not be perpetuated after death:

All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations, that are not made and entered into and sealed by the Holy Spirit of
promise, of him . . . whom I have appointed on the earth to hold this power . . . 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. (DC 132:7)

From this it logically follows that marriages not established in this manner will not persist after death:

Therefore, if a man marry him a wife in the world, and he marry her not by me nor by my word . . . their covenant and marriage are not of force when they are dead, and when they are out of the world; therefore, they are not bound by any law when they are out of the world. (DC 132:15)

The revelation then indicates that through the proper priesthood authority a marital relationship can be established between a man and woman that will persist after death. It then goes on to say that a man and woman so united shall both be enabled to procreate eternally and to become gods:

if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my law, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him in whom I have appointed this power and the keys of this priesthood . . . it shall be done unto them in all things whatsoever my servant hath put upon them, in time, and through all eternity; and shall be of full force when they are out of the world; and they shall pass by the angels and the gods, which are set there, to their exaltation and glory in all things, as hath been sealed upon their heads, which glory shall be a fullness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever.

Then shall they be gods, because they have no end; . . . because all things are subject unto them . . . because they have all power. (DC 132:19-20)

It next indicates that the ordinance by which a man and woman are eternally linked can lead to a situation in which they are jointly sealed up to eternal life:

If a man marry a wife according to my word, and they are sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, according to mine appointment, and he or she shall commit any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever, and all manner of blasphemies, and if they commit no murder wherein they shed innocent blood, yet they shall come forth in the first resurrection, and enter into their exaltation; but they shall be destroyed in the flesh, and shall be delivered unto the buffetings of Satan unto the day of redemption, saith the Lord God. (DC 132:26)
The revelation finally indicates that through priesthood power a man may be simultaneously married to more than one woman:

And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood—if any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery for they are given to him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to no one else.

And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him; therefore is he justified. (DC 132:61-62)

The commencement of eternal marital unions

The first eternal marriage evidently occurred on 5 April 1841 when Joseph Smith was thus united with Louisa Beman. This was less than five months after the revelation on the temple was given and over two years before the revelation on eternal marriage was dictated to William Clayton. Between that date and his death in 1844, Joseph Smith allowed various of his closest followers to establish eternal marital unions as well as himself being thus united to numerous wives. All these ceremonies were performed in secret, and the rank and file membership of the Church was not aware that such ordinances were being performed.

The Endowment

On 4 May 1842, approximately one year after beginning the practice of celestial marriage, Joseph Smith met with nine of his closest male followers in a room above his store. He then organized them into a secret society that was referred to by contemporary sources by such titles as the Holy Order, the Ancient Order, Patriarchal Priesthood, Council Pertaining to the High Priesthood, the Quorum of the Anointed, the First Quorum of the Priesthood, or simply as The Quorum (Allen, James 1979:47; Fielding, Joseph 1979:156 note 65; Quinn, Michael 1978:85). For the sake of simplicity and consistency this association will here be referred to as "the Holy Order."
In inducting these men into the Holy Order, Joseph Smith led them through a complex rite of passage that has become known among Mormons as "the endowment." Although the details of the endowment ritual were to be kept secret, some of the participants in the organizational meeting of the Holy Order later gave some indication of what transpired.

The most complete account was written by Willard Richards in April 1845 while expanding Joseph Smith's journal entry for 4 May 1842 for inclusion in the official history of the Church. Writing in the person of Joseph Smith, Willard Richards relates:

4 Wednesday May 4--I spent the day in the upper part of the Store (IE.) in my private office . . . in council with Gen James Adams, of Springfield, Patriarch Hyrum Smith, Bishops Newel K. Whitney, & Geo. Miller Wm Marks, Wm Law & Prests Brigham Young Heber C. Kimball & Willard Richards, instructing them in the principles and order of the priesthood, attending to washings & anointings, endowments, and the communications of keys, pertaining to the Aaronic Priesthood, and so on to the highest order of the Melchizedek Priesthood, setting forth the order pertaining to the Ancient of days & all those plans & principles by which any one is enabled to secure the fulness of those blessings which has been prepared for the church of the Firstborn, and come up and abide in the presence of . . . Eloheim in the eternal worlds. In this council was instituted the Ancient order of things for the first time in these last days. And the communications I made to . . . [this] Council were of things spiritual, and to be received only by the spiritual minded: and there was nothing made known to these men but will be made known to all Saints, of the last days, so soon as they are prepared to receive, and a proper place is prepared to communicate them . . . therefore let the Saints be diligent in building the temple. (Ehat 1982:29, 254 note 61)

Between entries for the years 1844 and 1845, Heber C. Kimball has inserted a section in his journal entitled "strange events." Under this heading he records: "June [sic] 1842 I was aniciated into the ancient order was washed and anointed and sealed and ordained a preast and so forth in company with many others" (Kimball, Heber C., ms a, between 19 Oct. 1844 and 28 May 1845 entries).

And in 1855 George Miller wrote that "Joseph washed and anointed [us] as Kings and Priests to God, and over the House of Israel . . . as he said he was commanded of God . . . and conferred on us Patriarchal Priesthood. This took place on the 5th and 6th of May, 1842" (Mills 1917:121).
In 1853, Brigham Young, another participant in that meeting and now president of the Church, gave a brief public statement regarding the significance of the endowment. Said he:

Your endowment is, to receive all those ordinances of the House of the Lord, which are necessary for you, after you have departed this life, to enable you to walk back to the presence of the Father, passing the angels who stand as sentinels, being enabled to give them the key words, the signs and tokens, pertaining to the Holy Priesthood, and gain your eternal exaltation in spite of earth and hell. (JD 2:31)

On the basis of these statements, the following generalizations about the endowment may be made: (1) it initiates participants into the "order pertaining to the Ancient of Days," or Adamic order; (2) it confers upon them special priesthood keys including "Patriarchal Priesthood"; and (3) these keys empower them to "come up and abide in the presence of . . . Eloheim in the eternal worlds" and thus gain their "eternal exaltation in spite of earth and hell." In an official publication of the Church, Apostle James E. Talmage (1962:99-100) was later to describe the endowment as a course of instructions [that] includes a recital of the most prominent events of the creative period, the condition of our first parents in the Garden of Eden, their disobedience and consequent expulsion . . . , their condition in the lone and dreary world . . ., [and] the plan of redemption by which the great transgression may be atoned . . . .

The ordinances of the endowment embody certain obligations on the part of the individual, such as covenant and promise to observe the law of strict virtue and chastity; to be charitable . . .; to devote both talent and material means to the spread of truth . . .; and to seek in every way to contribute to the great preparation that the earth may be made ready for her King. . . .

With the taking of each covenant and the assuming of each obligation a promised blessing is pronounced, contingent upon the faithful observance of the conditions.

The Second Anointing

For some eighteen months the Holy Order consisted only of Joseph Smith and the nine men to whom he had administered the endowment on 4 May 1842. Beginning in the fall of 1843, however, new members of both sexes were brought into the order. The admittance procedure was the same as it had been for the original members: each
had to undergo the endowment ceremony. Coincidental with the
inclusion of women in the order, however, a new ritual was
introduced. Referred to as "the second anointing," it was the most
sacred of all Mormon ordinances. It was experienced jointly by a
husband and wife after both had received their endowments and been
united in an eternal marital union.

According to Brigham Young, when Joseph Smith gave members of
the Holy Order the second anointing, he "said he had given us all that
could be given on the earth" (Kimball, Heber C., ms b, 26 Dec 1845).
Andrew Ehat's investigation (1982:94-96) of the ritual activities of
the Holy Order indicates that recipients of the second anointing
received what they termed "the fullness of the priesthood." In the
course of the ritual the husband was ordained "a priest and king," his
wife "a queen and priestess unto her husband," and they were jointly
"sealed up to eternal life."

There were two parts to this ritual: the first was witnessed
by the other members of the Holy Order and was administered by a third
party to both husband and wife; the second was later performed in
private and involved only interaction between husband and wife
(Buerger 1983:25-26). Referring to the public portion of the ritual,
Heber C. Kimball (ms a, between 19 Oct. 1843 and 28 May 1844 entries)
records in his journal: "February the first 1844 myself and wife
Vilate were anointed Priest and Priestess unto our God under the hands
of Brigham Young and by ways of the Holy Order." A more complete
understanding of the significance of this ceremony can be gained by
examining the text of the blessings that were given to Heber and
Vilate when they again received their second anointings in the Nauvoo
Temple. Heber first received the ordinance. Among other things he
was told that he was being anointed a king and priest in the Church
and in Israel; that the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, his
progenitors, were being sealed upon him, and that he would have power
to save his posterity and bring them into his kingdom. Finally he
received the "blessing of the Holy resurrection, Even the Eternal
Godhead." Vilate was then anointed "a Queen and Priestess unto her
husband and received all blessings in common with him" ("Book of
Anointings," entry no. 1, 8 Jan. 1846).
In general terms this ritual might be understood as an extension of the patriarchal blessings of the 1830s. As is usual in such blessings, Heber is here receiving the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, his progenitors, while Vilate is given rights to such blessings in common with her husband. There are promises, however, that are not contained in patriarchal blessings. Heber is given the blessing of the "Eternal Godhead" and the power to save his posterity and bring them into his kingdom. Evidently he is promised that he will preside as a god over a kingdom consisting of his posterity.

The second part of the ritual is a rite that is privately administered by the wife to her husband. Describing this, Heber C. Kimball (ms a, between 19 Oct. 1843 and 28 May 1844 entries) writes:

April the first . . . 1844 I Heber C. Kimball received the washing of my feet and was anointed by my wife Vilate for my burial that is my feet head stomach. Even as Mary did Jesus that she mite have a claim on him in the Resurrection.

Following this statement the journal contains a short entry in the handwriting of Vilate Kimball:

I Vilate Kimball do hereby certify that on the first day of April 1844 I attended to washing and anointing the head stomach and feet of my dear companion Heber C. Kimball that I may have claim upon him in the morning of the first Resurrection.

Vilate Kimball

The statement regarding Mary anointing Jesus refers to John 12:3-7, where Mary, the sister of Lazarus, is described as anointing Jesus' feet, after which he states "against the day of my buying hath she kept this." The purpose of the rite seems to be to establish a ritualized bond of reciprocity: in exchange for the service rendered, in the resurrection the wife will have right to claim "all blessings in common with" her husband. This ceremony is apparently one basis for the often repeated statement of nineteenth-century Mormon leaders that it is essential for a woman to be sealed as a wife to a husband so that she can have someone to resurrect her.
There is a close fit between the mythological elaborations of the 1840s and the ordinances of endowment, eternal marriage, and second anointing. The ordinances symbolically led one along the path described in the mythology and impart to him the power he needs to reach its end. Underlying the whole is the assumption that basic to the process is the establishment and intensification of kinship-like associations. The endowment inducts you into the patriarchal Adamic order. Through participation in this ritual you become united with the posterity of Adam that met with him in the valley of Adam-ondi-Ahman. As Adam had there imparted to his offspring the power to enter again into the Lord's presence, so by receiving the endowment, you obtain the same keys and similar instructions. Eternal marriage establishes your particular position within the patriarchal order. A man and woman who are united by this ordinance not only share an eternal relationship with one another, but also with their offspring. Eternal marriage thus becomes the means for forging the network of eternal relationships upon which the patriarchal order within the celestial kingdom will be established. Finally, by receiving your second anointing, the most awesome of all power is sealed upon you: you ritually receive the status of a god.

The complex is a ritual enactment of a concept that Joseph Smith (1980:247) succinctly stated in a single sentence: "What was the design of the Almighty in making man, it was to exalt him to be as God." Perhaps all that needed to be added to this statement was that such exaltation could only be achieved by an individual enmeshed within an eternally binding kinship network.

It should not be supposed, however, that Mormons believed that the enactment of rituals themselves automatically transformed them into gods. Thus in 1848 Heber C. Kimball spoke of the probation of man. Said how that some supposed that when they got through this world they would be free from trials and troubles but it was not so for they would have to go through many of them before they got to the godhead. He said it would be
like going through an orchard after the fruit was gathered. By looking hard you might find now and then an apple. So with people getting to the godhead. (Davis, Daniel, ms a, 11 Sept. 1848)

There does not appear to have been complete agreement among nineteenth-century Mormons over whether the promises associated with "being sealed up to eternal life" and receiving one's second anointing were unconditional (Buerger 1983:37-39). The wording of the rituals would seem to indicate that this was so as long as one did not commit the "unpardonable sin" of murder or denial or the Holy Ghost. Orson Pratt evidently took the position that once an individual was sealed up to eternal life, he might have to suffer in hell for his sins, but would eventually receive all that had been promised:

The Saint who has been sealed unto eternal life and falls into transgression and does not repent, but dies in his sin, will be afflicted and tormented after he leaves this vale of tears until the day of redemption; but having been sealed with the spirit of promise through the ordinances of the house of God, those things which have been sealed upon his head will be realized by him in the morning of the resurrection." (JD 2:260)

Heber C. Kimball, however, was of a different opinion. He felt that all such promises were contingent upon faithfulness:

Some will come with great zeal and anxiety, saying, "I want my endowments; I want my washings and anointings; I want my blessings; I wish to be sealed up to eternal lives. . . ." What good would all this do you, if you do not live up to your profession and practise your religion? Not so much good as for me to take a bag of sand and baptize it, lay hands upon it for the gift of the Holy Ghost, wash it and anoint, and then seal it up to eternal lives, for the sand will be saved, having filled the measure of its creation, but you will not, except through faith and obedience. (JD 3:124)

Brigham Young was apparently in agreement with Heber C. Kimball. Thus in 1866 he discussed the issue of women who had been sealed to and received their second anointing in conjunction with "a man not worthy of a wife." He indicated that such women were to be sealed again to righteous men and once more receive their second anointing in conjunction with their new husbands (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 26 Dec. 1866).

The rank and file membership of the Church appear generally to have been in agreement with Heber C. Kimball and Brigham Young. For
example, some nine months after Joseph Smith had told him that "nothing but the unpardonable sin" could prevent him "from inheriting eternal glory," William Clayton (1982:53) was to write in his journal: "May the God of Joseph preserve me & mine house to walk in the paths of righteousness all the days of my life. . . . For thou oh God knowest my desire to do right that I may have eternal life." And although Joseph Hovey (ms a) received his second anointing in conjunction with his wife in the Nauvoo temple, when she died some eight months later he recorded in his journal:

If I am faithful I anticipate meeting her and embracing her when she comes forth in the morning of the resurrection. . . . My daily prayer is that I may hold out until the end and enjoy the glories of the Celestial kingdom with her and reign with my brother throughout all eternity.

The Abrahamic covenant and the Nauvoo ordinances

The relationship between eternal marriage and the second anointing

During the Nauvoo period there developed a close association between the rituals of eternal marriage and second anointing. This should not be surprising given the fact that the purpose of both was to establish a form of eternal relationship between a husband and wife. The second anointing was thus in many ways an extension and culmination of the eternal marriage covenant. The term seal was often used to describe both rituals. For example, Wilford Woodruff (ms a) first writes that on 11 November 1843 "Br. Hirum Smith . . . sealed the marriage covenant between me and my wife Phebe W. Carter for time and eternity." He then later records that on 26 January 1844 he and his wife "received our 2d anointing and sealing."

That the term meant different things when applied to each ordinance is indicated by a statement Joseph Smith made to members of the Holy Order. William Clayton (1982:27) indicates that

J[oseph] gave us much instruction, showing the advantage of the E[verlasting] C[ovenant]. He said that there was two seals in the Priesthood. The first was that which was placed upon a man and woman when they made the [marriage] covenant & the other was the seal which allotted to them their particular mansion.
Subsequent to the death of Joseph Smith yet another sealing ritual began to be performed. This involved children being "sealed" in an eternal relationship to parents. This ritual was performed to establish an eternal relationship both between parents and biological offspring that had been born before they had been joined by an eternal marriage ceremony and between a couple so united and adopted children that were not their biological offspring.

The Abrahamic covenant and the concept of sealing

The relationship between these three forms of sealing becomes clearer when examined in light of the manner in which the Abrahamic covenant concept and the notion of the sealing power of Elijah were fused during the Nauvoo period.

As already detailed in chapter 4, early in the history of the Church, the Abrahamic covenant concept became fundamental to Mormon group identity and solidarity. The self-proclaimed purpose of the Book of Mormon, the Church's founding document, was "to show unto the remnant of the House of Israel what great things the Lord hath done for their fathers; and that they may know the covenants of the Lord, that they are not cast off forever" (BM, T Pg.). In the earliest days of the Church's existence the house of Israel was primarily identified as consisting of American Indians and the Jews. Failure to convince these groups of the validity of the Mormon restoration, however, was not disruptive to the Church's sense of mission, for the seemingly Gentile converts to the movement were coming to regard themselves as the biological descendants of Israel. Central to such identification was the practice of giving patriarchal blessings which proclaimed the recipient's descent from Abraham and his entitlement to the promises made to the fathers.

The Book of Mormon portrayed the Abrahamic covenant primarily in geographic imagery, and throughout the 1830s Mormons tended to equate the fulfillment of the covenant in terms of territorial control and development. This was manifest in their endeavor to establish the New Jerusalem in Jackson County, Missouri, and there instigate the law of consecration and stewardship. Receiving "an inheritance in Zion"
was equated with receiving the promises that had been conferred upon Abraham and his seed.

With the expulsion from Missouri, the Abrahamic covenant concept, like so much else in Mormon ideology, was modified. First the covenant made with Abraham was now presented as of the same order as promises that God had previously made with his fathers all the way back to Adam. And second, the covenant was no longer primarily territorial rights but patriarchal jurisdiction. In short, it was position in the Adamic order. Both of these developments are delineated in the 1842 publication of the Book of Abraham. In the opening lines of the text, Abraham declares:

I sought for the blessings of the fathers, and the right whereunto I should be ordained to administer the same; having been myself a follower of righteousness, desiring also . . . to be a father of many nations . . . I became a rightful heir, a High Priest, holding the right belonging to the fathers. It was conferred upon me from the fathers; it came down from the fathers, from the beginning of time, . . . even the right of the firstborn, or the first man, who is Adam, our first father, unto me. I sought for mine appointment unto the Priesthood according to the appointment of God unto the fathers concerning the seed. (PGP Abr. 1:2-4)

When later in the narrative God establishes his covenant with Abraham, no mention is made of land. The covenant rather essentially consists in the promise that the rights Abraham had received to the priesthood and eternal life would be transferred to his posterity. The Lord thus declares to Abraham:

My name is Jehovah, and I know the end from the beginning, therefore my hand shall be over thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee above measure, and make thy name great among all nations, and thou shalt be a blessing unto thy seed after thee, that in their hands they shall bear this ministry and Priesthood unto all nations; And I will bless them through thy name, for as many as receive this Gospel shall be called after thy name, and shall be accounted thy seed, and shall rise up and bless thee, as their father; And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee; and in thee (that is in thy Priesthood) and in thy seed (that is, thy Priesthood), for I give unto thee a promise that this right shall continue in thee, and in thy seed after thee (that is to say, the literal seed, or the seed of the body) shall all the families of the earth be blessed, even with the blessings of salvation, even of life eternal. (PGP Abr. 2:8-11)
In a sermon delivered 18 August 1843, Joseph Smith extends the Abrahamic covenant concept even further by linking it to the sealing power of Elijah and associating it with both being sealed up to eternal life and being eternally united with one's posterity. This sermon reaches to the very core of the meaning behind the Nauvoo rituals. According to William Clayton's (1982:50) journal, while delivering this discourse Joseph Smith made the following comments:

When speaking of the passage 'I will send Elijah the prophet & c' [Mal. 4:5-6] he said it should read and he shall turn the hearts of the children to the covenant made with their fathers. Also where it says and they shall seal the servants of God in their foreheads & c [Rev. 7:2-3] it means to seal the blessing on their heads meaning the everlasting covenant whereby making their calling & election sure. When a seal is put upon the father and mother it secures their posterity so that they cannot be lost but will be saved by virtue of the covenant of their father.

The Martha Jane Knowlton Coray notebook (ms a) renders the same statement as follows:

Malachi 4th ch [v. 1] Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven and all . . . that do wickedly shall be as stubble . . . but before that God shall send unto them Elijah the prophet and he shall reveal unto them the covenants of the children in relation to the Fathers that they may have the privilege of entering into the same in order to effect their mutual salvation And I saw another angel ascending from the east having the Seal of the living God [Rev. 7:2]. . . .

Now I would ask who know the seal of the living God . . . .

A measure of this sealing is to confirm upon their head in common with Elijah the doctrine of election of the covenant with Abraham—which when a Father & mother of a family have entered into their children who have not transgressed are secured by the seal wherewith the Parents have been sealed. And this is the Oath of God unto our Father Abraham and the doctrine shall stand forever.

This sermon clarifies a number of issues relative to the sealing complex that Joseph Smith was then introducing among his followers. First, the promise or covenant made to the fathers is equated with being sealed up to eternal life. Second, this same covenant secures one against the forces that will destroy the wicked at the end of the world. Third, when a husband and wife enter a covenant by which they are sealed up to eternal life, their children are included with them in that covenant. Fourth, the relationship
thus established between parents and children will effect their mutual salvation. Fifth, this process is equated with the Abrahamic covenant. And sixth, because of the coming of Elijah children can once again participate in the covenant of their fathers.

The logic behind these statements can only be understood in terms of the relationship between eternal marriage and the second anointing. First, by virtue of the sealing ordinance that had occurred at the time a man and woman established an eternal union, they were given the promise that the children that were subsequently born to them would be eternally bound to them as they were to one another. Second, by virtue of the sealing ordinance that occurred at the time they received their second anointing, the man and woman were jointly given both the assurance that they would be preserved from the destruction that would destroy the wicked at the Second Coming and also the promise that they would inherit eternal life and thus receive the status of gods. Third, the blessings that they were given coincidental to receiving their second anointing could be transmitted to their offspring who were united to them through the sealing power of the priesthood. As Heber C. Kimball was told: "Thou shall have power over thy posterity and shall save all of them and shall bring them into thy kingdom." Thus the promises made to the fathers would be implanted in the hearts of the children.

The sealing ritual by which parents could be united with children that had been born to them before they had been eternally married was in turn a way to establish the same covenantal relationship that existed between parents and the offspring that had been born after the eternal marriage ceremony had been performed. By being "sealed" to parents, such children would likewise have an eternal relationship with their parents and be part of their family kingdom. In this way the ritual linkages of sealing could theoretically be extended back through time, uniting all the descendants of Adam into one vast patriarchal order.
Sealing and federal holiness

This formulation is closer to the Puritan concept of the Abrahamic covenant than anything that had previously appeared in Mormonism. First, in both instances the promise of salvation is regarded as an essential aspect of the Abrahamic covenant: among Puritans this promise was manifest in the covenant of grace that God establishes with the elect; for Mormons it was the condition of being sealed up to eternal life associated with one receiving his second anointing. And second, children were included with parents in the covenant: for Puritans this was effected by the transmission of federal holiness by virtue of which children were born in the covenant that God had made with their parents; for Mormons an analogous process occurred by virtue of which children "are secured by the seal wherewith the Parents have been sealed." Not surprisingly, Mormons soon began referring to children who were born after their parents had been sealed in an eternal marriage covenant as having been "born in the covenant."

Despite such similarities, important distinctions existed between the concepts. First, the Mormon understanding of salvation remained essentially Arminian in emphasis. It was only after a man had demonstrated that he was "determined to serve [God] at all hazards" (HC 3:381) that he could expect to be sealed up to eternal life, and only children who had "not transgressed" would be "secured by the seal wherewith the Parents have been sealed." Second, consistent with its millenarian foundations, the Mormon concept had an eschatological emphasis. When one was properly sealed he could escape the destruction that would consume the wicked. And third, the Mormon formulation posited the eternal perpetuation of familial relationships.

It was this third distinction that was to have the most far-reaching consequence for Mormon covenant organization. Puritan theology had consistently maintained that no familial ties were to persist after death. Indeed, the process of regeneration seemed ultimately to necessitate the severance of affective ties with one's family. Thus John Bunyan's (1909:15) Christian could not begin his quest for salvation without leaving behind his wife and children: "So
I saw in my Dream that the Man began to run. Now he had not run far from his own door, but his Wife and Children, perceiving it, began to cry after him to return; but the Man put his fingers in his ears, and ran on crying, Life! Life! Eternal Life!" According to Joseph Smith, on the other hand, one takes his wife and children with him as he seeks for eternal life, for they are interdependent on one another for their mutual salvation.

There appears to have been two grounds for this interdependency. The first had to do with the Mormon concept of patriarchal authority. As Adam had received the keys by which he could effect the salvation of his righteous posterity, so the worthy Mormon priesthood bearer could have delegated to him keys by which he could effect the salvation of his wife (or wives) and children. The concept of sealing associated with the eternal marriage covenant included the understanding that when such a sealing had occurred a man's wife and children would participate with him in his exaltation. As such he would have eternal jurisdiction over them. They would be the members of his "family kingdom." The extent of his exaltation, however, would be dependent on the number of individuals over which he had eternal jurisdiction. The second had to do with Joseph Smith's view regarding the affective nature of kinship ties. In May of 1843 he declared that "to be righteous is to be just and merciful. If a man fails in kindness justice and mercy he will be damned" (Coray, Martha Jane, ms a). The matrix of kinship appeared to provide the ideal arena in which to develop such characteristics. Thus family members might "effect their mutual salvation."

**Modifications in Bases of Covenantal Relationships**

As has already been discussed, during the 1830s Mormon identity became defined in terms of the interrelationship between putative Abrahamic descent and the baptismal covenant. Each of these elements was conceptually linked to a different Book of Mormon depiction of the covenant people of God: the belief that Mormons should ideally be the offspring of biblical Israelites was consistent with Book of Mormon statements that the literal descendants of Abraham
stand in a special covenant relationship with God; while the
requirement that all Mormons submit to baptism was in harmony with
Book of Mormon teachings that God's covenant people consist
inclusively and exclusively of all who obey his commandments. Mormon
identity consequently became that of gathered Israel who had been
restored to its proper relationship with God through participation in
the baptismal covenant. Despite conceptual ambiguities alluded to in
chapter 4, the Mormon concept of Abrahamic descent was primarily an
aspect of the order of nature and the baptismal covenant concept an
aspect of the order of law. Mormon identity, like that of the
American relative, thus involved the interplay between biological and
normative conceptions.

After Joseph Smith abandoned efforts to pursue the
construction of the New Jerusalem, generalized the concept of Zion,
and refused to reinstitute the law of consecration and stewardship,
the notion of putative Abrahamic descent and the baptismal covenant
(together with the hierocracy) were the only basic aspects of original
Mormon covenant organization to remain in place.

All three elements were incorporated into the patriarchal
order. Abrahamic descent and the baptismal covenant thus continued to
serve as defining features of Mormon identity and as bases for
relationships in Mormon covenant organization. Within the context of
the patriarchal order, however, understandings regarding their
significance were changed and expanded. In addition, the mythological
and ritual elaborations of the 1840s resulted in the emergence of
additional and novel concepts that likewise provided bases for
relationships within the patriarchal order. The result was a much
more complex understanding of Mormon identity than had existed in the
1830s.

In the following section post-Missouri developments regarding
the baptismal covenant and putative Abrahamic descent will first be
examined. The additional bases for relationships within the
patriarchal order will then be discussed.
Putative Descent in the Post-Missouri Period

Modifications in the Abrahamic covenant concept

As already indicated, during the 1840s, the Abrahamic covenant concept was reformulated. This development was associated with elaborations in the concept of putative descent. Prior to the settlement of Nauvoo the LDS conception of the Abrahamic covenant had essentially been derived from the Book of Mormon. Three aspects of the Abrahamic covenant as there portrayed had particular significance for the development of Mormon covenant organization during the 1830s. First, the text presents a bipartite descent classification: Israelites and Gentiles. (Although Israelites are further divided into such subcategories as descendants of Judah and descendants of Joseph, Book of Mormon commentary does not elaborate upon the pragmatic significance of such distinctions.) Mormons of the 1830s viewed the world's population fundamentally in these terms: one was either a member of the house of Israel or a Gentile. Second, the Book of Mormon describes the Abrahamic covenant as a cluster of promises; and while there is considerable diversity among these promises, most are associated in one way or another with the occupation of land. Before the expulsion from Missouri, Mormons focused upon land-related promises and tended to equate the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant with obtaining a stewardship in Zion. And third, the Book of Mormon does not establish literal descent from Abraham as either a necessary or a sufficient criteria by which one becomes qualified to receive divine promises linked to the Abrahamic covenant. The text in particular states that Gentiles will participate with members of the house of Israel in building the New Jerusalem (BM 3 Ne. 21:14, 22-25). While during the 1830s Mormons increasingly identified themselves as the literal descendants of Abraham, they preserved this universalistic aspect of Book of Mormon covenant ideology. They were thus developing a descent idiom in terms of which to express their religious distinctiveness without establishing a precise understanding of what such biologically related distinctiveness entailed.
After the expulsion of the Saints from Missouri, each of these aspects of the Mormon Abrahamic covenant concept underwent significant change: a basically tripartite descent classification replaced the bipartite scheme; divine promises linked with the covenant became centered upon priesthood prerogatives rather than upon the occupation of land; and descent became established as an essentially qualifying criterion for full participation in the covenant.

It might be posited that such developments were causally linked to the abandonment of attempts to establish the New Jerusalem and instigate the law of consecration and stewardship. During the 1830s putative Abrahamic descent had emerged as a fundamental aspect of formal Mormon identity. Despite this development, group unity and integration in large measure were conceptualized in terms of the territorial symbolism of the New Jerusalem paradigm and the covenantal structure of the law of consecration and stewardship. When these aspects of Mormonism were declared inoperative, descent began to play a much more prominent diacritical and integrative role in the formation of Mormon group identity and solidarity. Modification in the Abrahamic covenant concept can all be interpreted as adjuncts of this development.

While the germs of these ideas were present in Mormon thought prior to the abandonment of Nauvoo, their full implications were not worked out until after the settlement of Utah. While the following discussion will refer to statements made during the lifetime of Joseph Smith, many of the formulations that it will deal with did not make their way into Mormon ideology until after the abandonment of Nauvoo.

The tripartite descent classification

In terms of the classification that emerged in Mormonism during the 1840s, the world's population was understood to be divided into three general descent categories: Israelites, Gentiles, and Negroes. Israelites in turn were believed to be subdivided into the various "tribes" associated with the biblical house of Israel. Three of these had particular significance for Mormon covenant organization: Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah. Except for the addition of Negroes as a
distinct category, this classification closely resembles the basic
descent structure described in the Book of Mormon and employed by
Mormons during the 1830s. The post-Missouri descent classification,
however, is associated with a much more elaborate descent ideology
than is the case with the Book of Mormon formulation. It is in terms
of this descent ideology that the significance of the tripartite
classification becomes apparent.

The classification scheme hierarchically ordered the three
basic descent categories: Israelites occupied the superior position;
Gentiles held an intermediate position; and Negroes were assigned the
most inferior position. The Israelite complex was in turn
hierarchically ordered with Ephraim ranked first, Manasseh second, and
Judah third. It was believed that the origins of the various groups
could be traced to specific blessings or cursings that God had
pronounced on founding ancestors. For example, God had established a
covenant with Abraham. This covenant had been transmitted by divine
decrees from Abraham to his son Isaac and grandson Jacob or Israel,
and from him to all his offspring. Of the twelve sons of Jacob,
Joseph had received the "birthright" blessing, and this particular
blessing had in turn been conferred on Joseph's son Ephraim and his
progeny. Thus all Israelites, as descendants of Jacob, were heirs to
the Abrahamic covenant, while the descendants of Ephraim were singled
out for special distinction. The Negroes, at the other extreme, were
believed to be descendants of Cain by way of the wife of Ham. As such
they were subject to the curse that God pronounced on Cain after he
had murdered his brother Abel.

The tripartite classification was apparently derived from an
interpretation of the blessings and cursing that Noah pronounced on
his posterity (see Gen. 9:24-27): thus Israelites were identified as
the descendants of Shem, the Gentiles as the descendants of Japheth,
and the Negroes as the descendants of Ham. Mormons made reference to
this scripture when discussing their tripartite descent scheme (see
for example HC 4:445-46; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 7 Nov. 1841; TS
6:857). Mormons were not distinctive in employing this scripture to
classify the world's population in such a manner; many
nineteenth-century Americans were doing so. Some of the consequences that Mormons derived from such a classification, however, were unique.

The tripartite classification did not suddenly appear in Mormon ideology during the 1840s; concepts associated with it had been developing during the 1830s. The Book of Mormon makes no use of such a scheme. During the early and mid-1830s, however, there was some tendency to regard Negroes as distinctive from Gentiles. As has already been seen, by 1833 Joseph Smith had written that the descendants of both Cain and Canaan had received dark skins as aspects of divine cursings; and in 1835 William W. Phelps posited a genetic connection between those two groups (via the wife of Ham) and inferred that they were distinctive from Gentiles. Furthermore, in 1836 Joseph Smith identified members of the Negro race as descendants of Ham and indicated that they were still subject to the curse inflicted upon Canaan (MA 2:289-301).

Such developments, however, were tangential to the general thrust of Mormon descent ideology of the 1830s, and almost all discussion during the period assumed only a division between Israelites and Gentiles. In particular, there appears to have been nothing in Mormon ideology of the 1830s indicating that by virtue of descent from Cain, Ham, or Canaan, Negroes were not to be ordained to the priesthood. Joseph Smith, for example, during the 1830s identified the curse of Canaan with slavery (see MA 2:289-301). Denial of priesthood to Negroes appears to have been the most prominent support for the tripartite classification as it was espoused during the 1840s and thereafter. In view of these factors, there appears to be considerable justification in assuming that prior to the establishment of Nauvoo, Mormons employed essentially a bipartite descent classification.

Mormons held that members of the various descent categories tended to manifest distinctive forms of behavior. Brigham Young thus characterized Negroes as basically servile (JD 2:184; 10:190) as well as "uncouth, uncomely, disagreeable and low in their habits, wild, and seemingly deprived of nearly all the blessings of the intelligence that is generally bestowed upon mankind" (JD 7:290). Gentiles, on the other hand, he regarded as "disobedient and rebellious" (JD 2:268).
And, according to George Q. Cannon, "It is difficult to convert them, difficult to control them, difficult for them to receive the truth in plainness and simplicity" (JD 25:172). Israelites, as a general category, were viewed as fundamentally susceptible to the Mormon gospel. Thus George Q. Cannon declared that "whenever we have gone among those people whom the Book of Mormon tells us are the descendants of the house of Israel, we have had no trouble in converting them by hundreds, and it may be said by thousands, to the truth. They were ready to receive it without any difficulty whatsoever" (JD 25:172). And among the Israelites, it was the descendants of Ephraim who were understood to have the greatest potential for leadership. Brigham Young thus maintained that "the sons of Ephraim ... are upon the face of the whole earth, bearing the spirit of rule and dictation" (JD 10:186). And Erastus Snow declared that "when the books shall be opened and the lineage of all men is known, it will be found that [the descendants of Ephraim] have been first and foremost in everything noble among men in the various nations in breaking off the shackles of kingcraft and priestcraft and oppression of every kind" (JD 23:186).

As adjuncts to the understanding that God had pronounced hereditary blessings and cursings upon the founding ancestors of the various descent categories, two explanations were put forth to account for the distinctive behavioral propensities that were understood to be characteristic of the different groupings. The first of these assumed a causal relationship between blood and religiously oriented conduct. Such a position appears to have at least implicitly included the following notions: (1) there is a relationship between behavior and genetically transferable blood; (2) through personal conduct or divine intervention, an individual's blood can be changed; and (3) this altered blood can itself be genetically transferred. Individuals were thus believed to have religious inclinations similar to those of these ancestors because of common blood.

Both Joseph Smith (HC 3:380) and Brigham Young at least partially accepted this position. For example, in 1854 Brigham Young rhetorically asked a Mormon congregation:
Can you make a Christian of a Jew? I tell you nay. If a Jew comes into the Church and honestly professes to be a Saint, a follower of Christ, and if the blood of Judah is in his veins, he will apostatize. He may have been born and bred a Jew, have the face of a Jew, speak the language of the Jews, and have attended to all the ceremonies of the Jewish religion, and have openly professed to be a Jew all his days; but I will tell you a secret—there is not a particle of the blood of Judaism in him, if he has become a true Christian, a Saint of God; for if there is, he will most assuredly leave the Church of Christ, or that blood will be purged out of his veins. We have men among us who were Jews and became converted from Judaism. For instance here is brother Neibaur; do I believe there is one particle of the blood of Judah in his veins? No, not so much as could be seen on the point of the finest cambric needle, through a magnifying power of two million.

Jerusalem is not to be redeemed by the soft still voice of the preacher of the Gospel of peace. Why? Because they were once the blessed of the Lord, the chosen of the Lord, the promised seed. They were the people from among whom should spring the Messiah; and salvation could be found only through that tribe. The Messiah came through them, and they killed him; and they will be the last of all the seed of Abraham to have the privilege of receiving the New and Everlasting Covenant. (JD 2:142-43)

The relationship that Joseph Smith and Brigham Young posited between blood and religious conduct was not inconsistent with the general nineteenth-century American tendency to conjoin race and culture: integral to both formulations is the belief that behavioral inclinations can be genetically transmitted. During the 1840s and 1850s, however, an alternative and more radical explanation regarding the relationship between behavior and descent began to be articulated by Mormon leaders. This theory was essentially as follows: based on individual degrees of innate intelligence and on personal conduct during the preexistence, spirits were foreordained to come to mortality as members of different descent groups. Thus in September of 1844 Apostle Orson Hyde declared:

At the time the devil was cast out of heaven, there were some spirits that did not know who had the authority, whether God or the devil. They consequently did not take a very active part on either side. . . . These spirits were not considered bad enough to be cast down to hell, and never have bodies; neither were they considered worthy enough of an honorable body on this earth. . . . [They were consequently] required to come into the world and take bodies in that accursed lineage of Canaan; and hence the Negro or African race. (Hyde, Joseph Smith 1933:56)
And in 1853 Apostle Orson Pratt wrote that

Some spirits take bodies in the lineage of the chosen seed, through whom the priesthood is transferred, others receive bodies among the African Negroes or in the lineage of Canaan whose descendants were cursed, pertaining to the priesthood. . . . [The reason for this is that there were] certain callings, ordinances, appointments, and authority, pertaining to this life, which were conferred upon spirits before they came here, and which, doubtless, were promised to them because of their good works in the spirit world. (Seer 1:54-55)

Foreordination on the basis of preexistent merit and the genetic transmission of behavioral propensities are essentially complementary concepts, and the two readily became fused in the minds of many Mormons. It is not unusual to find the same individual simultaneously indicating that different types of spirits have been assigned to different descent categories and also that distinctive religious orientations result from distinctive types of "blood inheritance." Thus in 1919, Apostle Orson F. Whitney (1927:143) wrote that

through . . . acts of deportation, enforced exile, and voluntary wandering, the blood of Israel, the blood that believes, with choice spirits answering to that blood, and no doubt selected for the purpose, were sent into those nations where the Gospel has since been preached—spirits capable of recognizing and appreciating the Truth, and brave enough to embrace it, regardless of consequences.

More recently, Apostle Bruce R. McConkie (1966:81), who at the time of his death in 1985 was regarded by many Mormons as their foremost living scriptorian, has written that the term "believing blood"

is a figurative expression commonly used to designate the aptitude and inclination of certain persons to accept and believe the principles of revealed religion. In general, the Lord sends to earth in the lineage of Jacob those spirits who in pre-existence developed an especial talent for spirituality and for recognizing truth. Those born in this lineage, having the blood of Israel in their veins and finding it easy to accept the gospel, are said to have believing blood.

Since much of Israel has been scattered among the Gentile nations, it follows that millions of people have mixed blood, blood that is part Israel and part Gentile. The more of the blood of Israel that an individual has, the easier it is for him to
believe the message of salvation as taught by the authorized agents of the Lord.

When making a statement such as "the more of the blood of Israel that an individual has, the easier it is for him to believe the message of salvation," a Mormon does not necessarily assume that Mendelian genetics or any other clearly discernible principles of descent determine the proportion of Israelite (or any other religiously significant) blood that is allotted to a given individual. As Brigham Young explained:

We want the blood of Jacob, and that of his father Isaac and Abraham, which runs in the veins of the people. There is a particle of it here, and another there, blessing the nations as predicted.

Take a family of ten children, for instance, and you may find nine of them purely of the Gentile stock, and one son or one daughter in that family who is purely of the blood of Ephraim. It was in the veins of the father or mother, and was reproduced in the son or daughter, while all the rest of the family are Gentiles. You may think that is singular, but it is true. (JD 2:268)

It should thus be understood that although Mormons employ both the terms "lineage" and "blood line" when discussing descent categories, such terms denote somewhat different concepts within the context of LDS ideology than they do in general American usage.

Covenantal rights to the priesthood and descent as a qualifying criterion

Israelites

During the 1840s priesthood prerogatives became regarded as a fundamental aspect of the Abrahamic covenant. The Book of Abraham appears to have provided much of the ideological basis for this perspective.

As already indicated, basic to the Abrahamic covenant that is presented in this text is the promise that the priesthood prerogatives that Abraham had received from "the fathers" back to Adam would continue in his seed after him (PGP Abr. 1:2-4; 2:8-11).
On the basis of their understanding of the Abrahamic covenant, Mormons believed that the various descent categories had differential rights to priesthood prerogatives. As Abraham's "literal seed" through his favored son Isaac and grandson Jacob, Israelites were believed to be lawful heirs to the priesthood. As Parley P. Pratt explained in 1853:

In the lineage of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, according to the flesh, was held the right of heirship to the keys of Priesthood for the blessings and for the salvation of all nations. . . . From the days of Abraham until now, if the people of any country, age or nation, have been blessed with the blessings, peculiar to the everlasting covenant of the gospel, its sealing powers, Priesthood, and ordinances, it has been through the ministry of that lineage, and the keys of Priesthood held by the lawful heirs according to the flesh. (JD 1:261)

**Ephraimites**

Among the various tribes of Israel, Ephraim had the right to preside and to hold the keys belonging to the Melchizedek Priesthood. Thus Apostle Erastus Snow stated that by the preaching of the word and the administration of the ordinances of the Gospel, is Israel sought out from among the nations . . . especially the seed of Ephraim unto whom the first promises appertain, the promises of the keys of the Priesthood. For it must be remembered that of all the seed of Abraham whom the Lord chose to bear the keys pertaining to this holy order of Priesthood, the seed of Ephraim, the son of Joseph, were the first and chief. While the tribe of Levi . . . was specially charged with the administration of affairs of the lesser Priesthood under the law, yet Ephraim, the peculiar and chosen son of Joseph, was the one whom the Lord had named by his own mouth and through the Prophets, to inherit the keys of presidency of this High Priesthood after the order of the Son of God. (JD 23:183-84)

Promises associated with patriarchal blessing lineage declarations expressed these same concepts. An 1840 patriarchal blessing thus declares, "Thou art of the blood of Joseph, and confirmed in his covenant, even in Ephraim, and if thou art faithful thou mayst become mighty, and be one of the horns to push the people together" (Milles, H. W. 1917:91). A blessing given in 1844 states, "Thou art of the blood and lineage of Joseph through the loins of Ephraim and an heir to all the blessings of the new and everlasting
Gentiles had no natural rights to the priesthood or to other aspects of the Abrahamic covenant. It was believed, however, that they could become "adopted" into the family of Abraham and thus acquire rights to the Abrahamic covenant. Baptism became identified as the means by which this adoption occurred. The birth symbolism associated with this ritual readily permitted it to be understood in this context. Thus baptism, which during the 1830s had been required as the means by which one was adopted into the kingdom of God, now had the added significance of being the means by which a Gentile could be adopted into the family of Abraham. Thus Parley P. Pratt stated that the literal descendants of Jacob are of the royal blood . . . and have a right to claim the ordination and endowment of the Priesthood, inasmuch as they repent, and obey the Lord God of their fathers.

Those who are not of this lineage . . . have a right to remission of sins and the Gift of the Holy Spirit, through their ministry, on condition of faith, repentance, and baptism, in the name of Jesus Christ. Through this Gospel they are adopted into the same family, and are counted of the seed of Abraham; they can then receive a portion of this ministry under those (literal descendants) who hold the presiding keys of the same. (JD 1:262)

Joseph Smith apparently believed that as an aspect of such adoption, the Lord caused a Gentile to possess the blood of Abraham
and thus literally be transformed into an Israelite. In June of 1839 he declared that the Holy Ghost

is more powerful in expanding the mind, enlightening the understanding, and storing the intellect with present knowledge, of a man who is of the literal seed of Abraham, than one that is a Gentile, though it may not have half as much visible effect upon the body; for as the Holy Ghost falls upon one of the literal seed of Abraham, it is calm and serene; and his whole soul and body are only exercised by the pure spirit of intelligence; while the effect of the Holy Ghost upon a Gentile, is to purge out the old blood, and make him actually of the seed of Abraham. That man that has none of the blood of Abraham (naturally) must have a new creation by the Holy Ghost. In such a case, there may be more of a powerful effect upon the body, and visible to the eye, than upon an Israelite, while the Israelite at first might be far before the Gentile in pure intelligence. (HC 3:380)

Brigham Young accepted Joseph Smith’s declaration that the Holy Ghost would transform the blood of Gentiles who converted to Mormonism, and he stated:

If any of the Gentiles will believe, we will lay our hands upon them that they may receive the Holy Ghost, and the Lord will make them of the house of Israel. They will be broken off from the wild olive tree, and be grafted into the good and tame olive tree, and will partake of its sap and fatness. (JD 2:269)

Whether or not Mormons in general believed that it was essential that Gentiles literally receive the blood of Abraham so that they could acquire rights to the Abrahamic covenant, the idea persisted that through adoption Gentiles could gain access to blessings that Israelites had by natural right. For example in 1929 Hyrum G. Smith (1929:124), then the patriarch to the Church, declared:

We have . . . a number in the Church, who, so far as we are able to judge and learn, did not originally belong to the house of Israel at all. Then you say, where do they get their blessings? What is their lineage? Well, I explain that this way: When you adopt a child that does not belong to you originally, and that child grows up in your family, it obtains its blessings the same as other members of the family. It is the same as your own. . . . And so, if other people outside the house of Israel have faith and obedience enough to come into the Church they will receive their lineage and blessings according to the house which they enter. If they enter into the family of Israel they will receive the same lineage as the house or tribe that adopted them, just the same as the adopted child receives the blessings of the family that adopted him.
Negroes, the third major descent category, were prohibited from holding the priesthood. Thus, unlike Gentiles, baptism did not result in their acquiring right to the priesthood blessings to which Israelites were natural heirs. The Book of Abraham appears to have provided the mythological justification for this exclusion. After relating his own ordination to the priesthood, Abraham declares that an unnamed king of Egypt who lived contemporaneously with him was a descendant from the loins of Ham, and was a partaker of the blood of the Canaanites by birth. From this descent sprang all the Egyptians, and thus the blood of the Canaanites was preserved in the land. The land of Egypt being first discovered by a woman, who was the daughter of Ham, and the daughter of Egyptus, which in the Chaldean signifies Egypt, which signifies that which is forbidden. When this woman discovered the land it was under water, who afterwards settled her sons in it; and thus, from Ham sprang that race which preserved the curse in the land. Now the first government of Egypt was established by Pharaoh, the eldest son of Egyptus, the daughter of Ham, and it was after the manner of the government of Ham, which was patriarchal. Pharaoh, being a righteous man, established his kingdom and judged his people justly all his days, seeking earnestly to imitate that order established by the fathers in the first generations, in the days of the first patriarchal reign, even in the reign of Adam, and also of Noah, his father, who blessed him with the blessings of the earth, and with the blessings of wisdom, but cursed him as pertaining to the Priesthood. Now, pharaoh, being of that lineage by which he could not have right of Priesthood, notwithstanding the Pharaohs would fain claim it from Noah, through Ham, therefore my father was led away by their idolatry. (PGP Abr. 1:21-27)

Although the 1842 Book of Abraham readily provided scriptural justification for excluding Negroes from the Mormon priesthood, there is no conclusive evidence that such a policy was instituted prior to the abandonment of Nauvoo. By the late 1840s, however, Church officials were declaring that by virtue of their descent from Cain, Negroes were not to be ordained to the priesthood. An individual with any known Negro ancestry came under this prohibition. Thus in 1852 Brigham Young declared that "any man having one drop of the seed of Cain in him cannot hold the priesthood" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 4 Jan. 1852). And it was not believed that the blood of Negroes, unlike that of their Gentile counterparts, could be transformed into Israelite blood subsequent to their conversion to Mormonism. Thus,
although Negroes could be baptized into the Mormon church and thus become "heirs to salvation," they were not fully participating members of the Mormon covenant community. While they were tied to their fellow Mormons by virtue of the baptismal covenant, they were not united with them in blood.

Mormons believed that the band on Negroes being ordained to the priesthood was only a temporary condition. Brigham Young held that Negroes would be permitted to hold the priesthood some time subsequent to the resurrection of the dead. Thus in 1854 he declared that "when all the other children of Adam have had the privilege of receiving the Priesthood and of coming into the kingdom of God, and of being redeemed from the four quarters of the earth, and have received their resurrection from the dead, then it will be time enough to remove the curse from Cain and his posterity" (JD 2:143). Subsequent events, however, invalidated this scenario; and on 8 June 1978, Mormon president Spencer W. Kimball announced that he had received a revelation authorizing the ordination of Negroes to the priesthood and allowing them to participate fully in the various rights and duties associated with such ordination.

Post-Missouri descent ideology and Mormon group identity

Unlike earlier Mormon descent ideology, post-Missouri understandings regarding descent provided the underpinnings for a well-developed pattern of inequality. Basic to this scheme was a concept of descent that had many parallels in Puritan thought. Like the Puritans before them, Mormons held that an individual's encounter with the Divine could affect his state of being and that this state could in some manner reappear in his offspring. Puritans believed that two antithetical conditions could thus be transferred: natural depravity, inherited by all the descendants of Adam; and federal holiness, passed on to their offspring by all who received the covenant of grace. Mormons maintained that various forms of religiously oriented inclinations could be thus transmitted. The most important of these were those associated with the curse of Cain and the covenant of Abraham. Both Puritans and Mormons believed that such
states of being were aspects of the order of nature rather than of law: the consequent behavior was interpreted as a result of an individual's innate faculties rather than of his environment or education. Puritans explained such a phenomenon in terms of their understanding of human physiology while Mormons discussed them in terms of blood inheritance and the capacities of spirits who had been foreordained to come through distinctive "blood lines." Integral to both Puritan and Mormon descent ideology was a concept of hereditary charisma associated with the Abrahamic covenant. Both groups believed that the descendants of Abraham had inherited a state of being that made them more susceptible than others to divine influence. Puritans called this federal holiness and regarded it as an increased tendency to receive the covenant of grace. Mormons referred to it as the "blood of Abraham" or "believing blood" and regarded it as increased attraction to the Mormon gospel and increased ability to abide by its code.

Based on such understandings, Mormons held that a condition of natural inequality existed among the inhabitants of the world. Humanity was believed to be divided into various descent categories which were hierarchically ordered as a result of their distinctive states of being. Negroes occupied the lowest position; Gentiles a middle position; and Israelites as a general category the highest position. The Israelite complex was in turn subdivided with Ephraimites occupying first rank, Manassehites second, and Jews third.

It was in terms of the same pattern of inequality that the different descent categories were believed to participate differentially in the Abrahamic covenant. Thus all Israelites were natural heirs to the covenant; but Ephraimites, having been granted the special blessing of leadership, alone had access to all the Abrahamic promises. Gentiles could acquire covenantal rights through adoption. While Negroes, at the bottom of the hierarchy were forbidden to participate in many of the covenants that Mormons identified as part of the general Abrahamic covenant.

This conceptual model was linked to the existent Mormon church through the belief that the various descent categories would be differentially affected by the Mormon gospel. The Church had been
restored for the gathering of Israel, and after the ideological elaborations of the 1840s many Mormons did not anticipate that it would attract many Gentiles. Thus in 1855 Brigham Young declared at a general conference of the Mormon church:

Recollect that we are now calling upon the Elders to go and gather up Israel; this is the mission that is given to us. It was the first mission given to the Elders in the days of Joseph. The set time is come for God to gather Israel, and for His work to commence upon the face of the whole earth, and the Elders who have arisen in this Church and Kingdom are actually of Israel. Take the Elders who are now in this house, and you can scarcely find one out of a hundred but what is of the house of Israel. It has been remarked that the Gentiles have been cut off, and I doubt whether another Gentile ever comes into this Church. (JD 2:268)

It was further believed that among Israelites, the Ephraimites would be most likely to join the Church. Such a perception was based in part on the understanding that as leaders in Israel, it was their special mission to prepare for the eventual gathering of the rest of the house of Israel. In order for them to do so, it was essential that they be the first Israelites to come under the directing influence of the Mormon priesthood. Brigham Young thus stated that "Ephraim has been mixed with all the nations of the earth, and it is Ephraim that is gathering together. It is Ephraim that I have been searching for all the days of my preaching, and that is the blood which ran in my veins when I embraced the Gospel" (JD 2:268).

Negroes, at the other end of the spectrum from Ephraimites, were naturally servants rather than leaders. They were not actively proselyted. While a few might join the Church, they were not to receive the rights and duties associated with ordination to the Mormon priesthood. Explained Brigham Young: "The seed of Ham, which is the seed of Cain descending through Ham, will, according to the curse put upon him, serve his brethren, and be a 'servant of servants' to his fellow-creatures, until God removes the curse" (JD 2:184).

This ideological pattern had far-reaching consequences for Mormon self-identity. Like both the Puritan church congregation and the Mormons of the 1830s, the post-Missouri Saints regarded themselves as a distinctive group bound together by the interrelationship between covenantal code and hereditary charisma. The concept of hereditary
charisma in the post-Missouri church, however, was both more central to Mormon group identity and more highly developed than had been the case during the 1830s. After the settlement of Nauvoo there was little feeling that the Church was composed partially of Israelites and partially of Gentiles. Almost all patriarchal blessings now indicated that the recipient was of the house of Israel: out of a sample of seventy-four patriarchal blessings received during the years that the Church was centered at Nauvoo, 85 percent gave house of Israel lineage declarations; after the settlement of Utah virtually all blessings contained such statements. The understanding persisted that through participation in the baptismal ordinance, Gentiles could be adopted into the house of Israel. Few, if any, specific instances of this having occurred, however, were ever cited. Given the evidence of patriarchal blessings and the belief that Israelites were much more likely to embrace the Mormon gospel than Gentiles, there was little incentive for a Mormon convert to assume that he was anything less than a literal descendant of Jacob. The identity of the Mormon group was thus essentially that of Israel who had been gathered out from among the Gentiles and united through participation in the baptismal covenant.

Given such perceptions, descent ideology had important consequences for Mormon boundary maintenance. The baptismal covenant remained the means by which an individual was admitted to the Mormon church. Descent ideology, however, provided the explanations why certain individuals joined the Church while others did not. Most individuals converting to Mormonism during the nineteenth century were of Christian European background. While it would have been theoretically possible for patriarchal blessings to indicate that such an individual was of any one of various Israelite lineages, in practice almost all were identified as descendants of Ephraim. During the Nauvoo period there was a slight tendency toward lineage differentiation. Out of a sample of sixty-three patriarchal blessing lineage designations given during this period, 43 percent indicated that the recipient was a descendant of Ephraim, 37 percent of Joseph, 5 percent of Abraham and Jacob respectively, 3 percent of Manasseh, and 2 percent of Judah, Zebulon, Naphtali, and Calab respectively. After the
settlement of Utah there was much less variation: almost all blessings given to individuals of European Christian background indicated that the recipient was of the lineage of Ephraim. Since Mormons of Christian European background regarded themselves as Israelites from the tribe of Ephraim, it was easy to infer that those with similar backgrounds who remained unconverted were of Gentile stock. Their lack of receptiveness to the Mormon gospel was clear indication that such was the case. Consistent with the teachings of the Book of Mormon, both American Indians and Jews were still regarded as part of the house of Israel. They were believed, however, to have different lineage affiliation from that of the bulk of the Mormon population. American Indians were thus regarded as descendants of Manasseh and Jews as descendants of Judah (JD 2:263; 10:188; Smith, Hyrum G. 1929:123). Since Ephraim had the birthright blessing, most Mormons of European descent believed themselves in some sense to have superior rank to either group. And it was apparent why these Israelites were not currently converting to Mormonism. Ephraim had to be gathered first to prepare the way for his brothers; and both American Indians and Jews were still under spiritual liabilities that had resulted from the transgressions of their forefathers. It was believed, however, that someday they would flock to the Mormon standard.

Whatever the ideological premises regarding the relative excellence of the different descent categories, Negroes were the only group of people who subsequent to their baptism were not allowed to be involved fully in Mormon covenant organization. Whatever their lineage designations happened to be, all others were permitted to participate fully in the Mormon covenant organization if they complied with the Mormon code. While it can be argued that the policy of the Church toward its Negro members was an outgrowth of general American racial attitudes, its consequence for Mormon group formation cannot be understood independently of Mormon descent ideology. Denying a category of Mormons the right to participate fully in Mormon covenant organization because of putative descent tended to validate the claim that other Mormons participated by virtue of hereditary rights. Negroes consequently became the embodiment of the theoretical category of individuals bound to the Mormon group by code and not by substance.
Post-Missouri descent ideology thus provided Mormons with strong group identity. Except for the few Negro members at the periphery of the group, Mormons believed themselves to be bound together both by common blood and by the distinctive qualities that they had brought with them from the preexistence. As such they were not only distinctive from but superior to the non-Mormons who surrounded them. As Brigham Young declared to a congregation of Mormons in 1855, "You understand who we are: we are of the House of Israel, of the royal seed, of the royal blood" (JD 2:269).

Elaborations in the Mormon Law/Nature Dichotomy

As has already been seen, like the Puritans before them, Mormons tended to bifurcate the conceptual universe between an order of law and an order of nature. Within the context of general Mormon identity this division was manifest in the interrelationship between the code of conduct associated with the baptismal covenant and the concept of putative Abrahamic descent. With the emergence of the patriarchal order during the Nauvoo period, these constituents of Mormon identity became fused with the concepts of kinship and familial ties that the LDS people had acquired as participants in American society. The result was a highly cohesive system of integration.

The co-mingling of religious and kinship identity did not commence with the settlement of Nauvoo. As demonstrated in chapter 4, this process was evident in the earliest days of the Church's existence. Among the most important manifestations of this tendency during the 1830s were the following: (1) the assumption that covenantal promises could be transmitted from parents to children as an aspect of blood inheritance; (2) the institution of a marital union established by the authority of the priesthood; and (3) the encompassment of the household by the hierocracy within the context of the covenantal network associated with the law of consecration and stewardship. But while these developments were important for the evolution of Mormon identity and solidarity, it was only after the Missouri expulsion that kinship and religious identity became interrelated in a consistent and fully coherent manner.
As already discussed in chapter 2, David Schneider (1968:21-29; 1969; 1972) argues that American kinship can be conceptualized as consisting in the interplay between two elements: one derived from the order of nature and the other from the order of law. From nature comes the element of "shared biological substance" and from law "code of conduct" based on the principle of enduring diffuse solidarity. Based on the various logical ways in which these two elements might interrelate, he posits that in American kinship there are three basic types of relatives: (1) those who share biological substance but not code of conduct; (2) those that share code of conduct but not biological substance; and (3) those that share both biological substance and code of conduct.

Relationships within the patriarchal order can likewise be conceptualized in terms of the interrelationship of elements from the orders of nature and law. There are, however, more elements that can be involved in such relationships than is the case in American kinship. The result is a more complex system that is isomorphic with American kinship in only certain aspects.

The order of nature

Blood

As is the case with American kinship, blood (or shared genetic substance) is perceived to provide a natural basis for solidarity. As has already been seen, the general American concept of blood as a unifying element underwent a number of specialized elaborations within the context of Mormon ideology. Such developments have had relevance for the evolution of the patriarchal order. Of particular note are the following: (1) covenantal promises and cursing can be genetically transmitted as an aspect of blood inheritance; and (2) blood is imbued with an ethical quality; and (3) the type of blood that an individual possesses will affect his response to the Mormon gospel and its code of conduct. Such concepts might be interpreted in part as providing bases for bringing closure to the patriarchal order.
Spiritual qualities

Because of the Church's teachings regarding the preexistence, Mormons believe that individuals are born with distinctive capabilities. Such capabilities can affect interpersonal relationships as well as an individual's susceptibility to the Mormon gospel. Various Mormons have believed that the amity that exists among kinsmen and between husband and wife was developed in the preexistence. Lorenzo Snow, who was president of the Church from 1898 to 1901, in 1900 related a conversation that he had had with Brigham Young which assumes that spirits had strong natural affinity toward those with whom they had established kinship and lineage lies in the preexistence:

He said that when Cain slew Abel he fully understood that the effects would not end with the killing of his brother, but that it extended to the spirits in eternity. He said that in the spirit world people were organized as they are here. There were patriarchs standing at the head of certain classes of spirits, and there were certain relationships existing which affected their coming into the world to take tabernacles; as, for instance, when Abel came into the world it was understood by Cain that the class of people he presided over as a prince, if they ever came into the world in the regular way, they would have to come through him. So with Cain, he was a prince presiding over a vast number of a certain class of spirits, and it was natural that they should come through him, if at all, and therefore when Cain slew Abel he understood that the taking of his brother's life was going to deprive the spirits over whom he presided from coming into the world, perhaps for thousands and thousands of years, hence the sin was immense because the effects were immense. Then there was this understanding when the Lord executed judgment upon Cain; the spirits under his leadership still looked up to him, and rather than forsake him they were willing to bear his burdens and share the penalty imposed upon him. This was understood when the curse was pronounced upon him, and it was understood that this curse would remain upon his posterity until the class of spirits presided over by Abel should have the privilege of coming into the world and taking tabernacles, and then the curse would be removed. (Council Minutes, 11 Mar. 1900)

Hartman Rector, Jr. (1968:10), a convert to the Church and currently a member of its First Quorum of Seventy holds that the instant attraction he felt for his future wife was a consequence of their association as spirits in the preexistence. He relates:
I met her walking down the street in my home town of Moberly, Missouri, when she was a little black-haired girl, 14 years old. I was 18, and I knew she was for me when I saw her. I didn't know then how I knew, but I know now. I am sure that we were very well acquainted before we came here. . . . If you live up to the light and knowledge that you have . . . then, the promise is to you that you will find that perfect him or her who was prepared just for you, it will be the right one and you will know it when you find her or him. Well, that's what happened to me.

The order of law

Code of conduct based upon amity

Like Americans in general, Mormons believe that a special condition of amity or love should exist among relatives. Unlike Puritans, they see no fundamental conflict between love for God and love for family. As Orson Pratt wrote in 1853:

Love should be the predominant ruling principle in all family governments. There is no danger of the different members of a family loving one another too much. They should love one another with all their hearts, and be willing, if required, to lay down their lives for each other. God is love, and He is the great fountain from which the beings of all worlds derive this heavenly attribute; it flows out in infinite streams, imparting joy and happiness to the whole universe, so far as it is received, nourished, and cherished by intelligent beings. (Seer 1:152)

Much of the rationale for their desire to perpetuate kinship ties eternally is discussed in terms of the joy and harmony that such relationships will engender. Joseph Smith thus discussed the resurrection in terms of the joyful reunification of relatives:

When the voice calls for the dead to arise, . . . what would be the first joy of my heart? To meet my father, my mother, my brother, my sister; and when they are by my side, I embrace them and they me. . . . If I have no expectation of seeing my father, mother, brothers, sisters and friends again, my heart would burst in a moment, and I should go down to my grave. (HC 5:362)

Parley P. Pratt (1979:297-98) maintained that Joseph Smith's teachings regarding the eternal duration of kinship ties intensified the emotion that he associated with such relationships:

Till then I had learned to esteem kindred affections and sympathies as appertaining solely to this transitory state, as
something from which the heart must be entirely weaned, in order to be fitted for its heavenly state.

It was Joseph Smith who taught me how to prize the endearing relationships of father and mother, husband and wife; of brother and sister, son and daughter.

It was from him that I learned that the wife of my bosom might be secured to me for time and all eternity; and that the refined sympathies and affections which endeared us to each other emanated from the foundation of divine eternal love. It was from him that I learned that we might cultivate these affections, and grow and increase in the same to all eternity.

And Orson Spencer (1847b: 4) held that kinship provided the most powerful source of solidarity in terms of which mortal or immortal beings could unite: "The domestic tie is the strongest bond of union and the most prolific source of virtue and happiness that appertains to mankind on earth or in heaven."

The patriarchal order was seen as a means to unite both the Mormon community in this life and the sanctified in the next on the basis of such amity. The rules governing relationships within the order were consequently intended to be consistent with the normative behavior of close kinsmen.

Priesthood power

As discussed in chapter 4, during the years that the Church was centered at Kirtland, a basic distinction began to emerge between marital relationships established by civil authority and those established by priesthood authority. It is partly as a result of ambiguities associated with the relationship between these two marriage forms that it has been posited that early Mormonism was characterized by two suborders within the order of law: one based on divine authority and the other on human authority.

During the early years at Nauvoo the cleavage between these suborders became more pronounced with the teaching that the only relationships that would persist after death would be those established by proper priesthood authority and "sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise." The concept of sealing associated with the eternal marriage covenant was a way of conceptualizing the understanding that all eternally enduring relationships must be welded
together through priesthood power. Such power consequently became perceived as an essential element upon which the solidarity within the patriarchal order was established.

Civil power

Despite the teaching that all relationships within the patriarchal order must ultimately be established by priesthood authority, participants in the order had previously existing kinship and marital ties established by civil authority. Ambiguities respecting the relationship between religious and civil authority were to generate various tensions as the patriarchal order developed. Some previously existing civil ties were abandoned while others became the basis for establishing covenantal relationships within the patriarchal order.

The Ordering of Sealing Relationships within the Patriarchal Order

The ritual innovations of the 1840s resulted in the establishment of relationships among members of the Church. While understandings regarding their significance have changed, the basic logic of such relationships persisted from the 1840s to the present. Ordinances that result in the establishment of relationships within the patriarchal order are referred to as "sealings." Such ordinances can only be performed in special circumstances by priesthood functionaries to whom have been delegated the "sealing keys" that Elijah the prophet is believed to have bestowed on Joseph Smith. A man and woman who have been united in an eternal marital relationship are said to be "sealed" to one another and the children born from the union are likewise said to be "sealed" jointly to their parents. To distinguish between these two forms of sealing, the first will here be called "matrimonial sealing" and the second "lineal sealing."

Explicit covenant making is associated with such sealing ordinances. As an aspect of being sealed together, a man and woman make covenants with each other and with the Lord; and the children
which they subsequently bear are believed to be born in that covenant. Explicit covenant making within the patriarchal order has resulted in the establishment of three basic relationships: husband-wife, parent-child, and master-servant.

**Husband-wife**

Within the context of the patriarchal order, the husband-wife relationship is created by a ritual enacted through the authority of the priesthood and is consequently grounded in the Mormon suborder of divine law. The ultimate purpose of such a union is to effect the mutual exaltation of the man and woman so joined. As Joseph Smith examined in May of 1843:

> In the celestial kingdom there are three heavens or degrees; and in order to obtain the highest, a man must enter into this order of the priesthood [meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage]; and if he does not, he cannot obtain it. He may enter into the other, but that is the end of his kingdom; he cannot have an increase. (DC 131:1-4; also Clayton, William 1982:40-41)

But while much of its manifest purpose involves post-mortal conditions, Mormons regard matrimonial sealing as the proper way to establish husband-wife relationships in mortality: a man and woman thus united can legitimately engage in sexual intercourse for procreative purposes. But while such a union is certainly a form of marriage, it differs conceptually in at least three important ways from that which existed in Puritan New England and from that which is found in contemporary secular American society: (1) the husband-wife relationship is established by priesthood, not civil authority; (2) a relationship thus established can be perpetuated eternally; and (3) it does not have to be consummated by sexual intercourse. The first two of these factors have already been discussed in some detail. The third requires additional comment.

**Sexual intercourse and eternal marriage**

The Puritans of New England regarded sexual intercourse as an essential aspect of marriage. As Edmund Morgan (1966:34) has
"The final step in Puritan marriage was sexual. Unless it were consummated in bodily union, no marriage was complete or valid." The same notion is found in contemporary American culture, and the failure to engage in sexual intercourse is regarded as legal grounds for the annulment of a marriage. The intimate tie that exists in America between sexual intercourse and marriage is one of the principal reasons that David Schneider (1968:37) has concluded that sexual intercourse is the root symbol of American kinship.

Mormons, on the other hand, do not regard sexual intercourse as essential for the sealing relationship between husband and wife to be regarded as valid. This can be illustrated in two ways. First, it is possible for a matrimonial sealing to occur between two individuals although one is deceased, even though no conjugal relationship had existed between them while living. All that is required is that a living individual act as proxy for the dead; the ceremony itself is essentially the same as if both were living. Thus several hundred women who had not been married to Joseph Smith in his lifetime were sealed to him as wives in the years following his death (Tinney 1973), and Wilford Woodruff had some four hundred deceased women sealed to him as wives (Cannon, Abraham, ms a, 4 Apr. 1894; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 1 Mar. 1877, 1 Mar. 1878, 14 Mar. 1878, 29 Jan. 1879, 1 Mar. 1879, 15 Mar. 1880, 19 Mar. 1880, 14 Mar. 1881, 31 Dec. 1885).

Second, during the nineteenth century, living women were sometimes sealed as wives to living men without the expectation that the two would subsequently engage in sexual intercourse. Catherine Lewis (1848:11), who defected from the Church at the time of the exodus, claimed that in January 1846 Heber C. Kimball proposed marriage to her. In the course of the conversation he purportedly stated, "I have a number of women, but do not lodge with all; the probability is I shall with you." Marietta Coray, who left the Church in the mid-1850s, wrote that while sealing ordinances were being performed in the Nauvoo Temple, Brigham Young instructed her to marry one Nathaniel J. Jones. According to her account, when Brigham Young informed her of this decision, he declared that he had "selected [Nathaniel Jones] for your 'spiritual' husband for eternity. . . . You need not live with him on
earth unless you wish. But it is necessary to have a husband to 'resurrect' you" (Green 1859:181).

While these statements might have been exaggerated as a result of the narrators' antagonism toward Mormonism, some women who remained committed to the Church also indicated that a matrimonial sealing did not necessarily presuppose sexual intercourse. Rhoda Richards, for example, remained a "maiden" throughout her life, although she had been sealed as a wife to Joseph Smith when she was fifty-nine. She later explained that "In my young days I buried my first and only love, and true to that affiance, I have passed companionless through life; but am sure of having my proper place and standing in the resurrection, having been sealed to the prophet Joseph, according to the celestial law, by his own request, under the inspiration of divine revelation" (Tullidge 1877:422). And in his prosopographical study of the Mormon hierarchy, D. Michael Quinn (1973:154-56) discusses a number of other instances in which matrimonial sealings were performed without subsequent sexual intercourse occurring. As in the cases when individuals were sealed to deceased spouses, the ritual that establishes such unions would be the same as that which results in a matrimonial relationship involving sexual intercourse.

In view of such situations, it might be argued that within the context of the patriarchal order, the union between husband and wife is conceptualized in terms of patriarchal priesthood power rather than in terms of lawful sexual intercourse. Despite such ideological conceptions, however, at least some nineteenth-century Mormons regarded marriages that did not involve sexual intercourse to be lacking in an important element. Susa Young gates (1977:273-75) writes that her mother, Lucy Bigelow, was "sealed to Brigham Young for time and all eternity" in March of 1846, but then goes on to indicate that she did not become his "wife indeed until 1850" when she evidently first began to have sexual relations with him. And John D. Lee (1877:289) relates that he married "old Mrs. Woolsey . . . for her soul's sake, for her salvation in the eternal state . . . . She was nearly sixty years old when I married her, I never considered her really a wife. True, I treated her well and gave her all the rights
of marriage. Still I never count her as one of my wives. That is the reason that I claim only eighteen true wives."

Inequality in the marital relationship

While the Mormon church teaches that a husband and wife who have been sealed together by proper priesthood authority are to participate jointly in their exaltation, it is believed that the wife is to remain perpetually under her husband's jurisdiction. Such a conceptualization is reminiscent of the Puritan notion of domestic order and structurally consistent with the husband-wife relationship that Mormons had established during the 1830s in conjunction with the law of consecration and stewardship.

There is considerable difference, however, between the 1830s covenantal system and the patriarchal order in the basis for such asymmetry. As has already been seen in chapter 4, under the law of consecration and stewardship, the subordination of the wife to her husband was primarily a function of economic control. The husband acquired an economic stewardship as a result of the covenant that he established with the bishop. The wife in turn had access to the proceeds of that stewardship as a consequence of being married to her husband. The husband was the manager of the stewardship and she was expected to follow his directions. In the event she divorced him, she would lose her interest in the stewardship. With the establishment of the patriarchal order, priesthood jurisdiction replaced economic control as the primary basis for the wife's subordination to her husband. Under the law of consecration and stewardship a man had not been required to be ordained to the priesthood in order to acquire a stewardship and the jurisdiction that he had over his wife was not conceptualized in terms of priesthood authority. Within the patriarchal order, however, the situation was different. A man had to be ordained to the Melchizedek or higher priesthood before he was permitted to enter an eternal marital relationship. This ordination became the basis for his patriarchal authority. Since women were never ordained to the priesthood, a man's superordinate relationship to his wife was regarded as a function of the priesthood power that
he, but not she, could exercise. As an aspect of the marriage ceremony he was given priesthood keys that gave him "patriarchal" authority over her.

From the mid-1840s to the present time, the official ideological position of the Mormon church has been that a fundamental aspect of the patriarchal order consists in the jurisdiction that husbands have over their wives. Justifications for this state of affairs have remained fairly constant: (1) men hold the priesthood while women can participate in the blessings of the priesthood by following their husband's directions; (2) this situation will create an organic bond conducive to harmony and amity by men attempting to be righteous leaders and wives righteous followers; and (3) the asymmetrical relationship thus produced is one element in a divine pattern that existed in heaven, was established on earth in the days of Adam, and will be perpetuated eternally in the celestial kingdom. While these premises have remained constant, some development has occurred. The main modification has been an increased emphasis that men should not attempt to force their wills upon their wives, but should rather endeavor to reach a condition of mutual agreement before making the final decision.

Representative statements from different time periods should illustrate the manner in which the Mormon church has sought to define the proper husband-wife relationship. In April of 1845 Brigham Young declared:

As no man can be perfect without the woman, so no woman can be perfect without a man to lead her, I tell you the truth as it is in the bosom of eternity; and I say so to every man upon the face of the earth; if he wishes to be saved he cannot be saved without a woman by his side.

Lest these my sisters should think I give power into the hands of their husbands to abuse them, I would say there is no man has a right to govern his wife and family unless he does it after the order of the church of Christ, unless he does it upon this principle he need not expect to receive a celestial glory. He that does not govern as Jesus governs his church, breaks his bonds and solemn obligations to his family.

With regards to the laws of the celestial kingdom, I say it always was, and is, and always will be a system of beauty and order.

Thus let every person stand in their own order, and do that which belongs to them to do, that there may be no confusion, but
let order and beauty be the characteristics of this people. (TS 6:955)

In December of the same year Heber C. Kimball (ms b, 20 Dec. 1845) counseled Mormons who had received their endowments in the Nauvoo Temple about "the necessity of women being in subjection to their husbands." He then went on to illustrate the proper husband-wife relationship that should prevail among properly ordered Saints by stating, "I am subject to my God, my wife is in subjection to me and will reverence me in my place and I will make her happy."

In 1853 Parley P. Pratt wrote:

The husband is the head of the family, and it is his duty to govern his wife or wives and children according to the law of righteousness; and it is the duty of his wives to be subject unto him in all things even as the church is subject unto Christ. This is clearly revealed in the declaration of the Lord to Eve immediately after the fall. . . . This divine institution in the order of family government was intended as an everlasting order to be continued in all generations. (Seer 1:143)

In 1857 Orson Hyde stated:

The order of heaven places man in the front rank. . . . Woman follows under the protection of his counsels, and the superior strength of his arm. Her desire should be unto her husband, and he should rule over her. I will here venture the assertion, that no man can be exalted to a celestial glory in the kingdom of God whose wife rules over him; and . . . it follows as a matter of course that the woman who rules over her husband thereby deprives herself of a celestial glory." (JD 4:258)

Joseph F. Smith, who became president of the Church in 1901, was to declare in 1902 that

The patriarchal order is of divine origin and will continue throughout time and eternity. . . . In the home the presiding authority is always vested in the father, and in all home affairs and family matters there is no other authority paramount. . . . Wives and children should be taught to feel that the patriarchal order in the kingdom of God has been established for a wise and beneficent purpose, and should sustain the head of the household and encourage him in the discharge of his duties, and do all in their power to aid him in the exercise of the rights and privileges which God has bestowed upon the head of the home." (Juvenile Instructor 37:148)

In the 1930s the leadership of the Church had Apostle John A. Widtsoe (1939:80-81) write a handbook dealing with Church
administration. Under the heading "the organization of the family" he wrote:

The family . . . must be organized, else chaos results. Just as there is but one Priesthood, but many offices in it, so every member of the family circle has equal claims upon the blessings of the home, but is assigned different tasks in connection with family life.

There must be a presiding authority in the family. The father is the head or president, or spokesman of the family. . . . A home, as viewed by the Church, is composed of a family group, so organized as to be presided over by the father, under the authority and in the spirit of the priesthood conferred upon him. The position which men occupy in the family, and especially those who hold the Melchizedek Priesthood, is one of first importance and should be clearly recognized and maintained in the order and with the authority which God conferred upon man in placing him at the head of his household.

Spencer W. Kimball, who became president of the Church in 1973, wrote in 1975 that

A woman need have no fear of being imposed upon or of any dictatorial measures or of any improper demands when the husband is self-sacrificing and worthy. Certainly no intelligent woman would hesitate to give submission to her own truly righteous husband in everything. We are sometimes shocked to see the wife take over the leadership, naming the one to pray, the place to be, the things to do. (Ensign 5:1:5)

And Dean L. Larsen, a member of the Church's First Quorum of Seventy, in September 1982 indicated that

In the Lord's system of government, every organizational unit must have a presiding officer. He has decreed that in the family organization the father assumes this role. He bears the priesthood ordination. He is accountable before the Lord for this leadership.

While the sealing between husband and wife is designed to exist eternally, this relationship can be terminated by action of the president of the Church. Such cancellations currently are difficult to obtain and are generally only granted when one of the parties is guilty of serious transgression.
Parent-child
Born in the covenant

Within the patriarchal order there are two covenantal parent-child relationships: (1) that which occurs when a child is born in the covenant; and (2) that which occurs when a child is not born in the covenant but is subsequently sealed to parents. As has already been stated, a child born to a man and woman after they have established an eternal marital relationship is said to be "born in the covenant." An individual born in such circumstances is automatically sealed to his parents and will be linked to them throughout eternity. By "birthright" such an individual is entitled to the blessings associated with the Abrahamic covenant.

The relationship between a child born in the covenant and his parents contains aspects from both the order of nature and the order of law. Like the parent-child relationship in the Puritan covenantal system, it is the only explicit covenantal relationship within the patriarchal order that involves the order of nature.

Parent-child relationship. Except for the belief that at some point in fetal development a preexistently created spirit entity is somehow combined with the physical body, Mormons have the same understanding of the procreative process as other Americans. Despite this perception, for a child to be born in the covenant, it is essential that he share biological substance with the mother, but not with the father to whom he is sealed. Perhaps the best way to understand this is from the perspective of the marriage covenant. When a man is sealed to a woman, he acquires eternal jurisdiction over her offspring as well as over her as an individual. Employing current anthropological terminology, it might be said that as an aspect of the marriage covenant a man acquires both rights in genetricem and rights in uxorem over his wife (see Mair 1965:83-84).

This can be illustrated in various ways. First, according to Mormon belief, if a couple are sealed and the man dies, all children that the woman might have through union with a subsequent husband are born in the covenant to her and her first husband. The first husband...
will thus be their father in the celestial kingdom. As Orson Pratt explained, the second husband

is obliged to enter into a covenant to deliver her up with all her children to her deceased husband in the morning of the first resurrection. In this case, the second husband would have no wife, only for time, neither could he retain his children in the eternal worlds, for they, according to the law of Heaven, would be given up to the wife and her first husband. (Seer 1:142)

The first marriage of this type appears to have been between Mercy R. Thompson and Hyrum Smith, older brother of the Prophet Joseph (Ehat 1982:63). According to Mercy's account, at the time of this marriage, Hyrum was placed under "covenant to deliver me up in the morning of the resurrection to Robert Blaskel Thompson [her first husband], with whatever offspring should be the result of that union" (Jenson 1887:22). Following the death of Joseph Smith, leading Mormon elders married various of his widows with the expectation that in so doing they would be "raising up seed" to their fallen leader. Lucy Walker Kimball (ms a), one of Joseph Smith's plural wives, thus relates:

On the 8th of February, 1845 I was married for time to President Heber C. Kimball, and bore to him nine children. And in this connection allow me to say to his everlasting credit, that during the whole of my married life with him he never failed to regard me as the wife for eternity of his devoted friend, the Prophet Joseph Smith.

After the Mormons settled in Utah the practice of marrying women "for time" in order to "raise up seed" to their deceased husbands continued. Indeed for a time Church leaders taught that it was a man's religious duty to marry his brother's widow in order to ensure him posterity (see JD 26:16, 171-72; Cannon, Abraham, ms a, 5 Apr. 1894). At the present time there are large numbers of Mormon men married for time to women who are sealed for eternity to husbands who have died. It is still taught and believed that the offspring of such unions will belong to the first husband when the patriarchal order is established in the celestial kingdom.

Second, it is possible for an individual to be regarded as the child of a man with whom his mother has never had sexual intercourse and to whom she was never married while he was alive. As has already
been indicated, during the nineteenth century many women were sealed as wives to deceased men although they had never been married to them. While they were alive various of these women were also married to living men for mortal existence only. According to Mormon belief, the offspring of such a union would be children of the man to whom the mother was sealed for eternity. The most notable example of this kind is that of Heber J. Grant, who served as president of the Church from 1918 to 1945. After his mother, Rachel Ivins, migrated to Utah in 1853, she was sealed for eternity as a wife to the now deceased Joseph Smith and married "for time" to Jedediah M. Grant, a counselor to Brigham Young. Her son Heber, born the next year, was regarded both by himself and by others as a son of Joseph Smith. For example, in 1894 he indicated that it had been "revealed to him . . . that he was called to be an apostle because his father according to the flesh, J.M. Grant [who had died shortly after his birth] and the prophet Joseph, to whom he rightfully belonged, had requested it" (Cannon, Abraham H., ms a, 5 Apr. 1894). In the official history of the Church, published in 1930, Mormon historian B.H. Roberts (1957 6:484) explained the relationship of Heber J. Grant to Joseph Smith as follows. Rachel Ivins was sealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith as his wife for eternity; but was married "for time" to Jedediah M. Grant. . . .

Under the principles of this new marriage system . . . the offspring of these "for time" marriages are recognized as members of the families of those to whom the mothers are married eternally. Hence, though President Heber J. Grant as a fact, and by the "for time" marriage is the son of Jedediah M. Grant, in reality, now and eternally, he is and will be a member of the family of Joseph Smith, the Prophet of the New Dispensation, his son! And such he is now. So it comes to pass that with the close of the first century of organized existence of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and at the beginning of the second century of that existence, the church has a president who is the son of the Prophet of God who was the first president of the church one hundred years ago.

And third, it is possible for an individual born in the covenant to inherit genetic substance from a genitor to whom his mother has been married neither for time nor for eternity. Three examples will illustrate ways in which this might occur. The first involves the issue of rape or adultery. In 1851 considerable
attention was focused upon the murder trial of Howard Egan (Deseret News, 15 Nov. 1851; JD 1:95-103). Egan had returned from an extended trip to California to discover that a wife to whom he had been matrimonially sealed had given birth to a son as a consequence of having been seduced by one James Monroe. In retribution Egan killed Monroe. The issue was later raised regarding the status of the child. Given the circumstances, had he been born in the covenant to Egan and his wife? This was answered in the affirmative in 1894 when the First Presidency of the Church authoritatively declared that he "belongs to Howard Egan, by virtue of the mother being Howard Egan's sealed wife." A more problematic case involves the theoretical possibility of a man appropriately acting as genitor in behalf of an infertile Mormon male who has been matrimonially sealed. Apparently in response to this issue Brigham Young wrote the following to a woman who had solicited his confidential advice:

In reply to your letter of 22nd Feb'y. I say, it will be well enough with you and your husband in the eternities, if you do right in time: see what is said of them that become eunuchs for the gospel's sake, and the promises made to them: if I was imperfect and had a good wife I would call on some good bror. to help me. that we might have increase; that a man of this character will have a place in the Temple, receive his endowments and in eternity will be as tho' nothing had happened to him in time.

Thus you see your position is good enough, if you are mutually satisfied & will do right. (Young, Brigham, ms b)

Although the letter might not actually be suggesting what it seems to imply and it is unclear whether or not the advice was ever carried out (see Foster 1981:312 note 132), a somewhat similar issue has more recently been raised with the development of artificial insemination. In April of 1977 the First Presidency of the Church issued the following statement on this subject:

The Church discourages artificial insemination with other than the semen of the husband. Artificial insemination with semen other than the husband may produce problems related to family harmony. The Church recognizes that this is a personal matter which must ultimately be left to the determination of the husband and wife with the responsibility for their decision resting solely upon them.

A child born by means of artificial insemination after parents are sealed in the temple is born in the covenant. A child born by
artificial insemination before parents are sealed may be sealed subsequent to the sealing of parents. (Bush 1979:101)

These examples amply illustrate that when an individual is born in the covenant, it is irrelevant whether or not he shares genetic substance with his pater. What then is the basis of their relationship? The answer seems to be that it is the same as that which binds the wife to her husband: patriarchal priesthood authority, an aspect of the suborder of divine law. A child born in the covenant, on the other hand, always shares genetic substance with its mother. His relationship to her is thus an aspect of the order of nature. It may thus be concluded that the act of being born in the covenant includes elements from both the order of law and the order of nature.

The sex dichotomy and the parent-child bond. This duality provides a conceptual basis for the Mormon understanding of the sex dichotomy. Mormon leaders often present priesthood and motherhood as complementary terms. Thus after stating that only men are to be ordained to the priesthood, John A. Widtsoe (1939:84) rhetorically asks:

Why should God give His sons a power that is denied His daughters? . . .

This division of responsibility is for a wise and noble purpose. Our Father in Heaven has bestowed upon His daughters a gift of equal importance and power, which gift, if exercised in its fulness, will occupy their entire life on earth so that they can have no possible longing for that which they do not possess. The 'gift' referred to is that of motherhood—the noblest, most soul-satisfying of all earthly experiences.

Declared Neal A. Maxwell in 1978: "We know so little . . . about the reasons for the division of duties between womanhood and manhood as well as between motherhood and priesthood. These were divinely determined in another time and another place" (Ensign 8:5:10).

And Gordon B. Hinkley was to state in September of 1983:

Priesthood is the power by which God works through us as men. . . . Motherhood is the means by which God carries forward his grand design of continuity of the race. Both priesthood and motherhood are essentials of the plan of the Lord.
Each complements the other. Each is needed by the other. God has created us male and female, each unique in his or her individual capacities and potential. (Ensign 13:11:83-84)

The relationship of the father to his children is conceptualized in much the same terms as the relationship of the husband to his wife: he is to exercise authoritative leadership by virtue of the patriarchal priesthood that he holds. The 1978-79 study manual for Melchizedek Priesthood holders thus contains the following instructions:

Fatherhood is leadership, the most important kind of leadership. It has always been so; it always will be so. Father, with the assistance and counsel and encouragement of your eternal companion, you preside in the home. It is not a matter of whether you are most worthy or best qualified, but it is a matter of law and appointment. You preside at the meal table, at family prayer. You preside at family home evening; and as guided by the Spirit of the Lord, you see that your children are taught correct principles. It is your place to give direction to all of family life.

A righteous husband and father exercises spiritual leadership in the same way that he performs all his priesthood responsibilities. (Prepare Ye the Way of the Lord 1978:9)

All the duties of motherhood, on the other hand, in one way or another are associated with the giving of substance. First, consistent with the belief that for a child to be born in the covenant it is essential that he share substance with his mother but not his father, mothers are regarded as procreators. Some statements indeed almost make it appear that the father has no role in the procreative process. Apostle N. Eldon Tanner (1979:4) thus recently wrote:

From the beginning God has made it clear that woman is very special, and he has also very clearly defined her position, her duties, and her destiny in the divine plan. One of her greatest privileges, blessings, and opportunities is to be a co-partner with God in bringing his spirit children into the world.

Apostle David B. Haight (1979:13-14) has said essentially the same thing:

The stewardships assigned to man and woman are part of God's eternal plan to prepare us for godhood, and we cannot disregard them without risking our positions in that plan. Adam received his responsibility to be father of the human race and to wrest from the earth that which was needed for his family's temporal
existence. Eve also received her responsibility: to bring sons and daughters into this world, to be "the mother of all living."

Since the dawn of creation no aspect of woman's life compares with her divine appointment to be the vessel for the physical birth of a child who has been nurtured within her.

And second, she is to give spiritual substance to those children once they are born. As Brigham Young declared in 1852:

If your children do not receive impressions of true piety, virtue, tenderness, and every principle of the holy Gospel, you may be assured that their sins will not be required at the hands of the father, but of the mother. Lay it to heart, ye mothers, for it will unavoidably be so. The duty of the mother is to watch over her children, and give them their early education, for impressions received in infancy are lasting. . . . It is the experience of people generally, that what they imbibe from their mothers in infancy, is the most lasting upon the mind through life. This is natural, it is reasonable, it is right. . . . The child reposes implicit confidence in the mother, you behold in him a natural attachment, no matter what her appearance may be, that makes him think his mother is the best and handsomest mother in the world. . . . If children are not taught by their mothers, in the days of their youth, to revere and follow the counsels of their fathers, it will be hard indeed for the father ever to control them. (JD 1:67-68)

Heber J. Grant (1942:152) felt that mothers possessed an innate ability to influence their children for good: "There seems to be a power which the mother possesses in shaping the life of the child that is far superior, in my judgment, to the power of the father. . . . A mother's love seems to be the most perfect and the most sincere, the strongest of any love we know anything about." And David O. McKay (1953:453), who was president of the Church from 1951 to 1970, held that "motherhood consists of three principal attributes or qualities: namely, (1) the power to bear, (2) the ability to rear, and (3) the gift to love." David Schneider (1968:35) has argued that among Americans in general the mother is regarded as naturally more endowed to nurture and care for the child than the father. It is likely that this belief is intensified among Mormons through the concept of being born in the covenant, which identifies the child's tie with the father in terms of priesthood authority and with the mother in terms of biological substance.
Adoptive sealing

When a child is born to a man and woman who have not been sealed in the new and everlasting covenant of marriage, he is not born in the covenant. He consequently will not automatically have the relationship of a child to those individuals after they are all dead. In order to ensure his proper place in the patriarchal order, it is essential that he be sealed as a child to a man and woman who have been sealed together eternally as husband and wife. He can thus be lineally sealed to his biological parents if they are matrimonially sealed after his birth. Or he can be lineally sealed to a couple so married who are not his biological parents. Likewise, he can be sealed to one biological parent and one individual who is not his biological parent if these have happened to be matrimonially sealed to each other. He cannot be lineally sealed to just one individual; he must be sealed simultaneously to both a father and a mother. One or both of these parents, however, can be dead. As in the case with matrimonial sealing, proxies can take the part of deceased individuals.

During the nineteenth century this ritual was generally referred to as "adoption" whether the individual was sealed to his biological parents or to individuals to whom he had no biological relationship. Wilford Woodruff thus records in his journal that in a sealing ceremony in the St. George Temple he was "adopted to his [biological] father, Aphek Woodruff" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 13 Apr. 1877). At the present time this ritual is simply referred to as "sealing." For the sake of clarity it will here be termed "adoptive sealing" to distinguish it from "being born in the covenant," the other form that lineal sealing can take.

It is believed that an individual so adopted has essentially the same rights and duties within the patriarchal order as an individual born in the covenant. An adoptive sealing, however, is not as absolute as being born in the covenant. Under certain circumstances an adoptive sealing can be "cancelled" by proper priesthood authority. This, however, cannot occur with the sealing relationship created by being born in the covenant.
Master-servant

In the 1843 revelation on eternal marriage, the point is established that individuals who have not been married for eternity but who are otherwise worthy of admittance to the celestial kingdom shall become "ministering servants":

Therefore, if a man marry him a wife in the world, and he marry her not by me nor by my word . . . their covenant and marriage are not of force when they are dead . . . Therefore, when they are out of the world they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are appointed angels in heaven, which angels are ministering servants, to minister for those who are worthy of a far more and exceeding, and an eternal weight of glory. (DC 132:15-16)

The revelation does not specify what the actual relationship of such "ministering servants" will be to those who have established eternal marriages. By the mid-1850s, however, Parley P. Pratt (1855:173) was writing that their position vis-à-vis the patriarchal family of heaven would be somewhat akin to that of domestic servants to an aristocratic nineteenth-century American family:

All persons who attain to the resurrection, and to salvation, without these eternal ordinances, or sealing covenants, will remain in a single state, in their saved condition, to all eternity, without the joys of eternal union with the other sex, and consequently without a crown, without a kingdom, without the power to increase.

Hence, they are angels, and are not gods; and are ministering spirits, or servants, in the employ and under the direction of THE ROYAL FAMILY OF HEAVEN--THE PRINCES; KINGS, AND PRIESTS OF ETERNITY.

By 1857 at least some Mormons evidently believed that such persons would be attached as servants to particular individuals within the "royal family." Thus in October of that year, while discussing the dependency of women upon men for salvation, Erastus Snow declared that "no woman will get into the celestial kingdom, except her husband receive her, if she is worthy to have a husband; and if not, somebody will receive her as a servant" (JD 5:291).

Brigham Young appears to have had a similar conception of that of Parley P. Pratt and Erastus Snow. Peter Hansen (ms a) records a discourse given by Brigham Young sometime in 1868-69 in which he said
that "the mechanic or merchant who instead of working for the kingdom of God sought to aggrandize himself could never enter into the celestial kingdom, unless some other faithful man would take him by the hand and ask permission to take him in with him as a servant." And in 1873, when addressing women who were reluctant to be matrimonially sealed, he stated:

Now, sisters, do not say, "I do not want a husband when I get up in the resurrection." You do not know what you want. I tell this so that you can get the idea. If in the resurrection you really want to be single and alone, and live so forever and ever, and be made servants, while others receive the highest order of intelligence and are bringing worlds into existence, you can have the privilege. They who will be exalted cannot perform all the labor, they must have servants and you can be servants to them. (JD 16:167)

While some nineteenth-century Mormons thus believed that the exalted in the celestial kingdom would have servants, there is only one known instance when the attempt was made to establish such a relationship. As has already been stated, the Mormon church had established the policy that Negroes could not be ordained to the priesthood, receive their endowments, or be sealed as husbands, wives, and children. This, however, did not prevent black members from wanting to participate in these ordinances. Jane Elizabeth Manning James, a devoted Negro member, repeatedly petitioned the leaders of the Church that she be permitted to receive her endowments, be sealed to her husband, and have their children sealed to them. Such requests were denied. But in 1894 the First Presidency of the Church decided that "under the circumstances it would be proper to permit her to go to the temple to be adopted to the Prophet Joseph Smith as his servant and this was done" (Council Minutes, 26 Aug. 1908; also 2 Jan. 1902). As a result, by the authority of the priesthood she was pronounced "a Servitor to the Prophet Joseph Smith . . . and to his household for all eternity."

From the data available, it is unclear whether this unique ritual should properly be termed a "sealing" ordinance. Like both matrimonial and adoptive sealing, its ostensive purpose appears to have been the establishment of an eternally enduring relationship. And the same term was used to describe this ritual as the ordinance
that unites child to parents. She was thus "adopted to the Prophet Joseph Smith." It thus appears to be in the same class of rituals as sealings, and will here be regarded as a sealing.

Patriarchal Order Relationships Compared to Puritan Domestic Organization

In terms of the different types of relationships established by explicit covenant, the patriarchal order is much reduced from the Puritan covenant system. Whereas the Puritan system involves various relationships within the household, church, and state, all patriarchal order relationships are at least ostensibly domestic in nature. There are thus three basic relationships within the system: husband-wife, parent-child, and master-servant. If the role of parent is differentiated according to sex, then there are a total of four. Since only one master-servant relationship has been established in the entire development of the system, however, it might be regarded as irrelevant for the existent patriarchal order.

Relationships within the patriarchal order are essentially the same as those found in the Puritan household and in the Mormon domestic organization of the 1830s. Neither of these facts should be particularly surprising since they are also the same as those that characterized general American domestic organization in the years during which the patriarchal order was being developed. What is interesting about the patriarchal order is the manner in which such relationships have been utilized for the creation and preservation of Mormon group identity and solidarity. Two basic aspects of such relationships might be seen as primarily responsible for this phenomenon.

Nature and law

First, within the context of the patriarchal order, aspects of nature and law associated with Mormon group identity are fused with aspects of nature and law within kinship per se. Such a development is not unique to Mormonism. As has already been seen, Puritans believed holiness to be an aspect of the order of nature and held that
federal holiness could be transmitted from parents to children as a type of hereditary charisma. By being born in the covenant an individual was regarded as at least partially religiously qualified, and upon this principle elect families could be distinguished from those that were outside the pale of the covenant of grace.

The Mormon relationship between religious identity and kinship is more complex. The relationship of an individual Saint to the Mormon group and of a child born in the covenant to his parents are conceptualized in almost identical terms. Both involve a similar interrelationship between the orders of law and nature. The group relationship established through the baptismal covenant and the father-child relationship both involve solidarity based upon priesthood authority. When an individual is baptized into the Church he is placed under covenant to obey the rules established by the priesthood leadership of the Church. His ability to identify himself with the Mormon group is in part a function of his ability to comply with those rules. Thus if he is judged to have broken his covenants he may be excommunicated from the Church and separated from the Mormon group. A child born in the covenant is likewise bound to his father by priesthood authority. The father is expected to regulate the conduct of the child in a way analogous to the manner in which the leaders of the Church regulate the conduct of individual Church members. If the child fails to follow the rules and regulations of his father, he may expect that in the next life the relationship between him and his father will be terminated and he will consequently find himself outside the patriarchal order. The group relationship based upon the concept of putative Abrahamic descent and the mother-child bond are likewise intimately connected. Both involve the establishment of unity and identity through the sharing of biological substance. Indeed it is the same substance that the child has received from his mother that he likewise shares as a descendant of Abraham with the rest of the Mormon house of Israel. For a Mormon born in the covenant there is no identifiable point at which kinship identity stops and Mormon group identity begins. Both are part of the same totality.
Organic solidarity and social hierarchy

As discussed in chapter 2, relationships within Puritan covenant organization were based upon two general concepts: (1) the Ramist relate and (2) the medieval concept of hierarchy. The Ramist relate was an "affirmative contrary." As such it could not exist independent of its paired opposite. In Puritan society this translated into the belief that each individual must occupy a well-defined social position in which he stood in actual relationship to someone to whom he was seen as a "relate." Thus there could not be ministers without congregations, and each individual was expected to be part of a domestic unit in which he was properly related to other individuals. In the Holy Commonwealth there were to be no citizens at large. This situation created ready-made bonds of organic solidarity. All relationships were theoretically hierarchically ordered. Thus the minister was over the congregation, the husband over the wife, and the parent over the child. Much of the solidarity of Puritan social organization might be regarded as a consequence of these two formal principles that underlay its development.

These same formal principles underlie the Mormon patriarchal order. Since the formal relationships within that order are the same as those found in Puritan domestic organization, it is not surprising that they fit the formal definition of the Ramist relate. The similarity, however, goes deeper than this. Within the patriarchal order it is deemed essential that each individual be bound by explicit covenant to other individuals to whom he stands as a relate. A fully qualified member of the order must therefore simultaneously be sealed as a child to a mother and a father, as a spouse to either a husband or wife, and as a parent to at least one child. If any of these conditions is not met, the individual is in an anomalous position within the order. There are no members at large. Each must be sealed to someone. Even to conceptualize "ministering servants" as in some sense part of the order, in nineteenth-century Mormonism it was assumed that they were servants to someone.

Likewise, the various relationships are all hierarchically ordered. The central authority figure is that of the husband/father.
The wife and child are formally subordinate to him. Any attempt to change this situation is regarded as contrary to the order of heaven. No husband/father, however, has independent authority. Each must be sealed to a father who in turn has authority over him. Thus the chain is assumed to extend back to Adam, who is under the jurisdiction of God, his father. But even God occupies the same relationship to the God who is his father. And beyond that the hierarchy is assumed to extend back infinitely.

Such elements have contributed to a complex social network that has had far-reaching consequences for Mormon group identity and solidarity. In order to understand how it has actually operated, however, it is necessary to analyze both how it has been controlled and regulated by the Mormon hierocracy and how such regulations have changed within the context of different social circumstances. It is the leaders of the hierocracy who hold the "keys" relating to the development and organization of the order. The patriarchal order might therefore be regarded as being encompassed by the hierocracy and its development analyzed in terms of changes in the pattern of encompassment. This issue will be discussed at length in the next two chapters.
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CHAPTER VI

THE PATRIARCHAL ORDER AND MORMON GROUP COHESION:

THE NAUVOO PERIOD

I would advise all the Saints to go to with their might and gather together all their living relatives to this place, that they may be sealed and saved, that they may be prepared against the day that the destroying angel goes forth; . . . and my only trouble at the present time is . . . that the Saints will be divided, broken up, and scattered, before we get our salvation secure. --Joseph Smith (HC 6:184)

The patriarchal order might be regarded as a mechanism for the maintenance of Mormon group identity and solidarity. It defines the boundaries of the religiously qualified Mormon community. Through acceptance of the identity believed to characterize members of the order, including Abrahamic descent and association with Adam's "righteous posterity," a believing Mormon is given the means to express his distinctiveness from the rest of mankind. And through the network of relationships that form the basis of the order, the same Mormon is linked both to other Mormons as fellow members of the order and to the hierocracy who supervise the conduct of individual participants in the order and regulate the expansion and development of the order as a whole.

Central to the manner in which the patriarchal order maintains Mormon group cohesion is the process of encompassment. As employed in this dissertation, 'encompassment' denotes the structural relationship in terms of which one aspect of a covenantal system is integrated with a more general aspect. Chapter 2 presented an analysis of the manner in which the Puritan household was encompassed by the church congregation and the church congregation in turn by the state. Through such a process the covenantal system of the Holy Commonwealth
became essentially an integrated unity. In chapter 4 mention was made of the manner in which the covenantal order, resulting from the implementation of the law of consecration and stewardship, was encompassed by the hierocracy. This was achieved primarily through the consecration and stewardship covenants that established a reciprocal relationship between the household head and the bishop acting as the agent of the hierocracy. Through such a relationship the individual households within the consecration community came under the jurisdiction and supervision of the hierocracy. One consequence of this was that the locus of power within the Church at large (as conceptualized in the priesthood keys monopolized by the president of the Church) likewise became the locus of power for the more restricted consecration community. The result was an integrated and unified system. Likewise the process of encompassment has been essential for the integration of the various formal aspects of post-Missouri Mormon group organization. As was the case during the years when the attempt was being made to implement the law of consecration and stewardship, the relationship between the household head and the hierocracy is of fundamental importance. And, as with this earlier covenantal system, the locus of power both within the Church at large and within the patriarchal order in particular is centered in the priesthood keys monopolized by the president of the Church.

The basic pattern of encompassment that has emerged in the post-Missouri period can perhaps best be understood when it is recognized that the patriarchal order's relationship to the Mormon hierocracy presupposes the existence of two centers or loci of power: one theoretical and the other pragmatic. Theoretical power centers in Adam and the priesthood keys that he monopolizes as the presiding patriarch of the human family. When the patriarchal order is established in its perfection in the celestial kingdom, Mormons believe that this power will pass by patriarchal succession from Adam to his righteous male descendants. By virtue of this delegated patriarchal authority, each man will be empowered to govern the wives and children under his jurisdiction. Pragmatic power, on the other hand, centers in the living president of the Church and the priesthood keys that he monopolizes as the temporary presiding high priest of the
visible Mormon kingdom. It is only by virtue of this power that sealing relationships can be established and dissolved. And it is through the portion of this power that has been delegated to Mormon males that they are regarded by the Church as religiously qualified to preside over the wives and children that have been sealed to them. Thus, because priesthood power is perceived as having two centers, at the same time Mormons are attempting to link themselves with Adam, they are also subordinating themselves to the authority structure of the Church as this is manifest in the hierocracy.

The relationship between the patriarchal order and Mormon ecclesiastical organization might best be understood if it is assumed that in the course of the Restoration, Joseph Smith received two sets of priesthood keys. With the first he organized the ecclesiastical system patterned upon the basis of its hierarchical structure of church positions and callings. With the second he established the patriarchal order based on the concept of patriarchal priesthood and the network of relationships forged through the enactment of sealing rituals. Both sets of keys continue to be monopolized by the president of the Church at the apex of the hierocracy.

In a certain sense the patriarchal order and the ecclesiastical organization might be regarded as discrete organizational systems in which essentially the same individuals are related on the basis of different principles. Ordinances associated with the patriarchal order do not confer ecclesiastical position, and (except for the prerequisite that adult males be ordained to the Melchizedek Priesthood) no ecclesiastical position is regarded as necessary for participation in sealing, endowment, and second anointing rituals. Despite this apparent cleavage, the patriarchal order and the ecclesiastical organization are in reality part of a single system. What unites them is the concept of priesthood power. It is thus only by virtue of the priesthood power monopolized by the president of the Church that both ecclesiastical positions are staffed and rituals associated with the patriarchal order are performed. And the same priesthood ordination that ensures the Mormon male a presiding position within his individual family kingdom, gives him access to various ecclesiastical callings and provides him with at
least a nominal place within the hierocracy. By simultaneously occupying all three positions, he becomes the principal link that unites the patriarchal order, the ecclesiastical organization, and the hierocracy. Since it is high officials within the hierocracy that regulate both the patriarchal order and the ecclesiastical system, both might be said to be encompassed by it. As a result all aspects of formal Mormon group organization are part of a unified and integrated whole.

The patriarchal order is not a stagnant system. Over the years it has experienced significant changes. Many such modifications have been the result of policy decisions by high hierocratic officials regarding qualifications for participation in ordinances and regulations governing covenantal relationships. Since the patriarchal order binds participants together in a complex social network, such changes have had important consequences for Mormon group cohesion. Many such modifications have occurred at important junctures in the internal development of the Mormon group and its external relationship to American society. As a result, it is possible to examine the possible consequences that such changes have had for the evolution of Mormon group solidarity.

While affecting Mormon group cohesiveness as a whole, most of these changes have had consequences both for aspects of Mormon familial organization and for the relationship between the individual Mormon family and the hierocracy. While both of these issues will be discussed at length in the following pages, consideration of the following points will here give some general understanding of the manner in which decisions by the hierocracy can have consequences for the individual Mormon family. First, permission must be received from recognized leaders within the hierocracy before an individual can participate in eternal marriage and other rituals associated with the patriarchal order. Second, ordinances essential for the formation of the patriarchal order, including eternal marriage, must be performed under the close supervision of individuals who have received authorization from officials in the hierocracy. Third, statements by individuals high in the hierocracy are regarded as authoritative pronouncements regarding the code of conduct that Mormons must adhere
to if the familial ties they have established in this life are to be perpetuated after death. Such statements often focus on various aspects of family life. And fourth, if an individual is excommunicated from the Church he automatically loses his position in the patriarchal order, including the sealing ties that are to link him with other family members after death. The only way he can regain his position and reestablish his former sealing ties is by first being rebaptized into the Church and then (at some later date) having his rights within the patriarchal order "restored" through personal action by a high hierocratic official.

Most of the modifications that have occurred in the ordering of the patriarchal order have in one way or another been issues concerning the distribution of power and the pattern of encompassment. As a result, much of the following analysis will focus on the manner in which changes in the distribution of power and the pattern of encompassment have affected the relationship between the hierocracy and the individual Mormon family and the consequence that such conditions have had for the development of cohesiveness within the Mormon group as a whole.

To facilitate analysis, various Mormon families will be examined over an extended period of time. Attention will be focused on the family life of five men: Heber C. Kimball; Daniel Davis; Peter O. Hansen; Joseph Hovey; and David Candland. These men have been selected for various reasons. First, considerable information has been preserved on the domestic practices of each. Second, when taken together, their lives illustrate many of the important aspects of nineteenth-century Mormon patriarchal organization. Heber C. Kimball was one of the most prominent of nineteenth-century Mormon leaders; and as the husband of some forty-three wives by whom he fathered sixty-five children, he might arguably be regarded as the Mormon patriarch par excellence. The other four men, on the other hand, lived in relative obscurity. If they had not written personal accounts of their life experiences, little would be known about them today. And third, these last four men were all sealed as adopted sons to Heber C. Kimball shortly before the Mormon exodus from Nauvoo. Data available on their lives provides vital information on this
important but little-known aspect of early Mormon patriarchal organization.

The remainder of this chapter will be concerned with the relationship between Mormon group cohesiveness and the patriarchal order during the Nauvoo period. Chapter 7 will deal with the same topic subsequent to the abandonment of Nauvoo. The lives of Heber C. Kimball, Daniel Davis, Peter O. Hansen, Joseph Hovey, and David Candland will be employed to illustrate important points in both chapters.

**Nauvoo before the Martyrdom**

For various reasons the development of the patriarchal order prior to the murder of Joseph Smith is difficult to reconstruct. Eternal marriage, the endowment, and the second anointing were administered secretly to a chosen few while the rank and file membership of the Church were not aware that these rituals were being practiced. Joseph Smith publicly did make reference to these ordinances, but his statements were general and often evasive. For example, William Clayton (1982:48) records in his journal that in a public discourse delivered 16 July 1843 Joseph Smith "showed that a man must enter into an everlasting covenant with his wife in this world or he will have no claim on her in the next. He said that he could not reveal the fulness of these things until the Temple is completed &c." While there is good indication that Joseph Smith spent a great deal of time discussing the significance of the new rituals to those who received them, it is not clear either how much they understood what he was attempting to say, or how much they agreed among themselves regarding their significance. Thus in February 1847, Brigham Young related that "Br. Joseph said he had taught the Twelve all that he knew concerning the kingdom but the difficulty was they could not remember it as he told them, but when it was necessary they would not be at a loss for understanding" (Woodruff, Wilford ms a, 16 Feb. 1847).

In order to reconstruct the order's development during this period it is necessary to rely heavily on rather general statements in
public discourses, on often cryptic comments in private journals and correspondence of participants in the order's rituals, or on reminiscence often made years later. Much of what transpired during this period will never be known, and the data at hand is susceptible to various interpretations. That which is written on the subject consequently remains tentative and subject to modification as more information becomes available.

The Response of the Nauvoo Saints to Insecurity

One way in which to examine the development of the patriarchal order during this period is from the perspective of the Mormon group's relationship to the surrounding society. The concluding section of chapter 4 discussed the various factors that resulted in the disruption of the group covenant organization that the Saints had attempted to implement during the 1830s. In the beginning paragraphs of chapter 5, it was suggested that the emergence of the patriarchal order might be interpreted as an attempt to establish a form of group covenant organization that replaced territoriality and economic cooperation with kinship as the basis for solidarity. It thus eliminated two of the chief elements of the earlier system that had resulted in its disintegration. What followed was a detailed examination of the basic aspects of the patriarchal order. While this analysis has shown that this covenantal system significantly modified important aspects of Mormon group identity and solidarity, the reasons why the order evolved in the manner that it did cannot be properly assessed without reference to the Nauvoo Mormons' relationship to the larger society of which they were a part.

While Mormon-Gentile conflicts in Missouri revolved around territorial control and economic cooperation, at its root the problem was one of individualism versus group solidarity. This issue was not resolved with the issuance of Boggs' extermination order, and the struggle continued after the Mormons had crossed the Mississippi River into Illinois in the winter of 1838-39.
The Nauvoo Charter

Once situated in Nauvoo, Joseph Smith and other leading Mormons evidently concluded that the best security against a repetition of the mobbings and persecutions that had characterized their sojourn in Missouri was an intensification of the political and military control that they had tenuously grasped while residents of Caldwell County, Missouri. They envisioned for themselves a semi-autonomous city-state, only nominally subordinate to the state of Illinois, and within whose boundaries they would be essentially free to enact their own laws, maintain their own judiciary, and establish their own military. They came to feel that the legal authority to pursue such ends was granted to them by the Nauvoo Charter.

Passed by the state legislature in December of 1840, the Nauvoo Charter was similar in most respects to the Springville Charter that had been approved by the same body the previous year (Flanders 1965:97-98; Hill, Donna 1977:281). It was, however, essentially just what the Mormons had desired. Thus John C. Bennett, the politically astute Mormon convert who had worked with members of the legislature to facilitate its passage, wrote enthusiastically from Springville:

"The act incorporating the city of Nauvoo has just passed the council of revision, and is now a law of the land. . . . [It is] very broad and liberal, conferring the most plenary powers on the corporators. . . . Every power we asked has been granted, every request gratified, every desire fulfilled." (HC 4:248)

And Joseph Smith declared himself the architect of the charter in the following manner: "The City Charter of Nauvoo is of my own plan and device. I concocted it for the salvation of the Church, and on principles so broad, that every honest man might dwell secure under its protective influence without distinction of sect or party" (HC 4:249).

Among the provisions of the act that Joseph Smith and his lieutenants deemed most significant were sections 2, 11, 17, and 25. Section 2 allowed the city theoretically to expand indefinitely: "Whenever any tract of land adjoining the 'City of Nauvoo' shall have been laid out into town lots, and duly recorded according to law, the
same shall form a part of the 'City of Nauvoo'" (HC 4:240). Section 11 empowered the city council to enact any law not disallowed by the constitutions of the United States and the state of Illinois:

The City Council shall have power and authority to make, ordain, establish and execute all such ordinances, not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States or of this State, as they may deem necessary for the peace, benefit, good order, regulation, convenience, and cleanliness of said city. (HC 4:241)

Section 17 allowed the municipal court of Nauvoo to grant writs of habeas corpus: "The Municipal Court shall have power to grant writs of habeas corpus in all cases arising under the ordinances of the City Council" (HC 4:243). And section 25 permitted Nauvoo to establish a military force with authority to establish most of its own regulations:

The City Council may organize the inhabitants of said city, subject to military duty, into a body of independent military men, to be called the "Nauvoo Legion," the Court Martial of which shall be composed of the commissioned officers of said Legion, and constitute the law-making department, with full power and authority to make, ordain, establish, and execute all such laws and ordinances as may be considered necessary for the benefit, government, and regulation of said Legion; provided said Court Martial shall pass no law or act, repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the Constitution of the United States, or of this State, and provided also that the officers of the Legion shall be commissioned by the Governor of the State. (HC 4:244)

The Mormons regarded the charter fundamentally as a means for maintaining the security and defense of their religious community. As Newel Knight (ms a) wrote in his journal shortly after the establishment of the charter:

Prosperity prevailed with the Saints in Nauvoo, they having the last session of the legislature a liberal charter granted them which was attributed to shield them from any invasion and trouble to which they have ever been exposed to the wicked who have ever sought to do us an injury and to bring trouble and death upon the Church.

While attempting to employ the charter to achieve these ends, however, the Mormons interpreted its provisions in such a way that they aroused the ire and indignation of the surrounding Gentile community.

At the heart of the difficulty was the Mormon belief that the charter was an act that ceded to the people of Nauvoo autonomous power
relative to their internal affairs. As Joseph Smith declared in an address before the citizens of Nauvoo in June of 1843:

"Relative to our city charter, courts, rights of habeas corpus, etc., I wish you to know and publish that we have all power; and if any man from this time forth says anything to the contrary, cast it into his teeth.

There is a secret in this. If there is not power in our charter and courts, then there is not power in the state of Illinois, nor in the congress or constitution of the United States; for the United States gave unto Illinois her constitution or charter, and Illinois gave unto Nauvoo her charters, ceding unto us our vested rights, which she has no right or power to take from us. All the power there was in Illinois she gave to Nauvoo; and any man that says to the contrary is a fool. (HC 4:466)"

Such a perspective did not differ greatly from the way in which many of the citizens of the Massachusetts Commonwealth came to regard the Massachusetts Bay Colony Charter. They, however, were an ocean away from Parliament and king, while Nauvoo was but a short horseback ride from the county seat at Carthage.

**Legislature and judiciary prerogatives**

Much of the furor over the charter grew out of the Mormons' attempt to employ the legislature and judiciary provisions of the charter to prevent the extradition of Joseph Smith by the state of Missouri. When he had escaped from custody and slipped across the border into Illinois, government officials in Missouri were apparently disposed to forget about the situation, and there was no attempt to have him extradited. After the Mormons began gathering numerous affidavits charging state officials in Missouri with gross misconduct and Joseph Smith traveled to Washington, D.C. to present the Mormon case before federal officials, attitudes in Missouri changed. "Governor Boggs was infuriated by what he considered the insult to the honor of his state, and whereas before he had been content merely to be rid of the Mormons, henceforth he would make every effort to recapture Joseph and bring him back to trial" (Hill, Donna 1977:274).

"It lies outside the scope of this dissertation to detail the events involved in this struggle. Two examples, however, should illustrate some of the basic issues that were involved. On 14 May"
1842 an unknown assailant unsuccessfully attempted to assassinate now ex-governor Boggs. Joseph Smith was suspected of involvement, and Governor Carlin of Illinois favorably responded to a request by Missouri to have him extradited. When sheriffs arrived in Nauvoo in August and arrested Joseph Smith, however, he appeared before the municipal court of Nauvoo, which released him on a writ of habeas corpus. The same day the city council passed an ordinance giving the municipal court "authority to judge the validity of every writ served upon a citizen of Nauvoo" (Hill, Donna 1977:311; HC 5:86-88). In June of 1843 the circuit court of Daviess County, Missouri, issued an indictment against Joseph Smith on charges of treason in connection with the 1838 conflict. Thomas Ford, the new governor of Illinois again complied with the request of Missouri to have Joseph Smith extradited. He was arrested while visiting relatives in Dixon, Lee County, Illinois. Through a complicated chain of events the officers who arrested him were themselves arrested on charges that they were mistreating their prisoner. Both cases ended up in the municipal court of Nauvoo. "After hearing a great deal of testimony about Joseph's ordeal as well as the Mormons' history of grievances against Missouri, the court discharged Joseph for want of substance in the warrant for his arrest and upon the merits of the case" (Hill, Donna 1977:329). Subsequent to this, the city council passed an ordinance stating that any person who attempted to arrest Joseph Smith on the basis of previous difficulties was to be arrested, tried by the municipal court and, "if found guilty, sentenced to imprisonment in the city prison for life; which convict or convicts can only be pardoned by the Governor with the consent of the Mayor of said city" (HC 6:105).

The Nauvoo Legion

The second major point of conflict generated by the Nauvoo Charter centered upon the military established by the Nauvoo City Council. Military organization per se was a regular feature of antebellum America. As Robert Flanders (1965:108) has written:
Universal manhood militia service was a commonplace in western America, though in peace time it often amounted to little more than roistering on muster days. Militia companies were usually formed when a new county was organized; such companies elected their own officers, who were commissioned by the state. The state armed the militia at least nominally. The first Mormon militia had come into being with the creation of Caldwell County, Missouri, and was an important factor in the anti-Mormon feelings there. In Illinois, the Nauvoo Charter granted the sect not a county but a new kind of governmental entity. The "extraordinary militia clause" in the charter provided for a military force to be semi-independent, like the city, and to have relations to county and state militia which were ill-defined and ambiguous.

That the military organization was to be something more than a group of ill-trained volunteers that might be called upon to fight Indians is indicated by the city ordinance that created "the Nauvoo Legion." The organization was to consist of two cohorts, one consisting of horse troops and the other foot troops. These men were to be presided over by "a lieutenant-general, as the chief commanding and reviewing officer, and president of the court martial and Legion; a major-general, as the second in command in the Legion, the secretary of the court martial and Legion, and adjutant and inspector-general; a brigadier-general, as the commander of the first cohort; and brigadier-general, as commander of the second cohort" (HC 4:293-94).

On 4 February 1841, the officers of the legion were elected. Joseph Smith was selected as lieutenant-general and John C. Bennett, who at the time was also mayor of Nauvoo, as major-general. Both men were later formally commissioned by the governor of Illinois. By virtue of his appointment as "lieutenant-general" Joseph Smith technically received a rank that was held by no other American from the death of George Washington until the Civil War commission of Ulysses S. Grant (Flanders, Robert 1965:110).

Regulations were passed that required all able-bodied male citizens of Nauvoo between the ages of eighteen and forty-five to enlist in the legion, and it eventually included over two thousand troops (Miller and Miller 1974:96, 98). The men originally bore only their own arms, but John C. Bennett, who was serving as "quartermaster general of Illinois, was able to get three cannons for the Legion, and about two hundred and fifty stand of personal arms. The Nauvoo troops
had rifles, which made them the envy of older state militiamen, who still bore muskets" (Hill, Donna 1977:285). Through repeated drills and sham battles, the Nauvoo Legion became widely "recognized as the best-trained military unit in the West at the time" (Miller and Miller 1974:98).

The Nauvoo Legion existed by authority of the state and was technically under the command of the governor. Despite its rapid growth and increasing state of military preparedness, there is no evidence that either Joseph Smith or his lieutenants intended to use it in any extralegal fashion. Even in the traumatic days following the murder of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, the troops were not called up. Virtually the only action in which the legion was actually involved was the quelling of a few minor disturbances within the City of Nauvoo. But for people who had been driven from their homes by armed mobs, the legion was of great importance. As Robert Flanders (1965:109) has suggested, "The symbol of the quasi-sovereignty of Nauvoo was the Legion." And it provided a basis for security and hope; it was a tangible force that could readily be employed if once again the Mormons were threatened with destruction.

Mounting insecurity

While Joseph Smith had evidently "concocted" the Nauvoo Charter in such a way that he felt "every honest man might dwell secure under its protective influence" (HC 4:249), in retrospect its existence appears to have had exactly the opposite effect. Although the citizens of Illinois had been very favorably disposed towards the LDS people upon their arrival as exiles from Missouri, conflicts generated in large measure by the Saints' interpretation of the charter led to increasing anti-Mormon sentiment. Government officials were incensed by attempts of the Nauvoo municipal court to invalidate legally processed state orders, and citizens of communities surrounding Nauvoo became increasingly fearful that the Nauvoo Legion might be unleashed against them. Indeed, many began referring to Joseph Smith as the American Mohammed. In a journal kept during this period, Joseph Hovey (ms a) records the following:
The Gentiles began to grumble about us having too much power granted us in our charter. More especially about the legion for we was numbering a goodly number at the same time we drew some 3 hundred arms. This did right for the brethren did have their arms taken away from them in Missouri when they was exterminated from that state into Illinois. Hence it was wisdom in God to command us to arm ourselves after the manner of the world. Therefore the world thought we was getting too much power by organizing a legion.

Such concerns, coupled with Gentile antagonisms at the Mormon practice of block voting, disdain for Mormon religious beliefs, and exasperation generated by Mormon exclusiveness set in motion events that eventually resulted in the death of Joseph Smith and the expulsion of the Mormons from Illinois.

By mid-1842 it must have been apparent to leading Mormons that their present position in Illinois was becoming tenuous. It was an election year; and Joseph Duncan, the Whig candidate for governor ran on an essentially anti-Mormon platform. He was in favor of repealing the Nauvoo Charter, of retrieving state arms that had been provided for the Nauvoo Legion, and of requiring the legion to train with the regular state militia. Although the Democrat, Thomas Ford, won the election, he did not cater to the Mormons, and later maintained that their overwhelming support had been more of a hindrance than a help in his election bid (Hill, Donna 1977:306-8).

After the August 1842 release of Joseph Smith on a writ of habeas corpus, he was forced to go into hiding to prevent further arrest. While he was undercover, there was widespread fear among the citizens of Nauvoo that Governor Ford would call up the state militia and have it occupy the city until Joseph was apprehended. Such thoughts conjured up images of another Far West-like siege. Although the prophet was in and around Nauvoo during the entire four months that he was out of sight, he felt that it might be necessary for him to leave the area "for months and years," and at one point he even wrote his wife Emma to get horse and gear ready for his escape to a Mormon outpost in Wisconsin (HC 5:103-5). Although the original 1842 arrest warrant was declared invalid by the Illinois Supreme Court in January 1843 and Joseph Smith was allowed to resume his usual activities (HC 5:232-45), he had excellent reason to suspect that new warrants would be forthcoming.
By the fall of 1843 hostilities against the Mormons had progressed from word to action. According to Flanders (1965:285):

During this season crimes of violence committed against individual Mormons increased alarmingly. Robberies, kidnappings, burnings, shootings, and stabbings, mostly of Mormon farmers in the outlying settlements, spread terror to the whole Mormon community. Most of the perpetrators were thought to be Missourians living within a few miles of Hancock County, among whom a belief had grown that Mormons were beyond the law, fugitives from justice and fair game. Smith wanted to activate the Nauvoo Legion as a police force and even pursue the offenders into Missouri if need be; but Governor Ford would not permit it.

This external animosity was fueled in part by conflict within the Mormon community itself. These internal difficulties largely centered on Joseph Smith's attempt to introduce polygamy among his followers. For good reason he felt it essential that the practice be kept secret. Because of this, individuals who were asked to enter polygamous unions were told to keep silent and feign ignorance. When some who were thus approached repudiated the practice and went public, their disclosures generated counteraccusations and character assassinations. An already messy situation was complicated by the activities of John C. Bennett. Amid rumors that Joseph Smith and leading brethren were secretly acquiring additional wives, he persuaded various citizens in Nauvoo to become involved in his own brand of polygamy. Both Bennett's system and his conduct were regarded as highly immoral by Joseph Smith and others. After Bennett's excommunication in 1842 he sought to destroy both Joseph Smith and the Church by broadcasting sensational and highly fictitious accounts of Mormon polygamy and other clandestine practices (Bachman 1975:218–60; Flanders 1965:260–67; Foster, Lawrence 1981:170–74; Hill, Donna 1977:297–303).

As the protective wall about the Mormon citadel in Illinois began to crumble, Joseph Smith seemed to grasp at almost any imaginable scheme that might somehow promote the security of himself and his followers. In July of 1843 he sent Johnathan Dunham to explore areas to the west (HC 5:509). In December a petition was sent to the United States Congress requesting that Nauvoo be granted territorial status and "that the mayor of Nauvoo [was now Joseph
Smith] be . . . empowered . . . to call to his aid a sufficient number of United States forces, in connection with the Nauvoo Legion, to repel the invasion of mobs" (HC 6:131). On 29 January 1844, he announced his candidacy for the office of president of the United States (HC 187-89). In the latter part of February he "instructed the Twelve Apostles to send out a delegation and investigate the locations of California and Oregon, and hunt out a good location, where we can remove to after the temple is completed, and where we can build a city in a day, and have a government of our own" (HC 6:222). On 10 March he organized what has become known as "the Council of Fifty," a secret body whom he designated as the presiding officers of the newly restored political kingdom of God (Ehat 1980; Hansen, Klus 1974; Quinn 1980). On 14 March Joseph Smith and the Council of Fifty sent one of its members, Lucien Woodworth, to open secret negotiations with the government of Texas regarding Mormon colonization in its western regions (Ehat 1979:148; Hansen, Klus 1974:85-86). And on 26 March yet another petition was sent to congress: this time with the request that "Joseph Smith of the city of Nauvoo [be] authorized and empowered to raise a company of one hundred thousand armed volunteers . . . to open the vast regions of the unpeopled west and south" (HC 6:275-77).

At the same time Mormon eschatological expectations, never completely dormant, appear to have increased. Thus in May 1843 Joseph Smith prophesied "in the name of the Lord God that in a few years this government will be utterly overthrown and wasted so that there will not be a potsherd left for their wickedness in conniving at the Missouri mobocracy" (Clayton, William 1982:42). On 15 October of the same year, he declared that "anguish and wrath and tribulation and the withdrawing of the Spirit of God from the earth await this generation, until they are visited with utter desolation" (HC 5:58). And in May 1844 he stated that "the scripture is ready to be fulfilled when great wars, famines, pestilence, great distress, judgments, &c, are ready to be poured out on the inhabitants of the earth" (HC 6:364).
The Patriarchal Order and Mormon Group Preservation

It was in such a milieu that the patriarchal order emerged. In its earliest form, it might be regarded as an attempt to maintain Mormon group identity and solidarity and provide for Mormon salvation despite any eventuality. Such appears to be a basic premise of Joseph Smith's 21 January 1844 sermon dealing with "the sealing power of the priesthood" (HC 6:183-85). He begins with a scripture that by now has become very familiar to his followers: the closing lines of Malachi dealing with the coming of Elijah "to turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." He then states that the word turn "should be translated bind or seal" and ensures his followers that they may be linked to their relatives by such sealing power once the temple is completed. He laments the fact that the temple is not yet finished so that the Saints can experience such rituals, but he demonstrates the relevance of these rituals by indicating that his listeners' eternal salvation, as well as their protection against the imminent eschatological destruction, is predicated upon their being sealed:

The Saints have not too much time to save and redeem their dead, and gather together their living relatives, that they may be saved also, before the earth will be smitten, and the consumption decreed falls upon the world.

I would advise all the Saints to go to with their might and gather together all their living relatives to this place, that they may be sealed and saved, that they may be prepared against the day that the destroying angel goes forth; and if the whole Church should go to with all their might to save their dead, seal their posterity, and gather their living friends and spend none of their time in behalf of the world, they would hardly get through before night would come, when no man can work.

And finally he indicates that his principal anxiety is that the Mormon community might somehow be disrupted before the temple is completed and the sealing rituals performed: "My only trouble at the present time is concerning ourselves, that the Saints will be divided, broken up, and scattered, before we get our salvation secure."

Not so apocalyptic in tone, his 8 April 1844 sermon explains how temple rituals could enable the Mormon people to continue to exist as a group without being geographically concentrated: once Mormons
have undergone temple rituals both for themselves and for their dead, it will be possible to live apart from their fellow Saints and yet be part of the kingdom of God and have all that is essential to their salvation. He thus first states that

The whole of America is Zion itself from north to south. . . .

I have received instructions from the Lord that from henceforth wherever the Elders of Israel shall build up churches and branches unto the Lord throughout the States, there shall be a stake of Zion. In the great cities, as Boston, New York, &c, there shall be stakes. It is a glorious proclamation, and I reserved it to the last, and designed it to be understood that the work shall commence after the washings, anointings and endowments have been performed [in the temple].

He then indicates that once the temple is completed, a family can come to that spot from any location, perform saving rituals both for themselves and for their dead and then return to their own homes "to live and wait till they go to receive their reward" (HC 6:318-19).

Brigham Young, who had already secretly received the temple ordinances and thus understood much of their significance, regarded such a procedure as an ideal way to ensure the continued existence of the Mormon group. On the day following Joseph Smith's sermon he stated:

Let us obey the proclamation of Joseph Smith concerning the Elders going forth into the vineyard to build up the Temple, get their endowments, and be prepared to go forth and preach the Gospel. You may build up Zion and learn to be men, and not children. It was a perfect sweepstakes when the Prophet called North and South America Zion. . . . It is a perfect knock-down to the devil's kingdom. There is not a faithful Elder who cannot, if he is humble and diligent, build up the Church. . . .

The Priesthood is fitted to every capacity in the world. There are blessings and conditions in that Priesthood that suit every man. This will suit the condition of thousands, because it is as broad as the heavens, deep as hell, and wide as eternity. (HC 6:321-22)

Such statements clearly indicate that shortly before his death, Joseph Smith regarded the temple rituals as a means by which his followers could undergo geographic dispersion while still maintaining both their identity as Mormons and performing all that was essential to escape the judgment of God and receive a celestial crown. Such a concept was far removed from the 1830s understanding
that the Saints' protection from destruction and their ultimate salvation were both contingent upon gathering together in the New Jerusalem and there participating jointly in the law of consecration and stewardship. This new formulation, however, held out the possibility that the Saints might now avoid the conflict and disruption that had thus far accompanied all attempts at territorial control.

Possible reasons for Joseph Smith's early introduction of patriarchal order rituals

As already indicated in chapter 5, although Joseph Smith had evidently intended for eternal marriage, the endowment, and the second anointing to be administered in the temple, he introduced each of these rituals among select followers before the temple could be readied for that purpose. Although conjecture over motives can only be tentative, there appear to have been at least three reasons why he acted as he did. Each of these is linked to the state of insecurity that existed in Nauvoo.

First, there is good indication that Joseph Smith felt that he might die before he could instigate the ritual in the temple. Speaking to a gathering of female Saints on 28 April 1842 he stated:

that he did not know as he should have many opportunities of teaching them—that they were going to be left to themselves—they would not long have him to instruct them—that the church would not have his instruction long, and the world would not be troubled with him a great while, and would not have his teachings—He spoke of delivering the keys to . . . the Church—that according to his prayers God had appointed him elsewhere. (Smith, Joseph 1980:116)

Subsequent to his murder, close followers clearly maintained that the primary reason why he had introduced the rituals when he did was that he feared he might not live long enough for the temple to be completed. Thus some two and a half months after the martyrdom, Apostle Orson Hyde related:

Before I went east on the 4th of April last, we were in council with Brother Joseph every day for weeks, says Brother Joseph in one of these councils there is something going to happen; I don't know what it is, but the Lord bids me to hasten and give you your
endowment before the temple is finished. He conducted us through every ordinance of the holy priesthood, and when he had gone through with all the ordinances he rejoiced very much, and says, now if they kill me you have got all the keys, and all the ordinances and you can confer them upon others, and the hosts of Satan will not be able to tear down the kingdom as fast as you will be able to build it up. (TS 5:651)

Second, he might have seen the introduction of such rituals as a way to solidify the loyalty of close followers. The Holy Order, for example, was organized just three weeks before John C. Bennett was disfellowshipped from the Church. The record is clear that the Prophet had known about Bennett's activities for some time, and it seems likely that he waited as long as he did to take action for fear of the consequences. It might be argued that he established the Holy Order at this point in time as one way to prepare for the disruptions that he anticipated would grow out of the public disclosures of Bennett's clandestine activities.

The original members of the order were among his most loyal followers as well as some of the most prominent elders in the Church. The rituals of the endowment were well suited to weld them together into an exclusive and cohesive body with him at its head. He might have expected that its existence could provide him with a select group of followers who could help him through the impending crisis. Heber C. Kimball (ms e) seems to have at least partially understood the holy order in these terms. In a letter written to fellow apostle Parley P. Pratt shortly after the order's organization, he states: "Brother Joseph feels as well as I ever seen him. One reason is he has got a small company that he feels safe in their hands. And that is not all, he can open his bosom, and feel him Self safe."

And third, Joseph Smith might have feared that the Mormon people might be driven from Nauvoo and scattered before the temple was completed. In the already cited 21 January 1844 discourse he thus states:

I would to God that this temple was now done, that we might go into it, and go to work, and improve our time, and make use of the seals while they are on earth. . . .

. . . And my only trouble at the present time is . . . that the Saints will be divided, broken up, and scattered, before we get our salvation secure; for there are so many fools in the world
for the devil to operate upon, it gives him the advantage oftentimes. (HC 6:184)

Whatever the reason, in the early 1840s he did secretly introduce some of his select followers to the rituals of celestial marriage, the endowment, and the second anointing. This was to have extremely important consequences for the development of the patriarchal order, as he was killed one and a half years before the Nauvoo Temple was sufficiently completed for the enactment of these rituals.

Since Joseph Smith died before he could put his plans relative to the patriarchal order into full operation, the precise manner in which he intended to organize it and the consequences that it would have had for Mormon group identity and solidarity will never be known. What can be examined is the manner in which Joseph Smith employed the temple rituals for the development of unity among select followers amid the conflict and pressures of the city of Nauvoo.

This will be done by discussing the development of the patriarchal order in terms of the personal biography of Joseph and various of his followers. Particular attention will be paid to Heber C. Kimball. He was among the first to be introduced to each of the various rituals associated with the patriarchal order, and considerable information is available about the impact that patriarchal covenant organization had on his life.

The early life of Heber C. Kimball

Like many early Mormon converts, Heber C. Kimball was of Puritan descent. Born in Vermont in 1801, he moved with his parents to western New York in 1811. He there married Vilate Murray in 1822. They settled in Mendon, Monroe County, New York, where they became close friends to Brigham Young and the members of his family. On 15 April 1832 Heber C. Kimball was baptized into the Mormon church, one day after Brigham Young had taken the same step. Vilate went through the same ritual some two weeks later.

In 1833 Kimball and Young, together with their families, moved to Kirtland, Ohio, in accordance with the command to gather with the
Saints. They were to prove themselves to be among Joseph Smith's most zealous and loyal followers. In 1834 they both took part in the Zion's Camp expedition. In 1835 they were called as two of the original members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. In June of 1837 Kimball was sent to begin Mormon missionary activity in Great Britain. By the time he left England the following April, some thirteen hundred Britishers had been baptized into the Church (Kimball, Stanley 1978:396-400; 1981:3-54; Whitney, Orson F. 1975:1-198).

Kimball arrived in Far West, Missouri, in July of 1838. Unknown to non-Mormons in the area, he was able to play a prominent role in evacuating the Mormons from that state (Kimball, Stanley 1981:55-63). While engaged in this activity, he relates:

My family having been gone about two months, during which time I heard nothing from them; our brethren being in prison; death and destruction following us everywhere we went; I felt very sorrowful and lonely. The following words came to my mind, and the Spirit said unto me, "write," which I did by taking a piece of paper and writing . . . as follows: . . .

"Verily I say unto my servant Heber, thou art my son, in whom I am well pleased; for thou art careful to hearken to my words, and not transgress my law, nor rebel against my servant Joseph Smith. . . ; therefore thy name is written in heaven, no more to be blotted out for ever, because of these things; and this Spirit and blessing shall rest down upon thy posterity for ever and ever; for they shall be called after thy name, for thou shalt have many more sons and daughters, for thy seed shall be as numerous as the sands upon the sea shore. (Whitney, Orson F. 1975:241)

This statement expresses in incipient form, much of the ideological basis of the patriarchal organization that Joseph Smith would be attempting to establish at Nauvoo. First, because of Kimball's faithfulness to the Mormon code of conduct and to the Mormon leader, he was assured of his salvation. Second, this same promise was extended to his posterity. Third, these promises were in some sense linked to the Abrahamic covenant: like Abraham, Kimball was promised that his seed would be "as numerous as the sands upon the sea shore (cp. Gen. 22:17). And fourth, this assurance came at a time when the Mormon group appeared to be in a state of disintegration.

In response to a revelation that Joseph Smith had received in July of 1838 (DC 118) Heber C. Kimball, Brigham Young and most of the
other apostles left Nauvoo in the fall of 1839 to engage in missionary work in Great Britain. They enjoyed even greater success than had Kimball during his first missionary effort to that land. While there, they developed a plan for the migration of British Saints to Nauvoo. The English converts that subsequently began pouring into Nauvoo helped the Church recoup the losses that it had experienced during the 1837-39 period.

Kimball, together with fellow apostles Brigham Young and John Taylor arrived back at Nauvoo on 1 July 1841. According to his daughter, Helen Mar's account, Joseph Smith met them at the dock and took them to his home for dinner without even giving them time to visit with their families. Joseph Smith "seemed unwilling to part with my father and from that time kept the Twelve in Council early and late" (WE 10:42). Evidently many of the private meetings he was now holding with the apostles and other close associates centered upon the particulars of the patriarchal order that he was then in the process of attempting to establish.

The emergence of sealing networks

When years after the exodus from Nauvoo Benjamin F. Johnson was asked to relate what he could remember of the teachings of his intimate friend Joseph Smith he responded:

The First Command was to "Multiply" and the Prophet taught us that Dominion & power in the great Future would be Commensurate with the no [number] of "Wives Childin & Friends" that we inherit here and that our great mission to earth was to Organize a Neculi of Heaven to take with us. To the increase of which there would be no end. (Zimmerman 1976:47)

What Johnson has to say about the Prophet's admonition to organize nuclei of heaven can only be comprehended by reference to the sealing ordinances that he introduced while the Church was headquartered at Nauvoo. As has already been indicated, there were basically two such rituals: one by which two individuals might be sealed in an eternal relationship, and another by which a husband and wife might be jointly "sealed up to eternal life" through receiving their second anointing. The two were linked by the belief that a man
and woman who were first sealed together as husband and wife and then jointly sealed up to eternal life could transmit the promises that they had obtained in their second anointing to their offspring that were born in the covenant. The wives that were sealed to a patriarch and the children that were sealed to him and his wives thus became a nucleus of heaven that was organized with him as its head and which would persist throughout eternity as an organic unit. As Joseph Fielding (1979:154) expressed this concept while writing in his journal shortly after the death of Joseph Smith: "I understand that a Man's Dominion will be as God's is, over his own Creatures and the more numerous the greater his Dominion."

Between April of 1841 and his death in June 1844, Joseph Smith permitted a number of his followers to participate in matrimonial sealings. In Benjamin F. Johnson's terminology, such individuals were forming nuclei of heaven that would constitute basic units in the patriarchal order when it was at last fully organized with Adam at its head. The enactment of matrimonial sealings was highly regulated. The July 1843 revelation on marriage stated that only one individual on earth at a time has the power and priesthood keys to perform this ritual and then went on to specify that during his lifetime Joseph Smith was this individual (DC 132:7). All matrimonial sealings were either performed by Joseph Smith himself or by close associates to whom he had directly and specifically delegated the priesthood keys deemed essential to perform such rituals. The closeness with which Joseph supervised this activity is demonstrated by the difficulty that was created when Hyrum Smith took it upon himself to seal Mary Ann Frost to her husband, Parley P. Pratt. As assistant president of the Church as well as its presiding patriarch, Hyrum evidently felt that he had sufficient authority to perform the ritual without first consulting his brother Joseph. When the Prophet learned what had happened he was irate, reenacted the ritual himself, and told Hyrum that if he ever assumed this authority again, "he would go to hell and all those he sealed with him" (Ehat 1982:70). Thus while a matrimonial sealing established a discrete unit within the patriarchal order, that unit was ultimately dependent upon the priesthood power of Joseph Smith for its existence.
The attempts to create these eternal patriarchal units resulted in the formation of social networks. When attempting to analyze such networks, a number of things must be kept in mind. First, during the lifetime of Joseph Smith the practice of sealing was still in an incipient form and was more flexible than it was later to become. Second, while not everyone who participated in matrimonial sealing received his or her second anointing, the ideology associated with the ritual assumed that the individual thus sealed would eventually either personally receive the second anointing or be sealed in some way to individuals who had. Third, no adoptive sealings were performed during the lifetime of Joseph Smith (see Ehat 1982:144, 279 note 414). And fourth, relationships established through sealing superseded those established through civil authority while at the same time assuming that kinship and marital ties created through civil authority could provide bases for the extension of sealing networks.

Joseph Smith's personal sealing network

Perhaps the best way to begin to analyze the nature of sealing networks that were established during the lifetime of Joseph Smith is to focus upon the types of relationships that he personally attempted to institute through the enactment of sealing rituals. Years after his death, Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner (ms d, p. 3) recalled that, when asking her to be sealed to him as a wife, Joseph Smith made the following statement: "I know that I shall be saved in the Kingdom of God. I have the oath of God upon it and God cannot lie. All that he gives me I shall take with me for I have that authority and that power conferred upon me." This statement contains the basic premises of the concept of sealing that Joseph Smith introduced in Nauvoo: first, it was a power by which an individual might be ensured of his salvation; and second, it was a power by which others might participate in that same promise through being "given" to him by the authority and power of the priesthood.

The sealing relationship between Joseph and his wife Emma.

Although Joseph Smith had married his first wife, Emma Hale, by civil
authority in 1827, they were married a second time by authority of the priesthood when they were eternally sealed together as husband and wife on 28 May 1843. The following 28 September they jointly received their second anointing (Ehat 1982:102). These rituals were believed not only to unite Joseph and Emma eternally as husband and wife and to effect their mutual salvation, but also to place Joseph in a superordinate position to Emma. This relationship of inequality was evidently understood in terms of his ability to effect her salvation. Thus in 1844 when William Clayton (1982:2) was asking various women to be sealed to him as wives, he records in his journal that "Mary Aspen is ready to unite to me as her savior, and Sister Booth says that she shall not risk her salvation in Roberts hands & wants me to interfere. . . Jane Hardman . . . prefers me for a Saviour to any one else, so she says."

After Emma Smith refused to accept the leadership of Brigham Young, Mormons in Utah began to feel that if Joseph Smith was indeed going to save her, his effort would have to take on heroic proportions. As Brigham Young stated in 1874: "Joseph used to say that he would have her hereafter, if he had to go to hell for her, and he will have to go to hell for her as sure as he ever gets her" (JD 17:159).

Joseph Smith maintained that the same power of salvation would be extended to children that would subsequently be born in the covenant to him and Emma. When in the spring of 1844 he learned that Emma was pregnant, he was elated. According to Phebe Woodworth, a member of the Holy Order, during this period he came to her house and said Emma was going to have a son of promise; and if a son of promise was walled in with granite rock when the power of the Holy Ghost fell upon him he would break his way out. He knew the principle upon which a son of promise could be obtained, he had complied with that principle and Emma should have such a son. (Quinn 1981:16)

In the New Testament the term "children of promise" is applied to those born in the Abrahamic covenant. Thus Galatians 4:22-23 states: "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise." As
has already been seen, Joseph Smith equated being born in the covenant with being born under the Abrahamic covenant. Thus a "son of promise" would be one born in the covenant and thus entitled to the promises made to the fathers, including Abraham. According to Mormon ideology of the 1840s, this would mean, among other things, that the child could participate in the promise of exaltation that had been made to his parents at the time they received their second anointing.

As has already been indicated, Joseph Smith did not institute adoptive sealing. From the evidence at hand it is not clear whether he saw no need for this practice, was killed before he had time to introduce it, or felt that it could only be performed within a temple. Whatever the reason, at the time of his death Joseph Smith remained unlinked by sealing either to his parents or to the children that Emma had borne prior to her being sealed to him. Thus among his original family there were only two individuals with him in his patriarchal kingdom: his wife and a son that would be born five months after his death. The size of this kingdom, however, was greatly increased by the addition of other wives.

Polygamy and the extension of sealing networks. Among the various activities of Joseph Smith's controversial life, perhaps nothing has generated more debate than the practice of plural marriage. Even the precise number of his wives remains unclear. In her popular but often inaccurate and generally inflammatory biography of Joseph Smith, Fawn Brodie (1977:457-88) supplies a list of forty-eight probable polygamous wives; while, in what is likely the most complete study of early Mormon polygamy, Dane Bachman (1975:106) writes that "the statements of the most reliable witnesses make a convincing case for his matrimonial ties to about twenty women. Additional testimony strongly suggests that he was wedded to another ten."

These women believed, and many of their coreligionists agreed, that by being sealed to the prophet Joseph, they would participate with him in the reward that he would receive in the celestial kingdom. Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner (ms a) later recalled that Joseph Smith had told her that "all the Devils in hell should never
get me from him." When she received a patriarchal blessing in 1874 she was told that "great is thy glory and exaltation with thy husband the prophet who is working for thee in the presence of our Father. . . . Thou shalt be a Queen to reign in the kingdom and dominion that are appointed unto him" (Lightner, M.E.R., ms c). In 1880 she received a letter from Emmeline B. Wells (ms a) informing her of the death of Joseph's wife Sarah Ann Whitney. Emmeline Wells wrote: "I know Sarah Ann . . . suffered many severe trials. . . . She bore it all in patience and meekness like a true saint and has earned her reward, which no doubt she is now rejoicing in possession of with Joseph." And in 1886 she received a letter from Emily Partridge Young (ms a), another of Joseph Smith's wives. In this letter mention is made of the recent deaths of various women who had been sealed to Joseph Smith: "Of course you heard of my sister Eliza's death. Also Sister Marinda Hyde's death. Desdemona Fuller has passed away also, all went pretty much together. It seems as if Joseph was calling his family home."

It seems clear that in some instances Joseph Smith's marriage to a particular woman was regarded as a way for his saving power to be extended through her to other individuals with which she already had kinship connections. A man's chances for salvation might thus be enhanced by having his daughter or sister marry the prophet. Once the ritual of adoptive sealing had been instituted, such a procedure was no longer necessary: a man could then be adopted as a son by a powerful Church leader and as a result share in his exaltation. During the period before the death of Joseph Smith, however, evidently the only way in which a man not born in the covenant might participate in the exaltation of another man would be through the intermediate link established by a matrimonial sealing.

One of the clearest examples of a marriage of this type involved Sarah Ann Whitney, daughter of Bishop Newel K. Whitney. Her father performed the ceremony that sealed her to Joseph Smith on 27 July 1842. Just before the sealing was performed Joseph Smith received a revelation in behalf of Bishop Whitney. Among other things the revelation stated:
The thing that my servant Joseph Smith had made known unto you and your family and which you have agreed upon is right in mine eyes and shall be rewarded upon your heads with honor and immortality and eternal life to all your house, both old and young because of the lineage of my Priesthood, saith the Lord, it shall be upon you and upon your children after you from generation to generation, by virtue of the holy promise which I now make unto you. (Smith, Joseph, ms c)

Thus at the time that Bishop Whitney sealed his daughter to Joseph Smith, he received a promise of eternal life that extended to all his "house" and to his children "from generation to generation."

Lucy Walker depicted her increasing involvement with Joseph Smith as part of a process by which her family gradually became incorporated into his own. The first contact between her family and Joseph Smith occurred when her father John and brother Loren visited Nauvoo as recent converts:

My father and brother called on the Prophet, in the course of conversation who said, "why not leave this boy with me until you return with your family." He consented with the understanding that he would return and help him through harvesting. But when the time came the Prophet told him to write to father, to hire someone in his stead, and at his expense, as he could not part with him. In the Spring of '41 father took his family to Nauvoo. My brother met us with an invitation to dinner, which we gladly accepted and were introduced to the Prophet and his wife Emma and the dear children who in after years I learned to love as my own brothers and Julia, an adopted daughter, as my sister. During the summer mother was taken very sick with chills and fever. At length one after another was attacked with the same disease until all were in a helpless condition. Mother was urged to spend a few days at the Prophet's house. They believed a change would benefit her. But she could not be content away from her afflicted family. At her earnest solicitation they sent her home to her family... Mother lingered until Jan. '42 then passed away. ... Ten motherless children! and such a mother!...

My father's health seemed to give way under this heavy affliction. The Prophet came to the rescue. He said, "if you remain here, Brother Walker, you will soon follow your wife. You must have a change of scene, a change of climate. You have just such a family as I could love. My house shall be their home. For the present I would advise you to sell your effects, place the little ones with kind friends and the four eldest shall come to my house and be received and treated as my own children, and if I find the little ones, they are not treated right, I will bring them home and keep them until you return." I rung my hands in the agony of despair at the thought of being broken up as a family and being separated from the little ones. But said the prophet, "My home shall be your home, eternally yours." I understood him not.
Soon after her father left, her sister Lydia became ill with brain fever.

When we told the Prophet how very sick Lydia was, he told the boys to put a bed in the carriage, and he went with them and said to the family in charge, "You must excuse me, but I am under the greatest obligation to look to her welfare and have come to take her home with me where I can look after her myself. . . . All that loving hearts and willing hands could do was done, but a few days only she lingered, then joined her dear mother in the spirit world, and we were left more lonely than before. Here let me say that our own father and mother could scarcely have manifested greater solicitude for her recovery than did the Prophet and his wife Emma. . . . One after another the children were brought home until all the younger except the baby was there. (Judge Adams and wife of Springfield Illinois, they took great fancy to sister Jane and begged us to let them take her to their beautiful home as they had no little children.) The prophet and his wife introduced us to their sons and daughters. Every privilege was accorded us in the home, every pleasure within reach was ours. He often referred to Brother Loren as his "Edwine." He was indeed his confidential and trusted friend. He was ever by his side, arm in arm they walked and conversed freely on various subjects of interest.

As this complex chain of events was drawing the family of John Walker ever more into the domestic sphere of Joseph Smith, he asked Lucy to become his plural wife.

In the year 1842 President Joseph Smith sought an interview with me, and said, "I have a message for you. I have been commanded of God to take another wife, and you are the woman." My astonishment knew no bounds. This announcement was indeed a thunderbolt to me. He asked me if I believed him to be a prophet of God. "Most assuredly I do," I replied. He fully explained to me the principle of plural or celestial marriage, said this principle was again to be restored for the benefit of the human family, that it would prove an everlasting blessing to my father's house, and form a chain that could never be broken worlds without end. (Kimball, Lucy Walker, ms b)

While Joseph Smith's marriage proposal to Lucy is subject to various interpretations, from the perspective of Mormon ideology it might be seen as an attempt to bind together eternally two families who emotionally were becoming a unity. Ties of amity had already been forged. Through the enactment of the matrimonial sealing, a "chain that would never be broken worlds without end" would now link the family of John Walker to that of Joseph Smith. The assurance that this action "would prove an everlasting blessing to my father's house"
appears similar to the promise to Newel K. Whitney of "honor and immortality and eternal life to all your house, both old and young." Underlying both appears to be the assumption that the saving power centered in Joseph Smith could be extended to an entire household by having one of its members sealed to him as a wife.

The sealing power and the relationship between civil and eternal marriage. At least seven of Joseph Smith's plural wives were married civilly to other men at the time that they were sealed to him (Bachman 1975:124). An awareness of the ill-defined nature of the boundary between civil and priesthood authority in early Mormon thought contributes to an understanding of this phenomenon. As has already been discussed, in 1835 Joseph Smith was more than willing to join as husband and wife Newel Knight and the already civilly married Lydia Goldthwait Baily. At the time of this ceremony he had stated that "marriage was an institution of heaven . . . [and] it was necessary that it should be solemnized at the authority of the everlasting priesthood" (HC 2:320). This formulation resulted in early Mormon attitudes toward civil marriage being highly ambiguous.

In order to discuss the relationship between civil marriage and marriage "by the authority of the everlasting priesthood," it was posited in chapter 4 that early Mormon thought is characterized by two suborders within the order of law: the suborder of human law and the suborder of priesthood or divine law. Civil marriage thus belongs to one suborder and priesthood-instigated marriage to the other. The ambiguous relationship between these two suborders lies at the root of many of the seemingly erratic aspects of early Mormon behavior. Thus Joseph Smith attempted simultaneously to govern the people of Nauvoo by the authority vested in the Nauvoo Charter and by the authority that he had received as the prophet of God. And in January of 1844 he announced himself as a candidate for the presidency of the United States and less than six weeks later organized the political kingdom of God with himself as its earthly head.

The ambiguity between human and divine law is clearly manifest in the relationship between civil marriage and matrimonial sealing. Sexual impropriety and promiscuity has always been regarded by Mormons
as a heinous sin. Consistent with their fellow Americans, the Saints of Nauvoo believed that sexual intercourse should occur only between two individuals who had been properly married. At issue was whether sexual relations were appropriate only in a civil union, only in a celestial union, or in both. During the Nauvoo years Mormons tended to regard civil marriage as a human convention that legitimized sexual activity but which could be terminated without adherence to strict legal procedures (Bachman 1974:129-33). An individual who had been abandoned or wronged by his or her spouse might thus remarry without divorce, and it was not essential that the new marriage be solemnized by civil authority. Although not enacted under civil authority, matrimonial sealing could also legitimize sexual relations.

Plural marriage was described by revelation in exclusively polygynous form: it stated that a man could have more than one wife, not that a woman could have more than one husband (DC 132:1-2, 34-40, 61-63). Such has evidently been the understanding of the Saints from the time that plural marriage was first introduced. For a man to be married civilly to one woman and sealed to another has thus presented no conceptual difficulties: they are both his wives, and under appropriate circumstances it would be proper for him to engage in sexual relations with either. For a woman to be married civilly to one man while sealed to another who is still living is, however, ambiguous: whose wife is she in actuality? which man has sexual rights over her? and which law takes precedence, human or divine?

As has already been seen in the case of Joseph Smith’s plural wives, during the Nauvoo years some Mormon women did have this ambiguous position: they were sealed as a wife to one man while being civilly married to another. Some had been abandoned or abused by their first husbands: for such women to remarry without obtaining a divorce and independent of civil authority would not have been regarded by the Mormons of Nauvoo as irregular. In more problematic cases, however, women were sealed to one man while continuing to live with another husband to whom they were civilly married. Awareness of this practice has generated some concern among committed Mormons. The explanation generally provided is essentially as follows. Since matrimonial sealing does not necessarily imply sexual intercourse, it
was evidently believed that such a woman might appropriately continue to have sexual intercourse with the man to whom she was civilly married while simultaneously being sealed as a wife to a man with whom she had no sexual intercourse. Although the record is somewhat vague on this point, it seems evident that at least some of these women were sealed only for "eternity" to the second husband. In such a case, the husband to whom the woman was sealed would have no actual rights over her until her death.

Some of Joseph Smith's civilly married plural wives were evidently sealed to him after being abandoned by their first husbands. Presendia Huntington Buell, for example, indicates that her first husband apostatized during the Missouri persecutions (Bachman 1974:134). Many Nauvoo Mormons would have regarded such a man as not even worthy enough to have a wife. As Joseph Smith explained to Lucy Walker:

Men must beware how they treat their wives. They were given them for a holy purpose that the myriad of spirits waiting for tabernacles might have pure and healthy bodies. ... Many would awake in the morning of the resurrection sadly disappointed for they, by transgression, would have neither wives nor children, for they would surely be taken from them and given to those who have proved themselves worthy. (Kimball, Lucy Walker, ms b)

In other instances, however, women were sealed to Joseph Smith without being divorced, abandoned, or mistreated by their first husband. Among these, the case of Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner is perhaps easiest to understand. Although her husband, Adam Lightner, was sympathetic to the Mormon people and a friend of Joseph Smith, he refused to join the Church. According to Mormon belief, this situation would jeopardize Mary Elizabeth's position in eternity. According to her own account: "My husband did not belong to the Church. I begged and pried with him to join but he would not. He said he did not believe in it though he thought a great deal of Joseph. ... After he said this I went forward and was sealed to Joseph for Eternity" (Lightner, ms d, p. 7). Being sealed to Joseph Smith "for eternity," however, did not abrogate the civil marriage that bound her to Adam Lightner. Joseph Smith, indeed, instructed her to continue to live with Adam as his wife. As she explained to Emmeline B. Wells in
"I could tell you why I stayed with Mr. Lightner. . . . I did just as Joseph told me to do, as he knew what troubles I would have to contend with" (Lightner, ms d).

More problematic are the sealings of women such as Patty Bartlett Sessions, Zina Diantha Huntington Jacobs, and Nancy Miranda Hyde, whose husbands were all faithful members of the Church. In some instances these women might have just preferred to be sealed eternally to Joseph Smith rather than to the men that they had married by civil authority. As the prophet had told Lucy Walker: "A woman would have her choice, this was a privilege that could not be denied her" (Kimball, Lucy Walker, ms b). There is a possibility, however, that in some of these cases, such matrimonial sealings were seen as a way to establish a link between Joseph Smith and the man to whom the woman was civilly married. Such a woman would thus have a position in a sealing network somewhat analogous to that of Sarah Ann Whitney and Lucy Walker. If this was so, then the civil union itself might have been regarded as a way to extend the saving power that centered in Joseph Smith.

While such a conception would help to explain why zealous followers of Joseph Smith such as Parley P. Pratt and Orson Hyde would permit their wives to be sealed for eternity to the Prophet, evidence that their behavior was motivated by such considerations is only circumstantial. Some men who married women that had previously been sealed to Joseph Smith evidently felt that such a union would bring them into closer proximity with their now deceased leader. Heber C. Kimball held this position. After the death of Joseph Smith, Lucy Walker and other of Joseph Smith's widows became his wives. Lucy relates that shortly before his own death in 1868, Kimball spoke to her as follows:

What can you tell Joseph when you meet him? Cannot you say that I have been kind to you as it was possible to be under the circumstances? I know you can and am confident you will be as a mediator between me and Joseph and never enjoy any blessing you would not wish Heber to share. (Kimball, Lucy Walker, ms c)

Given such an understanding, it is not unreasonable to suppose that some Nauvoo Mormons might have believed that the same type of
"mediation" might be effected by having their wives matrimonially sealed to Joseph Smith. There is good evidence that some men had a conception very similar to this in the years immediately following the abandonment of Nauvoo. In March of 1847, while addressing those who had been linked to him through adoptive sealing, Brigham Young remarked:

If I am able to save one man why cannot [I] save more, and sometimes I wish that I could say unto all the ends of the earth, come and be saved. I have no objection to receiving any man into this organization [i.e., his family kingdom] until he behaves like the very devil as Jos Woodard did after teasing and whinning around me for 3 days to have his wife sealed to me. I told him they were both adopted to me and that was enough, but that would not do. Now he wants to take my life. He is a poor miserable curse and will be cursed. (Lee, John D. 1938:135-36)

From the context, it seems clear that Woodard believed that he could become more closely linked to Brigham Young by having his wife matrimonially sealed to him. While Brigham Young is here upset with Woodard, his displeasure is focused on what he did after his petition was denied. If Young considered the petition to be completely out of the question, it seems strange that he would have allowed Woodard to "tease" him about it for three days.

The extent of Joseph Smith's personal sealing network. Within the context of Mormon ideology, the women who were sealed to Joseph Smith, together with the children that they subsequently bore, were to be part of his eternal family kingdom. It is unclear at the present time, however, how many of these sealings were also regarded as ways to establish links of solidarity between Joseph Smith and relatives of his plural wives. There is evidence that some effort was extended to achieve this result.

This is illustrated in part by the number of his wives who were linked by civil ties to prominent men within the hierocracy. Through matrimonial alliance, Joseph Smith established ties of affinity with at least ten men with the rank of general authority.

In 1842, he married the widows of Presiding Bishop Vinson Knight and President of Seventy, Lyman R. Sherman. In 1843 he married a daughter of Apostle Heber C. Kimball, a sister-in-law of Apostle
Parley P. Pratt, two stepdaughters of President of Seventy, Josiah Butterfield, and sisters of Apostles Brigham Young and . . . [Willard Richards]. He also allied himself to the ecclesiastically prominent first bishops of the church, Edward Partridge and Newel K. Whitney, in marriages to their daughters. (Quinn 1973:166-67)

And in February of 1843 he was matrimonially sealed to the wife of Apostle Orson Hyde (Quinn 1978:88 note 33).

Such a listing does not indicate the full extent to which matrimonial sealings might possibly have been employed as a way to establish alliances between Joseph Smith and other men. As already indicated, matrimonial sealing was presented as a way to establish an eternal relationship between Joseph Smith and the household of the obscure John Walker. Plural wife Lucy Walker's narrative at least suggests the possibility that Joseph was as interested in forging a tie of solidarity with her brother Loren as with herself. And while living in the household of Joseph Smith at Nauvoo, John Rollins, the brother of plural wife Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner (ms e) came to understand that he would be included in the family kingdom of Joseph Smith.

The sealing network of Heber C. Kimball

By the time of his death, Joseph Smith had authorized the matrimonial sealing of only a few of his followers. The majority of these sealings evidently did not result in the establishment of plural unions. Danel Bachman (1975:189) lists only nine men who are known to have entered authorized polygamous relationships prior to the martyrdom. One of these individuals was Heber C. Kimball.

The sealing between Heber and Vilate Kimball. The initial exposure of Heber and Vilate Kimball to celestial marriage was evidently traumatic. According to family tradition, shortly after Heber's return from England, Joseph Smith informed him that the Lord required that Vilate be given to the prophet as a plural wife. Heber evidently agonized for three days and then decided to do as commanded. He took Vilate to the home of Joseph Smith and presented
her to his leader. The prophet then said that it had all been a test of faith, that the Lord had required that they make a sacrifice akin to that of Abraham. He thereupon eternally sealed them together as husband and wife (Whitney, Orson F. 1975:322-24, 439-40).

**Heber's marriage to Sarah Noon.** According to daughter Helen Mar, Joseph Smith next told Kimball that the Lord required that he begin taking plural wives without informing Vilate. He again agonized and concluded that it would not be too objectionable if he married Abigail and Laura Pitkin, middle-aged spinster sisters who were close friends to Vilate. When he told the prophet of his resolve, he was informed that his first plural wife would have to be Sarah Noon, a thirty-one-year-old English convert with two daughters, who had been abandoned by her first husband.

After this marriage was secretly performed, Heber withdrew into himself and began suffering from insomnia. Vilate became alarmed when he would not tell her what was troubling him. She sought the Lord's help in prayer and (reports Helen Mar) received a vision by which she came to understand

the order of celestial marriage, in all its beauty, together with the great exaltation and honor it would confer upon her in that immortal and celestial sphere, if she would accept it and stand in her place by her husband's side. She also saw the woman he had taken to wife, and contemplated with joy the vast and boundless love and union which this order would bring about, as well as the increase of her husband's kingdoms, and the power and glory extending throughout the eternities, worlds without end. . . . She returned to my father, saying, Heber, what you have kept from me the Lord has shown me. (Kimball, Stanley 1981:95-96; WE 10:74)

Despite possible spiritual assurances, plural marriage initially appears to have been a source of deep sorrow for both husband and wife. On 16 October 1842, Vilate was to write her husband as follows:

Our good Friend S[Sarah Noon] . . . is as ever, and we are one. You said I must tell you all my feelings; but if I were to tell you that I sometimes felt tempted and tried and feel as though my burden was greater than I could bear, it would only be a source of sorrow to you. (WE 11:1-2)
In response Heber was to write on 25 October:

I could weep like a child if I could get by myself to think for one moment that I have been the means of causing you any sorrow. . . . There has been but a few nits but what I have dreamt about you but most always I find you distant. My feelings are of that kind that it makes me sick at heart so that I have no appetite to eat. . . . I go to the woods every chance I have and pour out my soul before God that he would deliver me and bless you my dear love for I love you most dear I assure you for my heart ake so it seems as though it would burst. . . . I would be in tears weeping like a child, about you and the situation that I am in but what can I do but go ahead. . . . I never suffered more in all the days of my life than since these things come to pass. (Bachman 1975:184-85)

Helen Mar Kimball's marriage to Joseph Smith. In the year 1843 Heber C. Kimball began taking active measures to have his only living daughter, fourteen-year-old Helen Mar, become a plural wife to Joseph Smith. Perhaps in anticipation of this event he gave her a father's blessing on 28 May of that year. Among other things he declared:

Thou shalt be blest with immortal glory and enthroned with glory in the presence of the Lord. . . . Thou shalt be blessed with the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Thy posterity shall become numerous and great in the earth. . . . Be humble and listen with care to thy father and mother and all thy superiors. . . . Let thy treasures be laid up in heaven, where thou shall be enthroned in the presence of God. Deposit it there. And thou shalt be blessed with a companion and he shall be a man of God. Listen with care to his counsel for he shall be thy head. In as much as thou wilt do this thou shalt be honored of God, and shall be inspired with the blessings of God. . . . Be upright, be pure, and whatsoever covenant thou shalt enter into, let it be in view of eternity, that thou mayest look upon thy father and mother and thou will then see their anxiety which they have had for thee. . . . I seal thee up unto eternal life and thou shalt come forth in the resurrection. (Kimball, Heber C., ms g)

Years later Helen Mar was to detail the events that transpired in her life shortly after the blessing was given:

Just previous to my father's starting upon his last mission but one . . . , he taught me the principle of Celestial marriage, & having a great desire to be connected with the Prophet, Joseph, he offered me to him; this I afterward learned from the Prophet's own mouth. My father had but one ewe lamb, but willingly laid her upon the altar. . . . I will pass over the temptations which I had
during the twenty four hours after my father introduced to me this principle & asked me if I would be sealed to Joseph who came next morning & with my parents I heard him teach & explain the principle of Celestial marriage—after which he said to me, "If you will take this step, it will ensure your eternal salvation & exaltation and that of your father's household & all your kindred. This promise was so great that I willingly gave myself to purchase so glorious a reward. None but God & his angels could see my mother's bleeding heart. When Joseph asked her if she was willing she replied "If Heber is willing I have nothing more to say." She had witnessed the suffering of others, who were older & who better understood the step they were taking, & to see her child, who had scarcely seen her fifteenth summer following in the same thorny path, in her mind she saw the misery which was as sure to come as the sun was to rise and set, but it was all hidden from me.

I thought through this life my time will be my own
The step I now am taking's for eternity alone,
No one need be the wiser, through time I shall be free,
And as the past hath been the future still will be.
To my guileless heart all free from worldly care
And full of blessful hope and youthful visions rare
The world seemed bright the threatening clouds were kept
From sight and all looked fair but pitying angels wept
They saw my youthful friends grow shy and cold
And poisonous darts from slander'd tongues were hurled,

Pure and exalted was thy father's aim. He saw
a glory in obeying this high celestial law
For to thousands who've died without the light
I will bring eternal joy & make thy crown more bright.
I'd been taught to revere the Prophet of God
And receive every word as the word of the Lord,
But had this not come through my dear father's mouth,
I should ne'r have received it as God's sacred truth.

(Whitney, Helen Mar Kimball, ms a)

In June of 1844 Heber C. Kimball (ms h) wrote to his daughter concerning issues evidently associated with the matrimonial sealing that had linked her to Joseph Smith:

I hold you as a blessing that we have received from our Father which is in heaven, so be obedient to the council you have given to you from your dear Father and mother who seek your welfare both for time and eternity. . . . If you should have feelings in your heart keep them to yourself and tell them to no creature on earth but your father and mother, if you do you will be betrayed and exposed to your hurt. Remember my dear child what I tell you, for you will find I tell you the truth in Christ and lie not. You are blest but you know it not. You have done that which will be for your everlasting good for this world and that which is to come. I
will admit there is not much pleasure in this world. . . . You must not show this letter to any but our family. Be wise and you shall prosper in all things and you shall lack for nothing that is good and be true to your covenant that you have made.

Available data thus indicates that prior to the death of Joseph Smith, the Heber C. Kimball family had become involved in three matrimonial sealings: the first sealed Heber and Vilate eternally as husband and wife; the second resulted in Heber taking Sarah Noon as a second wife, and the third linked Heber C. Kimball's household to Joseph Smith through the marriage of daughter Helen Mar. This began what was to become one of the most extensive family kingdoms in Mormon history. The sealing ties upon which it was thus far established, however, had apparently brought considerable turmoil to the parties involved.

Organizational aspects of the Holy Order

As already indicated, the Holy Order was organized on 4 May 1842 with Heber C. Kimball as one of its charter members. On 1 November 1843 his wife, Vilate, was initiated into the order and on 8 January 1844 they jointly received the public portion of the second anointing (see Ehat 1982:102). Comment has already been made both on the nature of the rituals associated with the Holy Order and on possible reasons why it was organized at the time it was. In this section an overview will be presented of its organizational aspects.

Membership qualifications

By the time of Joseph Smith's death the Holy Order had developed various features in terms of which it had considerable affinity to the consecration community of the 1830s as well as some formal similarity to the Puritan church covenant group. First, like both the consecration community and the church covenant group, it consisted of a select group of individuals who had been drawn from the more general body of the Church. Its membership was highly restricted; by the time of the martyrdom only sixty-five individuals had joined its ranks. According to Elizabeth Ann Whitney, a member of
the order, Joseph Smith had stated that the endowment ritual by which
an individual was admitted was intended to be given only "to such
persons as were pure, full of integrity to the truth, and worthy to be
entrusted with divine messages[,] that to spread them abroad would
only be like casting pearls before swine and that the most profound
secrecy must be maintained" (WE 7:105). The membership consisted
primarily of the most prominent leaders of the Church together with
their wives. When the Council of Fifty was organized, most of the
male members of the order also became part of that body. As D.
Michael Quinn (1979:88) has written: "These men and women of the Holy
Order were a select group, a religious elite within the Church."

Admittance procedures

Second, procedures by which a prospective member was selected
combined methods employed in conjunction with the consecration
community with others reminiscent of Puritan church covenant group.
Thus, as with the consecration community, a new member was supposed to
be designated by revelation. In addition, as was the case in the
church covenant community, he also had to be approved by the other
members of the order. The best example of how this was done is found
in the journal of William Clayton. As private secretary to Joseph
Smith, Clayton was aware of the existence of the order and became
concerned because he was not asked to join. On 21 November 1843 Hyrum
Smith informed him that at least part of the reason he was kept out
was due to opposition of order member Emma Smith. Soon thereafter he
was told that still another member, Reynolds Cahoon, was also opposed
to his joining. He confided in his journal:

I now realize my situation more sensibly than I ever did in my
life. I might have the privilege of being received into the
quorum of anointing but Cahoon has got there and through private
pique he is resolved to deprive me of that privilege. That added
to Emma's determination to be revenged sinks my mind & fills me
with agony.

He consulted Joseph Smith, who told him "I had no need to be troubled,
the only reason why I was not admitted into the quorum was because
there is no convenience, and none were admitted only for a particular
purpose by Revelation." On 22 January 1844 he was visited by Reynolds Cahoon, who informed him "that a vote had been taken on my being admitted into the quorum & I was accepted. This filled my heart with joy, and gratitude for truly the mercy of the Lord and the kindness of my brother have been great to me." And finally on 3 February he was allowed to go through the endowment ritual by which he became part of the order. On that date he wrote that he "was permitted to the ordinance of washing and anointing, and was received into the Quorum of Priesthood. This is one of the greatest favors ever conferred on me and for which I feel grateful" (Ehat 1982:104–6).

Covenantal solidarity

Third, in all three instances members were bound together by covenants that they had jointly made. The nature of these covenants of course differed greatly: the Puritan church covenant consisted in a promise to abide by the rules of discipline that had been established by a particular church congregation; the consecration covenant was essentially an economic transaction in which the consecrator exchanged rights in fee simple for rights in usufruct over a specified stewardship; while the endowment ritual included a number of covenants associated with different aspects of the Mormon code of conduct. Despite such differences, members of all three types of organizational forms felt that through participation in their society's particular covenants, they established a distinctive relationship with the Lord that distinguished them, not only from mankind in general, but also from members of their respective religious communities that had not made similar covenants.

The promise of salvation

And fourth, in all three instances membership in the covenantal group was associated with the attainment of salvation. The Puritan church covenant group was believed to be composed exclusively of those who had received the covenant of grace and were thus endowed with real holiness and elected for salvation. Through participation in the consecration covenant, an individual was believed to have
demonstrated his willingness to sacrifice all for God and thus obtain an eternal inheritance in the New Jerusalem; while the second anointing with its accompanying promise of exaltation was a ritual reserved exclusively for members of the Holy Order.

The nature of order meetings

By "common consent . . . and unanimous voice" of the Holy Order, Joseph Smith was chosen as its president (Ehat 1982:94). Essentially all that transpired in its meetings was under his direction and supervision. Besides the enactment of rituals associated with the endowment and the second anointing, the principal activities of order meetings were prayer and instruction. Members of the order frequently joined together in a ritualized form of prayer which they believed gave them special access to Deity (Ehat 1982:109; Quinn 1979:94). Such prayers included petitions relative to the well-being both of individual Saints and of the Mormon community as a whole. It was believed that through the employment of such prayer, forces that were seeking the destruction of the Mormon people might be frustrated. Thus in April of 1844 Brigham Young told a gathering of Mormon elders that "when John C. Bennett went forth to try to destroy the Saints, a little company of us went before God and asked him to take away his power, and it fell like lightning from Heaven" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 9 Apr. 1844). Instructions covered a wide range of issues. A basic concern, however, appears to have been the need to remain loyal to the Church and its leader. Wilford Woodruff summarizes the instructions given in one such meeting as follows:

In the evening I met with the quorum Br Joseph was not present. B Young was called to the chair who addressed the meeting in a very feeling manner and interesting to our minds. He reasoned clearly that we should follow our file leaders and our savior in all his laws and commandments without asking any questions why they were so. (Woodruff, Wilford, 10 Dec. 1843)

Conclusion

During his years at Nauvoo, Joseph Smith initiated an essentially new covenantal system. While incorporating elements of
the 1830s covenantal order, it eliminated territoriality and economic cooperation as basic aspects of solidarity. In so doing it overcame what had heretofore been one of the chief obstacles to Mormon unity: the difficulty entailed in maintaining group cohesion when confronted with individualistic economic motivation and the almost constant threat of dislocation and forced migration.

Basic aspects of patriarchal organization. There were two basic organizational forms in this new covenantal system: the Holy Order and the sealing networks. The Holy Order was a sodality of individuals who were symmetrically linked through common participation in covenantally oriented rituals. Participants in a sealing network, on the other hand, were asymmetrically conjoined on the basis of affirmative opposition and hierarchy associated with American kinship patterning.

Power in both organizational forms was derived from the priesthood keys and authority that Joseph Smith was believed to have received. In both instances he personally remained the center of that power as long as he lived.

The Holy Order was a unitary body. Its initiation rituals were personally administered to the original inductees by Joseph Smith himself; and all others admitted to the order received these same rituals either from him or from members to whom he had delegated keys to perform such ordinances. As president of the order, it was he who supervised its affairs and had the final say in its deliberations.

Joseph Smith's centrality is somewhat more ambiguous within the sealing network complex. He was clearly at the center of the network of those linked to him through sealing ties; the saving power within his person was seen to extend to wives that were sealed to him, to children born in the covenant to those wives, and in some sense beyond the wives to other relatives. Other men who received their second anointing, however, were believed to have somewhat similar power. Each had the potential to be the center of his individual sealing network; or as Benjamin Johnson would term it, the center of his own nucleus of heaven. Joseph Smith remained the center of power for such networks in the sense that it was only through his
authorization that these men both had received the second anointing that gave them the saving power entailed in the position of priest and king, and had participated in matrimonial sealing by which they were able to organize and build individual family kingdoms. But while Joseph Smith held the central organizing keys by which such networks were established, the patriarchal priest and king at the head of each network held a degree of autonomous power within the context of the particular network itself.

In view of the fact that Joseph Smith employed matrimonial sealing to forge ties between himself and other men, it is possible that he envisioned all the priests and kings within the system eventually being linked to him through some form of sealing network. This possibility is given additional support by statements of some of Joseph Smith's intimate followers made subsequent to the instigation of adoptive sealing. They set forth the possibility that some day the entire membership of the Church might be linked through sealing ties to Joseph Smith. Thus in February of 1847 Brigham Young indicated that he might take measures to have the church membership sealed to Joseph Smith (Lee, John D. 1939:8-; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 16 Feb. 1847). And in 1894 Wilford Woodruff instructed the membership of the Church to link all their ancestral lines in sealing "chains" and when they had gotten as far as possible in each line "let the last man be adopted to Joseph Smith, who stands at the head of the dispensation" (Deseret News, 21 Apr. 1894, p. 543).

It was, however, its semi-autonomous power base, coupled with the kinship ordered nature of its linkages, that made the sealing network form of organization so pertinent within the context of the insecurity that the Mormon people were attempting to confront during the last months of Joseph Smith's life. It was essentially independent of the ecclesiastical organization of the Church: it created a new structure of religious organization by fusing the concept of distributed authority with that of kinship association. And it did not require its members to be territorially united: theoretically all contact among them might cease; some could even die; but the structure itself could remain in place. Its members could expect that despite any externally imposed disruption, inclusion in
the network could ensure them of the two basic elements of the Mormon concept of salvation: protection from impending eschatological destruction and a position in the celestial kingdom. Thus, as Joseph Smith had indicated, it would be possible for a man and his family to come to the temple only long enough to receive essential ordinances. They could then return to their own abode amid Gentile society to "wait till they go to receive their reward" (HC 6:319). And even if the ecclesiastical structure of the Church should be torn asunder, the saving capacity of the Restoration would still be preserved in the sealing power binding individual Mormons together in familial-based sealing networks. As Brigham Young would have it, the formulation was "a perfect knock-down to the devil's kingdom" (HC 6:321).

**Impact of the patriarchal order on participants.** While the Saints were never "divided, broken up, and scattered" (HC 6:184) in the manner that might have been feared, participation by devoted Mormons in the rituals of the patriarchal order appears to have yet another consequence for Mormon group solidarity. It intensified the Mormon sense of exclusiveness. This was produced by the interaction between plural marriage and the promises associated with the rituals of the patriarchal order. The writings of Heber and Vilate Kimball illustrate this point. As has already been seen, acceptance of plural marriage was traumatic for them. Their acquiescence to this practice appears to have been accompanied by a rejection of Gentile society. They both seem to have realized this to a degree. In her 16 October 1842 letter to Heber, Vilate thus states: "I realize that the scenes we are called to pass through are calculated to wean us from the world and prepare us for a better one" (WE 11:1-2). And in 1849 Heber C. Kimball informed a gathering of Saints "that he was perfectly well aware of one thing that the principle [of plural marriage] was to bring them out from their former traditions and those that had moral courage, get to go ahead and not trust in the arm of flesh" (Davis, Daniel, ms a, 21 Jan. 1849).

Coupled with this "weaning" from the world appears to have been an unequivocal acceptance of the ideology associated with the
ritual enactments of the patriarchal order. Thus on 16 October 1842 Heber wrote to Vilate as follows:

O Lord my God I ask . . . that thou wilt look upon my dear Vilate and bless her . . . and my children and let them live long on the Earth that our seed may be as numerous as the stars in the firmament and that they may be all righteous from the least to the greatest that when I have finished my course that I may have power to bring forth my dear Vilate and all of my posterity in the Resurrection of the just and take them through the gate in the City and partake of the eternal life. (Kimball, Heber C., ms f)

The following June, Vilate was to write to her husband as follows:

Let your heart be comforted, and if you never more behold my face in time, let this be my last covenant and testimony unto you: that I am yours in time and throughout all eternity. This blessing has been sealed upon us by the Holy Spirit of promise, and cannot be broken only through transgression, or committing a grosser crime than your heart or mine is capable of. (Whitney, Orson F. 1978:335)

And in January 1847 she composed the following verse:

No being round the spacious earth
Beneath the vaulted arch of heaven
Divides my love, or draws it thence
From him to whom my heart is given,

Like the frail ivy to the oak
Drawn closer by the tempest riven
Through sorrow's flood he'll bear me up
And light with smiles my way to heaven.

The gift was on the altar laid
The plighted vow on earth was given
The seal eternal has been made
And by his side I'll reign in heaven.
(Kimball, Heber C., ms d, between entries for 19 Oct. 1844 and 28 May 1845)

Impact of the patriarchal order on nonparticipants. As already stated, only a small number of Saints participated in the ordinances of celestial marriage, the endowment, and the second anointing during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. The patriarchal order complex had much less impact on the rank and file membership of the Church who were excluded from such rituals. At best they had only
vague understandings regarding their nature, and generally did not even know that they were currently being performed. The formulations of the patriarchal order, however, did have at least two important consequences for such individual's solidarity with the Mormon group.

First, because of the practice of baptism for the dead and public teachings regarding the eternal nature of the family unit, the Saints in general were given the understanding that through continued loyalty to the Mormon church they might be eternally united with family members in the hereafter. Thus shortly after the death of his infant son, Thomas, in 1843, Joseph Hovey (ms a) recorded in his journal:

He was a promising little child, but nevertheless we did not mourn for believing to receive him and meet again at the resurrection if we faithfully fulfill and hold out to the end. I Joseph did also receive news that my mother died the same day that my little Thomas. She did not belong to the church of Christ for she did not have it presented to her only as I wrote to her. Nevertheless I have a hope of meeting her again at the first resurrection through the provisions that God has made for such that had not the opportunity to embrace the gospel of Christ. Hence, under the existing circumstances, I have a most glorious hope of meeting my dead . . . to clasp hands in eternal felicity.

And second, evidently as a means to prepare them for participation in the eternal marriage covenant, some attempt was made to organize the families of the general church membership according to some of the provisions of the patriarchal order. Joseph Hovey (ms a) thus records:

January 1844

The Spirit of Elijah was very comprehensive in some for truly they had the power to seal on earth and seal in heaven, those men being appointed by the Prophet Joseph to go through the City of the Saints and say unto them, set your houses in order and stop all bickerings against each other and your neighbor. Hence I Joseph and my wife Martha covenanted that we would strive to keep all the commandments and be humble, meek, and lowly with us as standing at the head of our family and also with our brothers and sisters. Meetings held both day and night in order to unite or covenant together to do the will of the Lord and great peace and joy did prevail amongst us.
The martyrdom

While understandings regarding the patriarchal order evidently thus contributed to a sense of "great peace and joy" among Mormons who remained committed to the teachings of its founder, there were others who were not so willing to accept these innovations as God inspired. Thus Isaac and Sarah Scott (1958:144) wrote home from Nauvoo:

A plurality of Gods. A plurality of living wives. And unconditional sealing up to eternal life against all sins save the shedding of innocent blood or consenting thereunto. These with many other things are taught by Joseph which we consider are odious and doctrine of devils.

In the end it was this internal antagonism that provoked the external hostility which directly precipitated Joseph Smith's death.

From his earliest attempts to instigate plural marriage, Joseph Smith had to confront opposition from Mormons who knew of the practice and could not accept it as God inspired. The defection of John C. Bennett in 1842 had temporarily provided such individuals with a standard behind which they might rally, but his fraudulent exposes and virulent anti-Mormon crusading failed to win him any lasting support within the Mormon community. Concerted opposition did not emerge until 1844. In the early months of that year some of the most prominent citizens of Nauvoo were becoming vocal about their feelings. In April and May a number of these dissenters were excommunicated from the Church. Among them were the following: William Law, a counselor to Joseph Smith in the Church's First Presidency; Wilson Law, Major-General of the Nauvoo Legion; Robert Foster, Surgeon-General of the Nauvoo Legion; and Austin Cowles, a member of the Nauvoo stake presidency (HC 6:341, 398). These men provided leadership to those who were opposed to the direction that Joseph Smith was leading the Church.

On 28 April the dissenters organized a new church with William Law as its president. Their main tenet was that Joseph Smith had once been a true prophet but was now fallen. Their objective was to remove him from office and replace him with an individual who would lead the Mormon church correctly. Some 300 members of the Mormon community in Nauvoo joined their ranks. One of their chief tools was to be an
opposition newspaper, published within Nauvoo itself and ostensibly established to "censure and decry gross moral imperfection wherever found, either in plebeian, patrician or SELF-CONSTITUTED MONARCH" (Hill, Donna 1977:392).

Only one issue of the Nauvoo Expositor appeared. After its publication on 7 June, Joseph Smith together with the Nauvoo City Council examined its contents, declared it a public nuisance, and ordered the city marshal to destroy the press. When the surrounding communities learned what had happened, there was a general outrage. Thomas Sharp, editor of the Warsaw Signal, wrote: "Let there be no cowards in the camp . . . but upon every man's countenance let there be written the desperate determination . . . to strike the tyrant to the dust" (Hill, Donna 1977:396). And on June 13 a mass meeting was held at Warsaw in which it was resolved that

the time . . . has arrived, when the adherents of Smith, as a body should be driven from the surrounding settlements into Nauvoo. That the prophet and his miscreant adherents should then he [sic] demanded at their hands; and if not surrendered, a war of extermination should be waged to the entire destruction, if necessary for our protection, of his adherents. (HC 6:464)

A warrant was issued at Carthage for the arrest of Joseph Smith and others believed to have been involved in the destruction of the Expositor. When a constable arrived to arrest them on 17 June, they appeared before Justice Daniel H. Wells of Nauvoo and were discharged. News of this event inflamed the already intense anti-Mormon feelings in the surrounding communities and hundreds took up arms. Joseph Smith in his turn called out the Nauvoo Legion, put the city under martial law, and began to prepare for its defense. On 21 June Governor Ford arrived at Carthage to take charge of the situation and attempt to restore order. The governor demanded that the prophet submit to arrest and come to Carthage for trial. With good reason Joseph feared for his safety, and on 22 June he told Stephen Markham "that if I and Hyrum were ever taken again we should be massacred, or I was not a prophet of God" (HC 6:546). He decided that the best thing would be for him and Hyrum to flee Nauvoo. In the early hours of 23 June, they crossed the Mississippi with the intention of going west. When later that day he received word that
his followers were accusing him of desertion and that Emma would not go with him, Joseph and his brother returned to Nauvoo, submitted to arrest, and were placed in the jail at Carthage. It was there while awaiting trial that they were murdered by a mob on 27 June 1844 (Brodie 1977:380-95; Hill, Donna 1977:395-418; HC 6:487-631).

Nauvoo after the Martyrdom

Preparation for the Exodus

The emergence of apostolic succession

The death of Joseph Smith was followed by a short hiatus in the Mormon-Gentile conflict. The non-Mormons of Hancock County feared that the Saints would seek to avenge the death of their fallen leader by sending the Nauvoo Legion against them, while the shocked inhabitants of Nauvoo, alarmed at the possibility of further anti-Mormon violence, turned inward while attempting to adjust to a new existence without their prophet-founder. As Apostle Willard Richards wrote Brigham Young on 30 June:

The effect of this hellish butcher was like the busting of a tornado on Carthage and Warsaw; those villages were without inhabitants, as in an instant they ran for their lives, lest the Mormons should burn and kill them suddenly—'the wicked flee when no man pursueth.' . . .

The Saints have entered into covenants of peace with the governor and government officers, not to avenge the blood of the martyrs, but leave it with the executive. . . . The elders cannot be too careful in all the world, to keep from saying anything to irritate and vex the governor, etc., for at present we must conciliate: it is for our salvation. . . . Let the elders keep cool, vengeance rests in heaven. (HC 7:147-48)

The most critical issue now facing the Mormons was determining who should be their new leader. At different points in his career Joseph Smith had indicated various ways in which succession might occur, and in the weeks immediately following his death there was no clear consensus among the inhabitants of Nauvoo as to who should take his place (Quinn 1976b; 1981). The confusion was compounded by the fact that at the time of the martyrdom many of the Church's leaders were away from Nauvoo due to their involvement in Joseph Smith's
presidential campaign and the Church's missionary work. For a time it almost appeared as if the Church might split apart. Thus William Clayton (1982:32) recorded in his journal under date of 6 July 1844: "The greatest danger that now threatens us is dissensions and strifes amongst the Church. There are already 4 or 5 men pointed out as successors to the Trustee & President & there is danger of feelings being manifest."

Among the contending parties, those who had the most support were Sidney Rigdon, the only remaining member of the Church's First Presidency, and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, headed by Brigham Young. Sidney Rigdon arrived in Nauvoo on Saturday, 3 August, and the next day publicly announced that he had received a vision in which the Lord had revealed that he should be appointed "guardian" to the Church. Following this declaration, William Marks, president of the Church's Nauvoo Stake, announced that a general church meeting would be held on Thursday, the 8th, "for the purpose of choosing a guardian" (HC 7:225). Brigham Young arrived in Nauvoo on Tuesday evening, and he and his fellow apostles took charge of the Thursday meeting.

Brigham Young spoke for some two hours, telling the gathered Saints that the apostles and the apostles alone had received from Joseph Smith the priesthood keys essential for the direction of the restored church. Priesthood power was now monopolized by the Twelve and existed in them independent of the will of the Church as a body. Thus the Church was but an appendage to the hierocracy:

You cannot fill the office of a prophet, seer and revelator: God must do this. You are like children without a father and sheep without a shepherd. You must not appoint any man at our head: if you should the Twelve must ordain him. You cannot appoint a man at our head; but if you do want any other man or men to lead you, take them and we will go our way to build up the kingdom in all the world. . . .

Does this church want it as God organized it? Or do you want to clip the power of the priesthood, and let those who have the keys of the priesthood go and build up the kingdom in all the world, wherever the people will hear them? . . .

Now if you want Sidney Rigdon or William Law to lead you, or anybody else, you are welcome to them; but I tell you, in the name of the Lord that no man can put another between the Twelve and the Prophet Joseph. Why? Because Joseph was their file leader, and he has committed into their hands the keys of the kingdom in this last dispensation. (HC 7:235)
He then asked those assembled:

Does the church want, and is it their only desire to sustain the Twelve as the first Presidency of this people? . . .
All that are in favor of this, in all the congregation of the saints, manifest it by holding up the right hand. (HC 7:240)

According to official Church record, the vote was "universal" in the affirmative.

Despite such public acknowledgment, the inhabitants of Nauvoo were far from unanimous in their unequivocal acceptance of the apostles' quorum as the appropriate group to lead the Church. Some believed that their leadership should continue only until Joseph Smith's oldest son became of age and assumed the presidency on the basis of patriarchal succession. Others initially accepted the Twelve as Joseph Smith's true successors but subsequently became disillusioned with the direction of their leadership. The Twelve, however, evidently did enjoy the backing of the Mormon group as a whole.

As president of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, Brigham Young in effect became head of the Church. Heber C. Kimball, Brigham Young's closest friend, and ranked second to him in the quorum, now became the second most powerful man in the Church.

Nauvoo under Brigham Young
The temple as a symbol of unity

The succession of Brigham Young and the apostles to the leadership of the Church was to be crucial for the subsequent development of Mormonism. As Andrew Ehat (1982) has shown, among the various contenders, they alone wholeheartedly accepted the practice of plural marriage and as a group had participated in all the rituals that Joseph Smith had secretly introduced during his last years at Nauvoo. During Joseph Smith's lifetime, most of these men had evidenced a fierce loyalty to their leader, and after his death they were determined to carry out his directions to the best of their ability. Foremost among their goals became the completion of the
temple and the performance within its walls of the rituals for which it had been built.

The temple readily became the symbol of the continuing existence of the Mormon church as a corporate entity with the apostles, employing the priesthood keys they had received from Joseph Smith, at its head. On 15 August, just one week after being sustained as the presidency of the Church, the Quorum of Apostles issued an epistle to the membership of the Church throughout the world in which they stated:

You are now without a prophet present with you in the flesh to guide you; but you are not without apostles, who hold the keys of power to seal in heaven, and to preside over all the affairs of the church in all the world; being still under the direction of the same God, and being dictated by the same spirit. . . .

On the subject of the gathering, let it be distinctly understood that the City of Nauvoo and the Temple of our Lord are to continue to be built up according to the pattern which has been commenced, and which has progressed with such rapidity thus far. (TS 5:618-19)

And in an epistle issued on 1 October, they wrote:

THE TEMPLE, as a great and glorious public work, immediately connected with the completion of our preparations, and ordinances, touching our salvation and exaltation, and that of our dead, necessarily claims our first and most strict attention. . . . We verily know and bear testimony, that a cloud of blessing, and of endowment, and of the keys of the fulness of the priesthood, and of things pertaining to eternal life, is hanging over us, and ready to burst upon us; or upon as many as live worthy of it, as soon as there is a place found on earth to receive it. Therefore, let no cunningly devised fable, no false delusive spirit, or vision, no man or set of men who go out from us, but are not of us, have any influence on your minds for a moment, to draw your minds away from this all important work. (TS 5:668)

The desire of many Mormons to move away from the Nauvoo area in the days following the martyrdom was counteracted by the imperative to build the temple and there perform rituals by virtue of the authority now monopolized by the apostles. Thus Brigham Young declared in a public discourse on 18 August 1844:

I discover a disposition in the sheep to scatter, now the shepherd is taken away. I do not say that it will never be right for this people to go from here. . . .; but I do say wait until . . . you are counseled to do so. . . . Stay here in Nauvoo, and build the
Temple and get your endowments; do not scatter; 'united we stand, divided we fall.' It has been whispered about that all who go into the wilderness with Wight and Miller will get their endowments, but they cannot give an endowment in the wilderness. If we do not carry out the plan Joseph has laid down and the pattern he has given for us to work by, we cannot get any further endowment.

... North and South America is Zion and as soon as the Temple is done and you get your endowments you can go and build up stakes, but do not be in haste, wait until the Lord says go. (HC 7:254-55, 258)

And for those who did leave, the temple and its rituals were given as an inducement to return. Thus after James Emmett left Nauvoo with a group of about one hundred Mormons, the apostles wrote them as follows:

We labored long and faithfully to persuade Brother Emmett to hearken to the counsel of his friends to whom were committed the power, authority and keys of the salvation of Zion and the redemption of her children together with the keys of endowment for the lifting up and exaltation of the heirs of promise ... , but our counsels ... with him were in vain. He still persisted in his course and has led you forth from our midst and separated you from the body and like a branch severed from a tree you must and will perish together with your posterity and your progenitors unless you are engrafted again thereon before you wither and die.

... Do you wish, dear brethren, to see the house of our God built up, adorned, and prepared according to the commandment and pattern given? Do you wish to enter into its sacred courts and receive your washings and anointings, and the keys of knowledge and power? Do you desire the eternal seal of the priesthood placed upon your head by which your progenitors for ages past and your posterity for endless generations to come shall be secured to you in a covenant that is everlasting? ... All of you are ready to answer yes, and respond with a hearty affirmative. But remember there is but one way by which you can realize or partake of these things; it is by hearkening to our counsel in all things. (HC 7:378)

Mounting persecution and the decision to abandon Nauvoo

While not all Mormons were willing to accept the leadership of Brigham Young and remain in Nauvoo, he was able to ward off any large-scale defection; and the population of the city actually continued to grow. In the fall of 1844 anti-Mormon persecution was renewed, and it continued to increase in intensity during the ensuing
months. In January 1845 the Nauvoo Charter was repealed in its entirety by the state legislature, and no alternative measures were passed in regard to Nauvoo's corporate existence or internal regulation. In response, Brigham Young instigated an extralegal and essentially theocratic form of government to manage the affairs of the city.

Throughout the spring conditions continued to deteriorate and it became increasingly apparent to Church leaders that the Mormon group's position in Illinois was becoming untenable. Letters were sent to each state governor (with the exception of Missouri and Illinois) as well as to the president of the United States requesting their aid in helping the Saints find a new location. The letters to the state governors said in part:

In the name of Israel's God, and by virtue of multiplied ties of country and kindred, we ask your friendly interposition in our favor. Will it be too much to ask you to convene a special session of your state legislature, and furnish us an asylum where we can enjoy our rights of conscience and religion unmolested? Or will you in a special message to that body when convened, recommend a remonstrance against such unhallowed acts of oppression and expatriation, as this people have continued to receive from the states of Missouri and Illinois? Or will you favor us by your personal influence, and by your official rank? (Roberts 1957, 2:522)

Evidently only Governor Drew of Arkansas answered: he suggested that they leave the United States and settle in Oregon.

By the end of the summer a condition of near anarchy existed in and around Hancock County, and it appeared that at any time civil war might break out between Mormons and Gentiles. Finally on 24 September Brigham Young entered into a formal agreement that the Mormon people would leave the state: "Whereas, we desire peace above all other earthly blessings ... we propose to leave this county next spring, for some point so remote, that there will not need to be a difficulty with the people and ourselves" (Roberts, B. H. 1957 II:509).

Being forced from their homes by mob action while neither the government of Illinois, the governments of the other states, or the federal government were willing to come to their assistance, the Mormons came to feel that the American people were collectively
expelling the LDS people from their midst. As Newel Knight (ms a) wrote in his journal on 1 October 1845:

Our enemies or rather the enemies of the kingdom which God has set up on the earth are raging and doing all that is in their power to destroy the Saints from off the earth. So violent have been their measures and so eminently aided by those who hold the reins of government that all our brethren whose lives have been spared have been forced to flee from every part of the country into the city for safety while their house and chattel have been given to the flames.

While I write my hand and heart, trembling at the picture or reality of the acts of men who are made in the likeness of God and ought to be noble and like him in their motives, almost fails and quite makes me blush to record their acts. So violate have been their works and so little has government paid to our cries and petitions for relief of wrong that the only way possible for us to quench the flame and check the hand of persecution so as to save the lives of the innocent babe, the spritely youth, together with the middle aged, and the silver headed veteran who once fought with a Washington to plant the standard of freedom and spread the banner of liberty in this glorious land. I say the only possible means of checking the fury of this nation has been to sign a decree that the people called Latter Day Saints must leave this bosted land of liberty, that they neither sow nor reap again upon their possessions. O Columbia, Oh bosted land of America! how hath thy glory faded, thy honor fled.

Expansion of the patriarchal order

Eternal marriage and polygamy. As these developments unfolded, the rituals that Joseph Smith had instigated during his last years continued to be enacted. Under the direction of Brigham Young, additional Church members were secretly introduced to eternal marriage, and the practice of plural marriage continued to spread. For example, in the fall of 1844 Heber C. Kimball married eight women: these included Sarah Lawrence, a Joseph Smith widow; Rebecca Swain, widow of Joseph Smith's former counselor Frederick G. Williams; and Nancy Whichester, who was subsequently sealed to Joseph Smith for eternity. During 1845 he took another five wives. Two of these, Sarah Ann Whitney and Lucy Walker, had also previously been matrimonially sealed to Joseph Smith (Kimball, Stanley 1981:122).

Developments within the Holy Order. The Holy Order initially met after the martyrdom on 11 August, the first Sunday following the
acceptance of the Quorum of Apostles as the First Presidency of the Church; and members continued to meet together thereafter. In January 1845 new members began to be inducted into the order. Among these were various women who had been matrimonially sealed to Joseph Smith, including Helen Mar Kimball and Sarah Ann Whitney. And on 15 August of the same year, second anointings once more began to be administered (Ehat 1982:102-3; 206-8; Quinn 1978:91-92).

One of the most important activities of the Holy Order during this period was the offering of prayers that the Mormons might be protected from mob activity and that the temple might be completed. Thus the purpose of the 11 August meeting was to "pray for deliverance from the mob" (Ehat 1982:207; HC 7:248). On 3 April 1845 members of the order prayed that the plans of the mob might be frustrated that they might have no influence nor power to disturb nor trouble us, that the leaders of the mob . . . may be visited with judgments, and that we may be preserved in peace to finish the houses and see the Elders endowed and fulfill all that the Lord commanded us in this place. (Clayton 1982:62)

On 29 May prayers were offered "that the Lord would over-rule the mob so that we may dwell in peace until the Temple is finished" (Clayton 1982:62). And on 25 September members of the order prayed "that the Lord will preserve us in peace to finish the Temple and prepare to depart West in peace" (Clayton 1982:74).

Such ritualized prayers were regarded by members of the Holy Order as central to Mormon solidarity, security, and continued existence. As Brigham Young declared to the entire body of the Holy Order on 7 December 1845:

a few of the quorum [of the anointed] had met twice a week ever since Joseph and Hyrum were killed and during the last excitement, every day and in the hottest part of it twice a day to offer up the signs and pray to our heavenly father to deliver his people and this is the cord which has bound this people together. If this quorum and those who shall be admitted into it will be as diligent in prayer as a few has been I promise you in the name of Israels God that we shall accomplish the will of God and go out in due time from the gentiles with power and plenty and no power shall stay us. (Clayton 1982:81)
The Nauvoo Temple and its ordinances

Once the Mormons had formally agreed to abandon their city, activity within Nauvoo was oriented toward two paramount tasks: the completion of the temple and an expeditious exodus from Illinois. As the Times and Seasons (6:1050) stated on 1 December 1845:

Peace and union reign at Nauvoo, and as to business, every saint that means to keep the commandments of the Lord, and prepare for the revelation of Jesus Christ, is earnestly employed in fitting out for the intended removal next spring; or, as a willing and obedient people many are engaged upon the Temple—determined to finish that glorious structure of Latter-day Saints faith and works, as a monument, that they were industrious, noble minded, and sincere.

Baptism for the dead had been performed in the basement of the unfinished temple as early as November of 1841 (see HC 4:446). The decision had been made, however, to administer the ordinances of endowment, eternal marriage, and the second anointing in the temple's attic story; and it was not until the temple was almost completed that these rooms could be employed for that purpose. On 29 November a group of elders met in the now essentially completed attic and "bowed ourselves before the Lord and gave him thanks for his gracishness to us in sparing our lives to finish this house thus far" (Kimball, Heber C., ms b, 29 Nov. 1845). And on the following day twenty members of the Holy Order again met in the attic as Brigham Young dedicated its rooms for the enactment of Mormonism's most sacred rituals (Kimball, Heber C., ms b, 30 Nov. 1845).

The endowment was to be the first part of this ritual complex to which the general population of the Church were introduced. A major portion of the attic was set aside for this purpose. In the days immediately following the dedicatory service, members of the Holy Order prepared this area of the temple for the proper administration of this complex ritual. On 9 December Heber C. Kimball (ms b) recorded in his journal:

We shall begin our operation tomorrow if the Lord wills. O Lord be with thy servants and inspire thy servants with light and knowledge so that they may not go wrong in thy ordinance of the Holy Priesthood and thy name shall have all glory.
The next day the endowment ritual was performed for the first time within the temple. Members of the Holy Order first went through the ritual themselves, essentially following the procedures that had been established by Joseph Smith. As Holy Order member Joseph Fielding (1979:158-59) records in his journal:

quoted text

On Friday, the 12th of December I and my Wife received our Endowment having formerly received it in the Days of Joseph and Hyram but it is now given in a more perfect Manner because of better Convenience, the 12 are very strict in attending to the true and proper form.

Having again received their endowments within the temple, members of the Holy Order began administering the same ritual to groups of adult members of the Church who previously had not been permitted to participate in the ordinance.

It was almost a month after the administration of the endowment had commenced that matrimonial sealings and second anointings were first performed in the temple. For this purpose a special altar was constructed in an attic room referred to as the Holy of Holies. The altar was dedicated on 7 January. The same day matrimonial sealings began to be performed at this altar, and the following day second anointings started to be administered in the same room (Brown, Lisle 1979:373; Buerger 1983:25-26; Kimball, Heber C., ms b, 7 Jan. 1846). (As the work load increased, the second anointing began to be performed at two other locations in the attic.) Those who had previously received these rituals were again among the first to receive them in the temple.

At the altar in the Holy of Holies adoptive sealings were evidently first performed in the history of the Church. Some of these sealings united children not born in the covenant with their biological parents, while others were performed between individuals who were not related biologically. Comments made by temple recorders at the time these rituals were performed indicate their ideological significance.

The purpose of adoptive sealing between a couple and their biological offspring appears clearly to have been to place the children in the same relationship to their parents that would have
existed had they been born in the covenant. It was a way to secure to the children the blessings that had been placed upon the parents. The children thus became heirs in the kingdom over which the parents were to preside as king and queen. The following comment thus occurs in "The Book of Adoptions and Sealings" immediately following the entry dealing with the sealing of Newel and Elizabeth Ann Whitney to their biological children:

The children . . . were (at the altar, in Holy Order . . .) sealed up unto their parents for time and all eternity (with the usual reserve in case of mutual agreement) and also unto eternal life . . . with all the blessings there unto which appertain to the fulfillment of the covenant which they mutually entered into at the altar.

The adoptive sealing of individuals to persons other than their biological parents appears to have had the identical intent. John Bernhisel, for example, was the only individual that the record indicates was sealed adoptively to Joseph Smith. Recording this sealing the record states that on 3 February 1846 John Milton Bernhisel came to the sacred altar in the upper room of the "House of the Lord" . . . and thereupon gave himself to Prest. Joseph Smith (martyred) to become his son by the law of adoption and to become a legal heir to all the blessings bestowed upon Joseph Smith pertaining to exaltation, even the eternal Godhead, with a solemn covenant.

The concepts of "exaltation" and "the eternal Godhead" are linked to the ritual of second anointing as can be seen by examining the text of Heber C. Kimball's second anointing blessing. It appears evident that John Bernhisel is here becoming a "legal heir" to the blessings Joseph Smith received in his second anointing. He is thus receiving the same blessings that would have been his had he been born in the covenant to Joseph Smith. In the terminology of Joseph Smith he is being "secured by the seal wherewith" Joseph Smith had "been sealed" (see Coray, Martha Jane Knowleton, ms a, 18 Aug. 1843 sermon).

The common ideological basis of adoptive sealings between parents and their biological offspring and parents and "adopted" children is clearly indicated by the fact that both types of sealings could be effected in the same ritual performance. Thus following mention of a ceremony in which John and Clarissa Smith were
simultaneously sealed as parents both to their biological offspring and to adopted children, the following statement is made:

The above mentioned children having all received their endowment were sealed to their parents John and Clarissa Smith at the altar, mutually entering into covenant, the parents and children covenanted together according to the order were all sealed (both natural and adopted) to them for time and all eternity to bear their name and to be numbered with them in their inheritance and kingdom which may be given and also sealed unto eternal life &c on condition of keeping the covenants made on this sacred altar.

Existing records indicate that by the time that ordinance work was discontinued in mid-February, over 5,000 people had received their endowments, approximately 2,500 persons had participated in matrimonial sealings, some 600 individuals had received their second anointing, about 70 children had been sealed to their biological parents, and between 130 and 180 men and women had been sealed as children to individuals who were not their biological parents ("The Book of Adoptions and Sealings"; Ehat 1982:240). Not everyone who desired to do so was able to participate in the various ordinances. By far the least performed ordinance was adoptive or lineal sealing. At least part of the reason for this was the unexpected departure of the apostles and the consequent premature closing of the temple to ordinance work (see JD 16:187).

Despite the early termination of ritual activity, by finishing the construction of the temple and therein performing the various ordinances of the patriarchal order, the Mormons of Nauvoo believed that they had fulfilled the commandment given to them through Joseph Smith and thus preserved their special relationship with the Lord. As Orson Hyde explained at the temple's public dedication on 3 May 1846:

As respecting the finishing of this house I will ask, "Why have we labored to complete it when we were not expecting to stay?" There is two sides to everything but in Mormonism there is but one side on earth and the other in Heaven. If we moved forward and finished this House we should be received and accepted as a Church with our dead. These things have inspired and stimulated us to action. In finishing of it which through the blessing of God we have been enabled to accomplish and prepared it for dedication. In doing this we have only been saved as it were by the skin of our teeth.
And as Wilford Woodruff concurred:

The Saints had labored faithfully and finished the temple and were now received as a Church with our dead. This is glory enough for building the temple. And thousands have received their endowments in it and the light will not go out (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 3 May 1846).

The Nauvoo Temple Ordinances and Mormon Group Cohesion

The social milieu in which the ordinances were administered

The participation of the general population of the Church in the temple rituals was to have profound consequences for Mormon group identity and solidarity. In order to understand why this is so, it is essential to comprehend the conditions under which they were administered. As has already been seen, the ordinances were performed as the Mormon community was experiencing what it regarded as extreme persecution at the same time that the quorum of apostles were both making plans to lead the body of Saints from the confines of the United States and attempting more fully to legitimize their position as the presiding officials of the Church. These factors were to have a great impact on the significance that the temple ordinances were to have for the Mormon group as a whole.

Documents from the period clearly indicate that while the ordinances were being administered, both its leaders and the Mormon community in general felt that the continued existence of the Church was in jeopardy. This was generated by four basic fears: (1) that schismatic leaders would draw away large portions of the Mormon population; (2) that mobs would directly attack the city of Nauvoo; (3) that state officials would somehow disrupt the Church's planned exodus; and (4) that the federal government would intervene in such a way that the Mormon community could not leave the United States.

The fear of schism

While the majority of the Mormons accepted the leadership of the Twelve, there still remained other individuals who claimed to be
the true successors to Joseph Smith. Each of these had his advocates both in Nauvoo and elsewhere. The arguments made by the various contenders were widely discussed among the Saints, and the decision to follow either Brigham Young or some other leader ultimately rested with each individual. Thus William Clayton (1982:82) writes in his journal under date of 23 January 1846:

R. Miller reports that Strang [a schismatic leader] is making heavy breaches in the church, and drawing many after him. In one place 30 families have left the church and gone with him. It is also rumored that many of the saints here are full of Strangism and talking hard in his favor. Among the rest are John Gaylord and Wm. A. Sangor who are openly advocating his rights to the presidency.

And under date of 1 February 1846, Norton Jacobs (1949:17) records:

There was a meeting in the Temple. . . . Brother Brigham Young said that Moses Smith wanted to set forth the doctrines and claims of James J. Strang. Moses then arose and read some of Strang's productions, and made some comments, and warned the people to flee to Voree, Strang's new city in Wisconsin, where he promised them peace and safety. He however recognized the authority of the Twelve. After he had done, Brother Brigham said he would make no comment but simply ask the people if they had heard the voice of the Good Shepherd in what had been advanced. "No!" resounded all over the house. 'Twas proposed that Moses Smith be cut off from the Church, which was carried unanimously. . . . Many have been deluded by Strangism, and one of them a president of Seventies.

Fear of external opposition

Mob action. While mobbers had not ventured to attack the well-armed Mormons within the city of Nauvoo itself, there was a widespread fear that this might happen at any time. An item appearing in the minutes of the October 1845 general conference of the Church indicates how explosive the situation was perceived to be:

At 2 o'clock President B. Young came to the stand, and dismissed the meeting until tomorrow at 10 o'clock A.M. This was done on account of a body of armed men having suddenly entered the city. Not knowing but this was a move by the mob, the president requested all the brethren to go home and prepare themselves for any emergency. He however soon ascertained, that W.B. Warren, Esq., was at the head of the troops, and that they had come in on business.
The President then informed the people of this fact; and requested them to retire to their homes in peace; concluding his remarks with these words "Be ye also ready" (TS 6:1013).

State intervention. An even greater threat than direct attack by the mob was that the governor might place Nauvoo under martial law, have it occupied by state troops, arrest the leaders of the Church, and prevent the Mormons from leaving the state as an organized body. Thus the official journal of Brigham Young for 9 October 1845 reads:

General Hardin has pledged himself to the mob that he will come to Nauvoo with his troops and either arrest Orrin P. Rockwell and some others of the brethren or he 'will unroof every house in Nauvoo.' Three hundred of our enemies have volunteered to come with him from Quincy and they expect to be joined by others on the way.

There seems to be no disposition abroad but to massacre the whole body of this people, and nothing but the power of God can save us from the cruel ravages of the bloodthirsty mob.

We concluded to plead with our heavenly Father to preserve his people, and the lives of his servants that the saints may finish the Temple and receive their endowments. (HC 7:481)

And under date of 27 January 1846 the same source states:

Sheriff Backenstos has returned from Springfield and says, that Governor Ford has turned against us, and that Major Warren is making calculations to prevent our going away.

I received a letter from Josiah Lamborn, Esqu, Springfield, stating that Governor Ford was decidedly in favor of General J.J. Hardin's policy, which is, that of suspending all civil offices, the collection of taxes, and placing the county under martial law.

And under date of 29 January the following item occurs: "Quite a number of the governor's troops are prowling around our city; I am informed that they are seeking to arrest some of the leading men of the church" (HC 7:577).

Federal intervention. Such fears were compounded by the belief that the federal government was also making plans to destroy the Mormon community and to prevent its exodus. This apprehension was based in part on reports Brigham Young was receiving to the effect that the federal government intended to take measures to prevent the Mormons from leaving the United States. Thus on 11 December, the day
after endowments were first given in the temple, Brigham Young's official journal states that

I called the Twelve and bishops together and informed them that I had received a letter from Brother Samuel Brannan, stating that he had been at Washington and had learned that the secretary of war and other members of the cabinet were laying plans and were determined to prevent our moving west: alleging that it is against the law for an armed body of men to go from the United States to any other government.

They say it will not do to let the Mormons go to California nor Oregon, neither will it do to let them tarry in the states, and they must be obliterated from the face of the earth. (HC 7:544)

The fear of federal intervention seemed substantiated when toward the end of December formal charges were made by anti-Mormons to the effect that Church leaders were engaged in counterfeiting, federal warrants were issued for their arrest, and a federal marshal was sent to Nauvoo to apprehend them (HC 7:549). According to George Laud's (1978:165) journal:

Now while the Endowment was continuing, till the Twenty Fifth of December, ware raging and came against us with Enditments against the Twelve For the Saying of being counterfitters in money matters. . . . Thus they ware striveing to overthrow the Kingdom continuly, being ignorant it being the work of God.

And wrote Joseph Fielding (1979:159):

Attempts are making to take the 12 it seems as tho Earth and Hell are mad to see the Work of the Priesthood proceeding so rapidly the United States Martial has been here for some time searching and laying in wait for the 12 and some others, he searched the Temple through but in vain the Bretheren have had to disguise themselves and conceal themselves to escape them, the Charge is Treason. you may see the 12 &c wherever they go with six shooter Pistols, in their Pockets but thus far they have been preserved and are ministering in the Temple and teaching the way of Life and Salvation.

And soon after the indictments were issued, Brigham Young was made aware of the contents of a letter Governor Ford sent to Sheriff Backenstos to the effect that if Church leaders were still in Nauvoo the next spring, the city would likely be occupied by federal troops. The letter stated:

This indictment in the U.S. court against the leading Mormons puts a new face on the matter. It will bring them and the United
States for the first time into collision. It is impossible for me to guess, with any certainty, as to the course of Mr. Polk in the matter, but I would think it likely that he will order up a regiment or two of the regular army, and perhaps call on me for the militia in which event I will be compelled to order them as you know.

I hope that the administration will not act in the matter this winter. If the Mormons remain in the state a strong force will be ordered to Nauvoo by the secretary of war, to remain there until arrests can be made. . . . I also think that it is very likely that the government at Washington will interfere to prevent the Mormons from going west of the Rocky Mountains. Many intelligent persons sincerely believe that they will join the British if they go there, and be more trouble than ever. (HC 7:563)

The exodus begins

Throughout the early weeks of 1846 apprehension continued to increase that if the Church remained in Nauvoo until spring, it would become impossible to leave. The official history of the Church thus states under date of 13 January:

A council was held in the Temple.

The captains of fifties and tens made reports of the number in their respective companies, who were prepared to start west immediately, should the persecution of our enemies compel us to do so. (HC 7:567)

At the same time great effort was expended so that as many Mormons could participate in temple rituals as possible. Thus under date of 20 January the same source states: "Public prejudice being so strong against us, and the excitement becoming alarming we determined to continue the administration of the ordinances of endowment night and day" (HC 7:570).

It was finally decided that the best course of action would be for most of the apostles and other high church officials to leave Nauvoo as soon as possible and then have the body of the Saints follow when weather would permit. Erastus Snow (ms b; see also HC 7:578) thus records in his journal:

It was . . . resolved about the first of February 1846 that the authorities of the church and as many brethren as could be fitted out and spared should start soon as possible in the direction of Council Bluff via Iowa Territory . . . and that the balance of the Saints follow in the spring as fast as they can get ready.
The decision was made to terminate the administration of temple ordinances on 3 February. According to Brigham Young's official journal for that day:

Notwithstanding that I had announced that we would not attend to the administration of ordinances, the House of the Lord was thronged all day, the anxiety being so great to receive, as if the brethren would have us stay here and continue the endowments until our way would be hedged up, and our enemies would intercept us. But I informed the brethren that this was not wise, and that we should build more Temples, and have further opportunities to receive the blessings of the Lord, as soon as the saints were prepared to receive them. In this Temple we have been abundantly rewarded, if we receive no more. I also informed the brethren that I was going to get my wagons started and be off. I walked some distance from the Temple supposing the crowd would disperse, but on returning I found the house filled to overflowing. Looking upon the multitude and knowing their anxiety, as they were thirsting and hungering for the word, we continued at work diligently in the House of the Lord (HC 7:579).

Brigham Young permitted the ordinance work to continue for a few more days. But as Norton Jacob (1949:18) records in his journal:

Sunday, February 8, 1846--At 9 o'clock a.m. the endowments were stopped in the House of the Lord, and the veils were taken down. The people were then called out into the grove west of the temple where ... [the brethren] gave vent to their feelings by addressing the people for the last time in Nauvoo. Brother Brigham warned them that grievous wolves would come in among the sheep when they were gone, not sparing the flock; that from among themselves men would spring up speaking perverse things to turn men away from the truth.

With this sober admonition as his parting remarks, Brigham Young crossed the Mississippi on 15 February, traveled nine miles, and made camp (HC 7:585). Thus the Mormon exodus from Illinois officially began.

Temple rituals and Mormon unity

Separation

Amid such insecurity and anxiety, the covenantal ordinances of the temple became firmly established as fundamental to Mormon group unity. Believing as they did that it was only through the performance of these rituals that they could preserve their distinctive
relationship with the Lord, and perceiving themselves to be surrounded by forces seeking their destruction, the Saints came to regard the rituals as central to their continued existence as a group. As Helen Mar Kimball Whitney later recalled the feelings of the Mormons at the time of their exodus from Nauvoo:

To all earthly appearance we were then to be scattered or wiped out of existence. We were but a little handful and no power to look to but to the Omnipotent, whose hand had thus far kept us together and not the power of man. But He, in his infinite mercy, had endowed them and given them the key by which his faithful servants and handmaidens could approach nearer to His throne, and find greater favor, because of their humble obedience to His laws and requirements. (WE 12:3:14)

In this way the rituals of the patriarchal order became fundamental to the sense of exclusiveness among the Mormon group as a whole as they previously had been to Joseph Smith’s select followers who participated in celestial marriage and the Holy Order.

Separation and the sacred. As has already been seen, long before its completion, the temple had become a symbol of the continued unity of the Church under the direction of the Twelve Apostles. With the administration of the rituals in its attic story, such unity became concretely grounded in the establishment of covenants. At least part of the significance such covenant making had for Mormon unity stems from the otherworldly nature of the temple itself. As “the house of the Lord” the temple was profoundly regarded as sacred space, separated from the profane world that surrounded it. Thus Joseph Fielding (1979:158) writes that when he first entered the temple subsequent to its dedication for ordinance work, “I truly felt as though I had gotten out of the World.”

Since the temple had been constructed for the performance of rituals, it might be expected that they would be regarded in the same sacred sense as was the building itself. For devoted Mormons such rituals were extremely awesome. The thing that seemed to have most impressed Helen Mar Kimball was the seriousness of the covenantal obligations associated with the rituals. As she later recalled, although she and her young groom Horace Whitney were “gay and
highminded in many other things[,] we reverenced the . . . covenants which we had . . . made in that house, so much that we would as soon have thought of committing suicide as to betray them; for in doing either we would have forfeited every right or claim to our eternal salvation" (WE 12:11:81). For Norton Jacob (1949:14), participation in temple rituals was an occasion for profound joy. After he and his wife received their endowments he recorded in his journal that "it was the most interesting scene of all my life and one that afforded the most peace and joy that we had ever experienced since we were married." It was common to contrast the significance of such rituals with the rewards that might be obtained in profane society. An editorial in the 15 January 1846 issue of the Times and Seasons (6:1096) thus states: "O Lord, the true hearted saints now know that the endowments, and blessings upon the faithful, as far exceeds the earthly glory of Babylon, as the sun outshines a spark from the fire."

Finally those Mormons who went to the temple and there participated in the endowment and other rituals came to regard themselves, like the building itself, as holy and separated from the uninitiated. Part of this sense of distinctiveness was a consequence of the fact that once an individual had received his endowment he was included in the Holy Order (Quinn 1978:94). Since the Holy Order had come to be regarded as a spiritual elite, Mormons who received their endowments had the sense that they were joining the ranks of a group who both ritually and morally were apart from the rest of mankind. Norton Jacob (1949:14) thus writes that on 21 December "I with my wife, first had the exquisite pleasure of meeting with the holy order of the Lord's anointed in his holy House, whose motto is 'Holiness to the Lord.'" As already stated, by the time that the administration of ordinances had ceased in the Nauvoo Temple, over 5,000 people had received their endowments and become part of the Holy Order. What in the days of Joseph Smith had been a highly restricted and secretive body now came to include a large proportion of Nauvoo's adult population. Thus the Mormons who followed Brigham Young out of Nauvoo regarded themselves literally as a "Holy Nation."

That at least Brigham Young was consciously aware of the relationship between Mormon group unity and the administration of
temple rituals is indicated by remarks he made in the temple to a group of Saints who had recently received their endowments:

My mind is constantly on the stretch because I know that the Church must be saved. The gospel must be preached in all the world. Temples must be built. . . . I tell you no man knows nor can know the burden & responsibility that rests upon my mind unless he experiences it. One thing I will do, I will do my uttermost to break down everything that divides. I will not have division. I mean that there shall not be a fiddle in this Church but what has holiness to the Lord written upon it. (Kimball, Heber C., ms b, 2 Jan. 1846)

Antagonism toward America. Given the social milieu in which the ordinances were administered, it was an easy step to link this ritual separation from the world to a desire for an actual social and geographic disassociation. Thus while addressing a gathering of Saints in the temple, Brigham Young strongly impressed upon the minds of those present the impropriety of mingling again with the wicked after having come here and taken upon them the covenants which they had. He spoke pointedly to his daughter Vilate and told her that if she should do so after this, she might expect to meet the frown of a father who held the keys of the Priesthood. . . . The President invited all those who were willing to covenant that they would keep themselves from mingling with the wicked to rise upon their feet. Where upon all rose up. (Kimball, Heber C., ms b, 1 Jan. 1846)

Such disassociation was often tenaciously adhered to. For example, shortly after the exodus the destitute and ill Cathorine Spencer wrote her wealthy but nonbelieving parents, asking them to provide her with some sort of assistance. When they wrote that they would willingly help her on condition that she would agree to come and live with them, she is reported to have replied: "I would rather abide with the church, in poverty, even in the wilderness, without their aid, than go to my unbelieving father's house, and have all that he possess" (Spencer, Orson 1848:239).

This sense of separation was given most pervasive expression in statements dealing with the United States. At the time of the exodus and in the years immediately following, there is a common theme running through statements made by Mormons to the effect that the American people together with their governmental representatives were
collectively responsible for the death of Joseph Smith and the LDS group’s eviction from Nauvoo, that in consequence America would soon be destroyed as a nation, and that the Mormon group would become an independent people in their stronghold in the West. In his 2 January temple address, Brigham Young emotionally declared:

We will go to a land where there are at least no old settlers to quarrel with us . . . and we will leave this wicked nation to themselves for they have rejected the gospel and I hope and pray that the wicked will kill one another and save us the trouble of doing it . . .

The U.S. government says if we let the Mormons go out from this nation they will give us trouble—Well, perhaps their fears will come upon them. Where is there a city of refuge, on the face of the earth but this? They have tried to break us up. But with all their officers, all their troops & all their power we are here yet. They have got writs out for me, but they have not got me yet, and when they do get me they will get something else, I assure you. (Kimball, Heber C., ms b, 2 Jan. 1846)

And on 24 January he stated:

The Lord has said he would fight our battles, and if this nation still continues to be actuated towards us with a persecuting spirit, vengeance shall come from the Lord upon them, until they shall be utterly wasted. (HC 7:575)

At the time the temple was publicly dedicated on 3 May 1846 Orson Hyde exclaimed:

We have been oppressed all the day long and at last are now driven to the wilderness, but we will go and not stay with the world. And when we go we remove the candle light from their midst. . . . I feel to resign my citizenship because I cannot enjoy it. . . . As our father and mother, or the nation that has born us, has rejected us and driven us out, there is a nation of calamity at the door.

And in seconding what Hyde had stated, Wilford Woodruff declared that Joseph and Hyrum Smith "would rise in judgment against this Nation, the state of Illinois, Hancock Co, and especially Carthage and the murders it contains" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 3 May 1846).

On 14 January 1847 Brigham Young issued a revelation containing "the word and will of the Lord," which said in part:

Thy brethren have rejected you and your testimony, even this nation that has driven you out; And now cometh the day of their calamity, even the days of sorrow, like a woman that is taken in
travail; and their sorrow shall be great unless they speedily repent, yea, very speedily. For they killed the prophets, and them that were sent unto them; and they have shed innocent blood, which crieth from the ground against them. (DC 137:34-37)

On 20 December 1847 Orson Spencer (1848:224-31) issued an impassioned "farewell address" to the American people:

Americans and countrymen! Farewell! I have been exiled from your soil for cherishing the inalienable rights of man. The principles of liberty and heaven-born truth have been the exclusive cause of the lawless banishment of thousands of which number I am one. . . .

Before our people experienced their sad disaster in the state of Illinois, they took the timely precaution . . . to forewarn every governor of the several States, and many other distinguished citizens, of the necessity of timely succour from our countrymen and rulers. . . . Our petitions were barely answered, and coolly slighted. We were accounted as a people too clannish, like the ancient Hebrews, and too peculiar and exclusive, like the apostles of Palestine.

We had no alternative but to commend ourselves to the God of the oppressed, and take precipitate refuge, in the dead of winter, in the wild valleys of the mountains. To the God of justice, and the great Arbiter of the destinies of nations, we look to avenge our wrongs, and chasten the nation that has been deaf to the voice of her suffering and loyal citizens. He will hear our cries and avenge our wrongs. . . .

You are weighted in the balances, and from henceforth, until you break the rod of the oppressor and redress the wrongs of the injured, your councils will be distracted, and your greatest chieftains will be at variance. Hand to hand, and toe to toe, every one again his fellow--your struggles will be sanguinary and obstinate. The people whom you have trodden down in your pride . . . happen to be the choice ones of all the earth and the favorites of heaven. . . .

To the mountains, oh ye who would escape the convulsive throes of a perplexed nation, and the indignant blasts of the Almighty. . . . All ye that fear God . . . separate yourselves from the tents of wickedness, and flee to the strongholds of Zion.

And on 8 July 1849, Brigham Young declared that when the American people "killed Joseph Smith they sealed their damnation as a nation" (Davis, Daniel, ms a, 8 July 1849).

The temple and apostolic authority

Given the degree to which the Mormon people felt separated and alienated from America and its political leadership, it is not surprising that their perception of Mormon priesthood as the only
legitimate authority was intensified. As has already been seen, following the death of Joseph Smith, the apostles experienced some difficulty in being unequivocally recognized as his proper successors. The temple and its rituals greatly facilitated the attempt to consolidate and monopolize priesthood authority.

It was under the direction of Brigham Young and his fellow apostles that the temple was finished and the rituals within its walls administered. This seems to have been recognized by everyone. For example, George Miller, who had been an original member of the Holy Order and who was active in administering rituals in the temple, broke with Brigham Young and the apostles in 1847 when he became convinced that they were usurping authority. It might thus be supposed that he held that the temple ordinances were administered under the direction of the Holy Order rather than under the directions of the apostles. He, however, was to write in 1855 that

In the course of the winter of 1845 and 1846 at the insistence of Brigham Young, H. S. Kimball and Willard Richards, and others of the quorum of the Twelve, it was agreed by them in council that brethren who had been faithful in paying their tithing . . . should receive an endowment of patriarchal priesthood, under the hands of the twelve Apostles so soon as the upper room of the Temple could be fitted therefore. (Miller, George 1916:29)

One consequence of the Twelve's involvement with the temple and its rituals was the fact that they were perceived to be carrying out the measures on which Joseph Smith had placed so much emphasis in the months preceding his death. If the salvation of the Church was indeed contingent upon the completion of the temple and the performance of esoteric rituals within its walls, then it was the actions of the apostles that were bringing about the salvation of the Church.

Once the administration of ordinances began in mid-December of 1845, the relationship between apostolic authority and temple rituals became even more concrete. That this was so was the result of at least three factors: (1) the manner in which individuals were selected to participate in temple rituals; (2) the manner in which the rituals were administered; and (3) the nature of the rituals themselves.
Admittance procedures. As had been the case during the days of Joseph Smith, temple rituals were not freely administered to all who desired to participate: an individual had to be selected and notified before he was allowed to go through any of the rituals in the temple's attic story. William Clayton (1982:82) thus writes that he spent the evening of 17 December 1845 in the temple where he "assisted Br Young and Kimball to collect a list of brethren to come here tomorrow." When and if one would be permitted to participate in temple rituals was often a matter of some uncertainty. Norton Jacob (1949:14) records in his journal that

On Friday, the 12th, Brother Wm. Weeks came to me and said he wanted me to go home and prepare myself and wife and come to the Temple at 12 o'clock a.m. ready to receive our endowments. We most joyfully complied with the request, and at about 5 o'clock p.m. we were washed and anointed in the House of the Lord.

While John D. Lee (ms a) writes: "About 6 oclock I went home to attend to some business--I here obtained permission from B. Young to bring [my] family in [to the temple] and let them pass through the ordinance of the endowment." And George Laud (1978:164) states: "December 12, 1845, commenced End[o]wment in the temple of Nauvoo . . . & on the 19th . . . I receaved mine . . . being chosen to receive my washing & anointing in the House of the Lord."

Although Brigham Young desired to involve as many of the Nauvoo Saints in temple rituals as possible (see HC 7:546), compliance with the basic Mormon code of conduct, acceptance of its doctrine, and submission to apostolic leadership were deemed essential. As Marietta Coray later recalled:

By early winter, the "upper rooms" of the Temple, set apart for the mysteries of the Endowment were finished, and the persons in the different quorums accounted worthy, were sent for, to receive the "fullness of that blessing."

None but those of approved integrity, and of undoubted orthodoxy, who have paid their "tithing," can travel this "Mormon road to Heaven." (Green, Nelson 1859:41)

On occasion individuals were not allowed to go through the rituals until they acquiesced to decisions of ecclesiastical officials in matters affecting intimate aspects of their lives. John D. Lee (ms a) thus records in his journal:
I had the pleasure [of] realizing the answer to Prayer in meeting the stubborn feeling of Br Benj M Gimus who had sworn vengeance against Br George L Lee; because of his being under promise to his daughter though against the consent & wish of her Father—and had they or she not past the Flour of her age—I don't know whether he ever would have consented but seeing that he could not get his endowment—while such feelings exist he at length offered to do as I said that was Pres Young & myself showed him by the Power of the Spirit—so that he wept like a child while I taught him the law of the Priesthood Pres Young confirmed what I said to him which seemed to reconcile his mind and soon I expect a wedding to take place instead of a trial before the Mormons as was contemplated but a few days before.

Since it was Brigham Young and the apostles who established the regulations with which one had to comply before being permitted to participate in temple rituals and who served as the final arbiters in determining the particular individuals who would be summoned to the temple attic, they became the formulators and regulators of the code of conduct that was linked to Mormonism's highest covenantal ordinances. Because a person could only participate in these rituals on terms that were established by the apostles, involvement in temple ordinances was de facto recognition of the apostles' right to establish such standards. Given the anticipation with which Mormons looked forward to these ceremonies, it is not surprising that most submitted to apostolic authority.

The direct involvement of the apostles in temple rituals. The fact that the apostles directed the administration of the rituals added another dimension to the association between temple rituals and apostolic authority. Given Mormon understandings regarding priesthood keys and delegated authority, most Mormons would regard it as logically impossible to view the temple rituals as efficacious while rejecting the apostles' claims to priesthood supremacy. This relationship is clearly stated in a statement found at the beginning of "The Book of Anointings" explaining why, when second anointings began to be administered in the Nauvoo Temple, Brigham Young first anointed Heber C. Kimball and was in turn anointed by him:

President Brigham Young as President of the church anointed brother Heber C. Kimball first[,] this being according to the order in which the ordinances of the Lords House are at all times
communicated to the children of men that he who holds the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to minister to men on Earth as President Brigham Young now does should confer the ordinances upon some faithful man who should in turn minister to him according to the pattern of heavenly things. This is the order observed by the Prophet Joseph he first baptized Oliver then Oliver baptized him. ("The Book of Anointings," p. 3)

The readministration in the temple of the endowments, sealings, and second anointings that had been performed previous to its completion was in itself a demonstration and acknowledgment of the apostles' exclusive right to administer temple ordinances. Having again received these ordinances under the supervision of Brigham Young and the Twelve, it would be difficult for members of the Holy Order to maintain either that they held prerogatives independent of the Twelve by virtue of ordinances that they had received from Joseph Smith or that the apostles did not have equal right with Joseph to officiate in such activities.

**Apostolic authority and eternal marriage.** The pervasive nature of the rituals themselves was to contribute to the legitimization of apostolic authority. This is perhaps most clearly demonstrable with the ordinance of matrimonial sealing. As has already been seen, since 1835 a tension had existed in the Church respecting the relative significance of civil and priesthood marriage. With the introduction of celestial marriage in the early 1840s, priesthood marriage clearly began to gain ascendancy over civil marriage in Mormon ideology. This was due to at least three factors: (1) priesthood marriage was established as the only form of marital union that would exist eternally; (2) Joseph Smith began to require that his closest followers be remarried by priesthood authority; and (3) previously existing civil unions were regarded as ultimately irrelevant to the establishment of priesthood-based eternal unions.

Such ideology became greatly intensified in the minds of the rank and file membership of the Church when matrimonial sealings began to be performed in the Nauvoo Temple. What had previously been a form of marriage clandestinely entered into by a select few of Joseph Smith's most intimate followers was now participated in by large
numbers of the general Church population. By the time the temple was
closed to ordinance work, almost 2,500 members of the Church had been
matrimonially sealed, while hundreds more were yearning for the
opportunity.

In order to understand the consequence that this phenomenon
had for apostolic authority, it is necessary to keep in mind the
degree to which the Mormon people at the time of the exodus felt
alienated from America and its institutions. As has already been
indicated, the tension that existed in Mormon thought between civil
and priesthood marriage might best be understood if it is posited that
Mormon ideology is characterized by two subdomains of law; one human
and the other divine. Given the antagonism that the Mormons felt
toward the United States government, it is not surprising that during
this period the subdomain of human law was devaluated to the point
that it was regarded as trivial if not fraudulent. Since civil
marriage was an aspect of the subdomain of human law, it came to be
regarded by some Mormons not only as insignificant but as nonexistent
in the eyes of God. Hence an individual who was married only civilly
was not really married at all. Hence the imperative to be married by
the power of the priesthood.

The existence of this perception is substantiated by
statements made by both apostates and loyal Mormons. The following
three statements come from individuals who in one way or another had
become disaffected with Mormonism. Shortly after their apostasy from
the Church, Increase and Maria Van Dusen (1847:16) wrote an expose of
the Nauvoo Temple rituals. They affirmed that after receiving the
endowment, initiates are assembled in a room where

are all the Mysteries of the Kingdom taught, such as what is
called the Spiritual Wife Doctrine for instance. We are here told
that this ceremony is the commencement of the law of God, and the
laws of the land are no more binding on us; all our former ties of
marriage, & c., are now cut asunder, and we are all thrown loose
upon the world as if never married. It is now the woman's
privilege to choose whom she sees fit; if she likes the one she
has been living with, she can keep him; if not, she is at liberty
to ship him and take another; and it is the man's privilege to
have one, two, four, ten or twenty, according to his standing in
the church, and the influence he has with the leader, for he is
the one whom they are brought before and married over.
After his break with Brigham Young in 1869 T. B. H. Stenhouse (1873:504) produced another analysis of the Nauvoo Temple ritual complex. He states:

The marriage of the Gentile world being utterly unauthorized, it becomes necessary for married persons, on accepting Mormonism, to come before the altar and be sealed by the Mormon high priesthood as husband and wife—the previous relationship being without the sanction of "the Lord."

And after becoming embittered toward Brigham Young and while awaiting execution for his part in the Mountain Meadows Massacre, John D. Lee (1877:165) was to write:

In the Winter of 1845 meetings were held all over the city of Nauvoo, and the spirit of Elijah was taught in the different families as a foundation to the order of celestial marriage, as well as the law of adoption. Many families entered into covenants with each other—the man to stand by his wife and the wife to cleave unto her husband, and the children to be adopted to the parents. . . . Others refused to enter into these obligations, but agreed to separate from each other, dividing their substance, and mutually dissolving their former relationships on friendly terms. Some have mutually agreed to exchange wives and have been sealed to each other as husband and wife by virtue and authority of the holy priesthood.

While such statements could be discredited because of the authors' avowed intent to expose Mormonism, they do not differ fundamentally from ideas expressed by loyal followers of Brigham Young. Thus on 15 August 1847, Orson Pratt declared that "all the ordinances of the gospel administered by the world since the apostasy of the Church was illegal in like manner was the marriage ceremony illegal and all the world who had been begotten through the illegal marriage were bastards" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 15 Aug. 1847). And in 1853 the impetuous Orson Spencer (1853:9, 14) was to write:

The marriage ties instituted by Christendom are a mere rope of sand. A few years will show that these ties are based merely upon the authority of man, and by no means founded upon the authority of God. When this fact is discovered, society will swing loose from its fastenings and former moorings, a miserable wreck in the swift wake of the dreadful cataract! . . . The whole earth is defiled by actual transgression. This general defilement has arisen by . . . changing the ordinance of marriage from divine permission to the shallow authority of magistrates and unordained priests.
Despite such rhetoric, there appears to be no evidence that the Mormon church took the logical step of forbidding converts from engaging in sexual intercourse with consorts to whom they had been civilly married prior to those unions being reconstituted by proper priesthood authority. And, public statements to the contrary, there is good indication that Mormon leaders allowed civil marriage some sort of validity. Thus in an 1848 speech to his adopted sons, Heber C. Kimball (ms h) forcefully stated that none of them could marry without permission from Brigham Young. When asked, however, if there was a way in which an individual could be "justified in marrying without the consent of Brother B[righam]," Kimball answered, "Yes, according to the Gentile custom, but by and by all men and women must be married by the consent of the head." Belief in the inadequacy of marriage by "Gentile custom," however, was sufficiently well developed that many devout Mormons hungered for the opportunity to get permission from "the head" of the Church to marry according to the laws of God.

Since individuals could only be matrimonially sealed under the aegis of the apostles, to be married in this manner was to acknowledge their right to regulate sexual conduct and establish and dissolve marital relationships. Catherine Lewis (1848:19) appears to be completely accurate when she states that within the context of the temple ritual complex, Mormon men were "only allowed to take to themselves wives with the consent of the Twelve." The apostles did not gratuitously prevent Saints from being so married. Indeed, their desire was to see that as many Mormons as possible were matrimonially sealed. In terms of the legitimization of authority, the important thing was that such marriages were recognized and acknowledged to have been enacted by virtue of priesthood keys that they claimed to monopolize.

Thus, although George Laud had already married his wife Mary Jane Megeness, he married her again in the Nauvoo Temple on 5 February 1846. On that occasion he states that she was

Sealed to me a wife for time & Eternity, to be my companion & comfort & to fill up the measure of our creation, & we was sealed up unto Eternal Lives, to come fourth in the Morning of the first
Resurrection. . . . Now when we was sealed in this order, J[ohn] D. Lee Embraced us in his arms & blessed us in the name of the Lord that we Should become mighty upon the Earth & our names to be honerable in all generations. (Laud 1978:165-66)

She was married already to him for time, was already his companion and hopefully his comfort. But now she was becoming such by divine law. They were to remain together until she died in 1872 after bearing him eleven children. The covenant in terms of which they conceptualized the interweaving of their lives was not perceived as grounded in human authority but in the divine authority that had been possessed by the apostles under whose authorization the matrimonially sealing had been performed. The significance of the marital status itself thus became intimately linked to acceptance of apostolic supremacy. To reject at any time the claim that the Twelve monopolized the keys of the priesthood was tantamount to a denial of the sacramental foundation of their marriage. Such an action would not merely mean that they would have to forfeit the hope that they would have part in the first resurrection and the right to eternal lives. More in line with the traditional concept of marriage, it would also mean that their names would not be honorable in all generations (as would be the case were their descendants to propagate and multiply within context of the Mormon community). Although such a denial could be made, it would not be made lightly.

Such a state of affairs had far-reaching consequences for the preservation of apostolic authority. From the earliest days of the Church's existence, the exclusive nature of Mormon priesthood had been supported by doctrine regarding the exclusive efficacy of baptism administered under its direction. Belief in the exclusive efficacy of priesthood marriage fortified the authoritative nature of Mormon priesthood even more. As Orson Spencer (1853:16) rhetorically wrote: "Is it the sole prerogative of God to appoint men to officiate in the ceremony of marriage?--Yes."
The establishment of family kingdoms
and the Nauvoo Temple

Heber C. Kimball's family kingdom

Nauvoo Temple ordinances and Heber C. Kimball's original family. As senior ranking apostle after Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball was prominent in all the ritual activities associated with the Nauvoo Temple. As members of the Holy Order, Heber, his wife Vilate, and daughter Helen Mar were among the first to go through the endowment ritual in the Nauvoo Temple in December of 1845. Thereafter, much of their remaining time in Nauvoo was spent in administering this same ordinance to members of the Mormon church who were flocking to the temple.

Heber and Vilate were matrimonially sealed in the temple on 7 January 1846, the same day that the sealing altar was dedicated in the Holy of Holies. The next day they returned to the same room and were the first individuals to receive their second anointings within the temple. Then on 11 January Heber and Vilate's six living children together with Mary Davanport, the wife of their son William, were linked to them by the ordinance of adoptive sealing.

Plural wives. Having thus had his original family sealed to him, Kimball's attention evidently next turned to securing his plural wives. Between January 12 and February 7 he was married in the Nauvoo Temple to some thirty-seven women, including the various wives that had been sealed to him before the temple attic was ready for ordinance work. Six of these women (Sarah Lawrence, Sarah Ann Whitney, Lucy Walker, Martha McBride, Sylvia Porter Sessions, and Presendia Huntington Buell) had been sealed as wives to Joseph Smith while he was still alive. Another four (Mary Houston, Sarah Scott, Sarah Stiles, and Nancy Maria Winshester) evidently had not been sealed to Joseph Smith during his lifetime but now were posthumously sealed to him. One wife (Mary Fielding) had been sealed to Joseph Smith's brother Hyrum while he was still living. And another (Rebecca Swain) had been married to Frederick G. Williams before his death. These women were sealed in the temple for eternity to Joseph Smith, Hyrum
In cases where Kimball's wives were sealed for eternity to deceased husbands, he acted as proxy for these men while the ordinance was being performed. In so doing he was ritually taking the part of the man whose role he would be fulfilling in mortality. As already discussed in this chapter, part of his motivation in marrying such women was to fortify his relationship with the men to whom they were sealed for eternity. This seems to have particularly been so in cases involving wives that were sealed for eternity to Joseph Smith. An important adjunct to this concept was the desire to act as genitor for the deceased husband and thus "raise up seed" that would be born to him in the covenant. As Catherine Lewis (1848:19) reported in 1848: "The Apostles said they only took Joseph's wives to raise up children, carry them through to the next world, there deliver them up to him, by so doing they should gain his approbation." It is interesting in this respect that of the fifty-five children that Kimball sired by plural wives, nineteen were born to four of his wives who were sealed for eternity to Joseph Smith (Kimball, Stanley 1981:125 note 19).

The remaining twenty-six women were sealed to Kimball for time and eternity. Except for the already cited instance involving his marriage to his first plural wife, Sarah Peck Noon, little is known about the circumstances that led to Heber C. Kimball being matrimonially sealed to these particular women. Catherine Lewis (1848:6-11) depicts Kimball as actively attempting to secure her as a plural wife. Daughter Helen Mar, on the other hand, indicates that her father's plural wives tended to seek him out as a way to achieve their own exaltation:

Sister Mary Ellen Harris . . . has testified to me that she was sealed in the [Nauvoo] . . . Temple to my father, and that she chose him because he was a man of God, though her heart was grieved that she should cause Sister Vilate Kimball one pang, but felt that if she did not take this step her own glory would be clipt. My mother, hearing how Mary Ellen felt, caused her for ever after to feel kindly towards her. There were over twenty women sealed to my father in that Temple for the same conscientious reason expressed by Sister Mary Ellen. . . . Those
women were actuated by the one principle, salvation and exaltation in our Father's Kingdom. . . . All had refused offers from single men, and no earthly inducements were held out to them to enter the plural order. They were given to understand that this was to be a life of trial and sacrifice, and no one was forced to enter into this order, only by the power of the Holy Ghost. . . . Pure and exalted was their aim--they saw a glory which they could not attain to except they obeyed this celestial law. (WE 12:10:74)

Among Heber C. Kimball's plural wives, only Sarah Ann Whitney, Sylvia Sessions, and Mary Fielding had belonged to the Holy Order (see Ehat 1982:102-3). And each of these three women had also been previously sealed for eternity to either Joseph or Hyrum Smith. Before being sealed to Kimball in the temple, however, all of his wives went through the endowment ritual and thus received the esoteric instructions that members of the order had originally received from Joseph Smith. Now, by being sealed to Kimball, they were participating in yet another ritual that previously had been restricted to a few. (See appendix A for a complete listing of Heber C. Kimball's wives.)

Adopted children. Toward the end of January Heber and Vilate had some forty additional individuals linked to them as children through the ritual of adoptive sealing. Since existing records give little indication of why these particular individuals came to be adopted into the Kimball family, only tentative suggestions can be made. Some had previously existing ties of kinship and friendship with members of the Kimball family. William Murray was a brother to Vilate Kimball; James Davenport was a father of the Kimball's son William's wife Mary; George Pitkin was a brother to Heber's wives Abigail and Laura Pitkin; Charles Wesley Hubbard had had a long friendship with the Kimballs; Harrison Burgess had been part of Zion's Camp and traveled back to Kirtland with Heber after the group was disbanded; and Heber had become close to James and Nancy Knowles Smithies during his missionary labor in England. Others such as Joseph Hovey and Hans and Peter Hansen were called to help with the ordinance work in the temple and likely came into close contact with Heber C. Kimball at that time. (See appendix B for a listing of Heber C. Kimball's adopted children.)
No record has evidently been preserved which details the process of how any of the Kimball's adopted children either chose or was selected to become part of Heber C. Kimball's family kingdom. Information available on the John D. Lee family, however, provides some suggestion of how this might have occurred. In his own journal, John D. Lee (ms a) indicates that various individuals made "application" with him to be adopted into his family. Thus under date of 18 December 1845 he writes: "This evening while at home I had application by Pres H. B. Owen & lady to be adopted into my family and take upon them my name which I consented to do." And he states that on the following 12 January "I had application made to me; to receive a man and his wife into my Family, after speaking freely upon the law of adoption, I accepted James Woosely & Lovina his wife into my Family by the Law of adoption." George Laud (1978:164), on the other hand, indicates that it was John D. Lee who actively persuaded him to be adopted to him. Under date of 12 December 1846 he writes: "Now in this time I agreed to goe in to John D. Lee's family as to the Law of Adoption through his persuasion according to the celestial law."

None of the adopted children has left a detailed description of the actual ceremony by which he became adopted into the Kimball family. It most likely was similar to that recorded by George Laud (1978:165) when he became adopted to John D. Lee:

Now Amasia Lyman being authorised to adopt & Seal. So on the 5th day of Febry, 1846, I & My Wife with many others were adopted to J.D. Lee family. This adoption is to Link the chain of the priesthood in Such a way that can not be broken only by braking Covenants, for they are made before God, Angels and the present Witness. We covenant together for him to be a father unto those who are Seald to him, to do unto them as he would to his own Children, & to counsel them in riteousness & to teach them all the principles of Salvation & shared unto them of all the blessings to comfort. These & all that are calculated to make them happy both in time & eternity. Now we did also covenant on our side to do all the good for his upbuilding & happyness both in time & Eternity. This was done at the altar according to the pattern of the ordinance.

In short adopted children were made to constitute part of their father's eternal family kingdom.
None of Kimball's adopted children was particularly prominent in the Mormon community. Among the men, evidently only Howard Egan had become involved in polygamy during the days of Joseph Smith (see Bachman 1975: 189) and most left Nauvoo as monogamists. None had been admitted to the Holy Order before receiving their endowments in the Nauvoo Temple. Given the ideology associated with adoptive sealing, they probably saw this ritual as a way to become closely associated with one of the most prominent members of the Church in this life and to share in his blessings of exaltation in the next. On 14 December 1845 Brigham Young had stated: "To constitute a man responsible he must have the power and ability not only to save himself but to save others; but there are those who are not capable of saving themselves and will have to be saved by others" (HC 7:546). To many Mormons of the late Nauvoo period, Heber C. Kimball appeared to be an eminently "responsible" man. Given Mormon salvation ideology of the period, those who became adopted to him likely hoped that some of his capability would be efficaciously employed to help effect their own salvation.

Helen Mar and the Newel K. Whitney family kingdom. Like other women who had been matrimonially sealed to Joseph Smith while he was living, Helen Mar Kimball was sealed again to him in the Nauvoo Temple. "The Book of Adoptions and Sealings" indicates that this took place at 12:30 a.m. on 4 February, with Horace Whitney, the twenty-two-year-old son of Bishop Newel K. Whitney, acting as proxy for the deceased Mormon prophet. Just previous to this event Horace and Helen Mar had been sealed for time at which occasion Helen also stood as proxy while Horace was matrimonially sealed for eternity to the deceased Elizabeth Sikes (Whitney, Helen Mar Kimball, ms a). Helen states that she "loved" Horace, and the two evidently hoped that despite her matrimonial sealing to Joseph Smith they might somehow spend eternity together. Helen was thus to write in 1883:

At early twilight on the 3rd of February a messenger was sent by my father, informing H. K. Whitney and myself that . . . we were to present ourselves there that evening. The weather being fine we preferred to walk; and as we passed through the little graveyard at the foot of the hill a solemn covenant we entered.
into—to cling to each other through time and, if permitted, throughout all eternity. (WE 12:11:81)

There is some indication that Heber had wanted Helen to be sealed for time to Brigham Young (Lewis, Catherine 1848:19), but was probably not displeased with her marriage into the Whitney family. Newel K. Whitney was the second man to hold the office of bishop in the Church. His mother’s maiden name had been Kimball, and Newel and Heber discovered that they were distantly related. According to Helen Mar, Joseph Smith had informed them that “they were descendants from one and the same branch of the Priesthood” (WE 12:11:82). Like Heber C. Kimball, Newel K. Whitney was one of the original members of the Holy Order; and his wife, Elizabeth Ann, had been inducted into the order about the same time as Vilate Kimball (see Ehat 1982:102). The Whitneys received their second anointing three months before the Kimballs. And Newel, like Heber, (although on a more modest scale) had plural wives and adopted children sealed to him in the Nauvoo Temple.

With the marriage of Helen to Horace, the families of Newel K. Whitney and Heber C. Kimball were allied through an exchange of two females who were both matrimonially sealed for eternity to Joseph Smith. First, Newel’s daughter Sarah Ann had been married to Heber for time after having been sealed for eternity to Joseph Smith. And now, in like manner, Helen Mar had married Newel’s son Horace after having been sealed as an eternal wife to Joseph Smith. During the ensuing years the two families were to act in consort in many economic and spiritual matters.

When Heber C. Kimball left Nauvoo in February of 1846 he might well have felt that he was much closer to having a posterity as “numerous as the sands upon the sea shore” than he had been when he initially received this promise in the spring of 1839. Through the second anointing ordinance he had been empowered to be a priest and king over his posterity and to save them in his kingdom. He now had some thirty-eight wives, twenty-seven of which he was sealed to for eternity. He had already fathered ten children: eight of these were still living and two had already married. With four of his wives currently pregnant there was good prospect that he would yet have many
more children. In addition, some forty adults had been adopted to him through a ritual enactment that formally established all the reciprocal rights and duties that would have existed had they been born to him in the covenant. Most of these individuals were themselves married, and many had children of their own. Sealing ties also linked him with other individuals: to the deceased prophet Joseph Smith, his brother Hyrum and counselor Frederick G. Williams, and to the living Newel K. Whitney, together with his own family kingdom.

While this familial organization had been established upon the theological conceptions of Joseph Smith and in anticipation of an eternal existence, its living members had to survive and interact in a mortal world. In mid-February they were now in the process of being uprooted from their homes to begin a trek for which they were ill prepared. It was in this arena that the pragmatics of the Kimball family kingdom were now to be worked out.

Family kingdoms of Heber C. Kimball's adopted sons

Although Heber C. Kimball's adopted sons had become part of his family kingdom through the ordinance of sealing, in the Mormon concept of patriarchal order they stood at the head of their own family kingdoms. As patriarchs they were to administer the affairs of their own families under the direction of their father, Heber. To examine the nature of this relationship as well as the form that patriarchal order took among more common members of the Church, attention will be focused on the lives of Joseph Hovey, Daniel Davis, Peter O. Hansen, and David Candland. They had all been converted to the Church after the Missouri exodus. They were thus becoming integrated into the Church as the concept of patriarchal order was unfolding. Although they were all to remain loyal to the Church throughout their lives, none was destined to gain any particular prominence. They cannot be regarded as a completely representative sample of ordinary nineteenth-century Mormons; their lives, however, do illustrate various consequences that patriarchal order concepts had for average members of the Mormon group.
Joseph Grafton Hovey. Joseph Grafton Hovey was born 17 November 1812 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. About 1832 he married Martha Ann Webster. His brothers Stephen and Ollando, who had moved to Illinois, wrote him about business opportunities, and in 1837 he and his wife moved there. He became aware of Mormonism at the time the Saints were being expelled from Missouri. George Pitkin (who also would subsequently be adopted by Heber C. Kimball) became his neighbor, taught him the Mormon gospel, and got him to read the Book of Mormon. Joseph and Martha were baptized 4 July 1839 and soon moved to Nauvoo.

Portions of his journal cited earlier in this chapter indicate that Joseph had great affinity for the Mormon concept of enduring familial relationships and that he looked forward to associating with his deceased mother and children.

Although he was not privy to Joseph Smith's private teachings regarding patriarchal organization, Joseph Hovey was able to identify himself as an heir to the Abrahamic covenant when he and his wife received their patriarchal blessings 25 November 1843. On that occasion he was told:

The beginning of your reckoning . . . is from Abraham passing through the loins of Jacob, through the lineage of the tribe of Manasseh, therefore in the lineage of Jacob according to the prophetic vision of your fathers, even Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are the blessings of your inheritance to be fulfilled. . . . And in this lineage are your rights inherent, lineal to the priesthood, and to an inheritance in the tribe and lineage of your fathers to be received and appreciated by yourself and your children.

At the same time, his wife was informed: "You are a daughter of Jacob, an heir of promise by lineage and descent . . . and shall . . . have an inheritance in the lineage of your Fathers, the same to be had in common with your husband." Although they still had much to learn about patriarchal organization, many of its structural aspects had been laid out for them in these blessings.

Joseph spent considerable time working on the construction of the Nauvoo Temple. As he wrote in his journal at this time: "I labor with my might on the Lord's house cutting and hauling stone to build his temple, for the twelve promise great blessings even to save our
dead friends and to go forth and build up the kingdom in the whole earth."

Joseph and Martha Ann Hovey were permitted to receive their endowments soon after the temple attic was open for ordinance work. He writes: "December 16. I was invited to go to the Temple to receive the blessings that was for us. We arrived at the temple at one o'clock. We got through the ordinance at ten o'clock in the evening." Shortly thereafter he was permitted to participate in the activities of the expanding Holy Order. He thus writes that on the Sunday after he received his endowments: "I met with the quorum [of the anointed] according to appointment."

On January 16 Joseph Hovey was called to assist in the ordinance work in the temple. It was while working in this capacity that arrangements were made for him and his wife to be adopted to Heber and Vilate Kimball. Of this event he simply states: "the 26th [of January] called on us to go to the temple to go to be sealed to Br. H. C. Kimbel." Shortly after this ordinance was performed he indicates that the adopted children of Heber C. Kimball attended what would be the first of many family meetings: "On this Friday we was invited to go up to Father Kimball and we received some good instruction and enjoyed ourselves in a dance also."

The next week Joseph and Martha Ann were permitted to be matrimonially sealed and to receive their second anointings. He thus records that while engaged in ordinance work in the temple:

Father Kimball called upon me to [go] home and get my wife and also James Smithies and wife [another couple who had been adopted to Heber C. Kimball] and be sealed to our wives which we was. And then conducted us in another department and received our Second Anointing which was a source of knowledge to us and great consolation that we was counted worthy before our Father in Heaven that which we did receive.

Upon receiving their second anointing, Joseph and Martha Ann received, as had Heber and Vilate, the ritual status of patriarchal king and queen over their posterity. This, however, did not obsolete their sealing relationship to their adopted parents. Within the patriarchal order there was to be a hierarchy of kings.
Joseph and Martha did not have their own children sealed to them nor did they receive adopted children as had Heber and Vilate. Most likely the reason that the children were not sealed to them at this time was that time was running out and the temple was closed before the ordinance work could be performed. They, like other Mormons, however, received the promise that other temples would be built and all saving ordinances could there be attended to.

**Daniel Davis.** Daniel Davis was born in Amesbury, Massachusetts 18 December 1808. He first arrived in Nauvoo in the fall of 1839 to help in his brother Amos's mercantile business. During the ensuing years he spent a good deal of time away from Nauvoo while engaged in business and with family concerns. He was not baptized a member of the Church until April of 1845. He records in his journal that in December of that year the servants of the Lord commenced giving the endowments.... January the 2nd I went into the temple to receive my washing and anointing. January 7 at five o'clock I went up into the temple at the hour of prayer in one of the upper rooms (as part of the holy order). February the 6th 1846 in the evening I went up into the upper rooms and was adopted into the family of Heber C. Kimball.

Unlike Joseph Hovey, he was neither matrimonially sealed nor received his second anointing.

**Peter Hansen.** Peter Olsen Hansen was born in Denmark on 11 June 1818. He first became aware of Mormonism when he read an article in a local newspaper about the Book of Mormon. Shortly thereafter his brother Hans (who would likewise be adopted to Heber C. Kimball) wrote him from the United States stating that he had joined the Mormon church and giving him particulars about his new faith. Peter relates that he now became filled with a consuming desire to translate the Book of Mormon into Danish. He sailed for Boston where his brother located him and baptized him into the Church 7 March 1844. They then left for Nauvoo together and arrived there 6 November of the same year.

He informed the leaders of the Church of his wish to translate the Book of Mormon. They encouraged him and indicated that he would
someday be sent as missionary to his native land. He writes that he worked on the temple every tenth day as a way to pay off his tithing obligation to the Church. He states that about Christmas 1845 the upper rooms of the temple were finished & the Twelve went in & had their washing & anointing & went on giving endowments to the people of the church, which lasted for six weeks. My brother and myself were set apart as door keepers at the vestry. For this reason we had our endowments right away after the first authorities.

Peter Hansen's writings give some indication of the evident desire that many individuals of both sexes had to be matrimonially sealed before leaving Nauvoo, of how such sealings were regulated by the apostles, and of the rapidity with which marriage arrangements could be made. He writes

One day a girl who had been a little unfortunate, came to me & asked me to marry her. I told her to go and ask bro. Brigham's advice and what he said I would do. She went & returned with the answer that he had said that he did not want me to get married for he was going to send me to Denmark & I would be gone for many years and I had better get me a wife there. This ended the courtship.

A short time later his brother (who daily worked beside him in the temple) was married without Peter's knowledge to a woman that he had not even met: "One day before leaving [Nauvoo] my brother married a young girl and he came and introduced her to me as his wife." Of his adoption into the Kimball family, he simply states: "My brother and me were adopted to Elder Heber C. Kimball & his first wife Vilate Murray as their children, both parties marking a solemn covenant to the effect."

David Candland. David Candland was born 15 October 1818 in Highgate, Middlesex, England, and was baptized 16 May 1841. He shortly thereafter left for America and arrived in Nauvoo sometime in 1842. He there married Mary Ann Barton on 27 March 1844. The following April 12 he received a patriarchal blessing which stated:

you are of the seed of Jacob and an heir of promised and of lineal descent beginning your reckoning from Abraham according to the covenants of grace and legal descent through the tribe of Levi, or in other words, from that lineage cometh your blessings and right
of priesthood and inheritance, which shall be meted out to your posterity in their days to come. (Jacobson, Grace, ms a, p. 10)

In relation to events associated with the temple, he simply states:

Jan 14 [1846] We had quite a large meeting of Brethren who belonged to our quorum that had passed through the Endowment. Partook of the Sacrament and kept it up till near midnight. I was sealed to my wife in the house of the Lord.

the 25th I was sealed to the family of H.C. Kimball.

29th. I took my wife and child to the temple. She was adopted into the same family. my child sealed to me.

Unlike Joseph and Martha Ann Hovey, the Candlands thus had their biological offspring sealed to them. They evidently, however, did not receive their second anointing.

Mormon Group Cohesion at the Time of the Exodus: A Summary Statement

The Mormons who crossed the Mississippi in the early months of 1846 proclaimed themselves to be a unified body who could maintain its cohesion despite any obstacle. As Orson Spencer (1848:215, 216, 219) was to boast the following year:

While the unity of great and powerful nations is undergoing a rapid conversion into fractional weakness, the strength of Israel is accumulating and augmenting beyond all former precedent. . . . Driven, and scattered, and robbed in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois, they have readily re-assembled and re-united. . . . And when the thousands that now compose the Church, and who have proved before the American people that the cords of their union cannot be sundered by the hottest thunderbolts of persecution, are assembled in the remote, extensive, and fertile valley of the almost unknown mountain, they will be forever invincible.

This emphasis on Mormon unity was in no way a recent phenomenon. From the Church's earliest existence, its resilient cohesion had been regarded by Saints and Gentiles alike as one of its most notable characteristics. The basis for Mormon group solidarity, however, had undergone important transformations in the period between Joseph Smith's identification of Jackson County as the site of the New Jerusalem and the abandonment of Nauvoo.
Certain things, of course, had remained essentially the same. Perhaps the most important of these was belief in the existence of an exclusive priesthood that had power to establish divinely sanctioned covenantal relationships. In both instances covenant making was used as the basis for separating the religiously qualified from the rest of mankind. And in both instances there were two basic categories of religiously qualified individuals: the Church as a whole and a more elite group of the fully religiously qualified. The same phenomenon had existed in the Puritan congregations of New England.

Qualification for inclusion in the Church group as a whole remained unchanged. It consisted in participation in the ordinance of baptism and acceptance of the code of conduct prescribed by the hierocracy. Throughout the period, however, the concept of Mormon group identity was in a state of transformation. At the time the Church was organized, Mormons regarded themselves essentially as converted Gentiles who had the responsibility to take the message of the Restoration to the house of Israel and by so doing be included with them in the covenant. By the time of the settlement of Nauvoo, Mormons as a group had come to regard themselves as the biological descendants of Israel, and thus heirs to the Abrahamic covenant. During the Nauvoo period the concept of the Abrahamic covenant was modified to signify the promises bestowed upon the righteous descendants of Adam, and thus from the Abrahamic order developed the Adamic order. The Mormon group did not cease to regard themselves as gathered Israel, but this Israel had exclusive ties back to the founder of the human race.

The nature of the more elite group within the Church community was to undergo more radical changes. As was the case with the Puritan church covenant group, members of this group were regarded as those who had the expectation of salvation by virtue of their full participation in the Abrahamic covenant. The basis for such salvation, however, changed significantly between the initial colonization of Jackson County, and the abandonment of Nauvoo. In the pre-Nauvoo period it had consisted in receiving an inheritance in the Land of Zion and there uniting with other Saints through common participation in the law of consecration and stewardship. By the end
of the Nauvoo period, temple and sealing had replaced land and economics as the basic aspects of Mormon salvation ideology.

In the early days of the Church the call had gone out for the righteous to flee to the Land of Zion while the wrath of God fell upon all who lived outside its boundaries. Such a belief underlay the conception that the boundary between the religiously qualified and the rest of humanity was essentially geographic in nature. With their expulsion first from Jackson County and finally from the entire state of Missouri, the Mormons lost their Holy Land; and the problems they encountered while attempting to maintain geographic dominance in Nauvoo, reemphasized the difficulty that might be expected in any attempt to employ territoriality as a basis for religious exclusiveness in nineteenth-century America.

Amid the increasing insecurity of the Nauvoo period, the temple came to replace the Land of Zion as the central symbol of Mormon unity and exclusiveness. Israel was now to gather, not to receive inheritances in the Land of Zion, but to build a temple and there participate in distinctive rituals. And protection from the destructive forces of the last days was no longer based upon occupying sacred space but by become a sacred people through involvement in sacred ordinances. As a result it became possible for the spiritual elite of the Mormon church to dwell among the wicked while still preserving their religious exclusiveness.

Concomitant with the change from land to temple as the underlying symbol of Mormon exclusiveness were transformations in the nature of the covenantal network that united the elite of the Mormon group. Basic to both organizational patterns was the concept that corporate salvation would be effected through the establishment of binding covenantal ties among members of the community. Under the law of consecration and stewardship such ties were basically economic in nature. It was assumed that through establishing economic equality and cooperation, the members of the community would achieve the degree of unity that was essential for group salvation. The consecration and stewardship covenants were basic to this process. In exchange for rights in fee simple over his real property, the consecrator received rights in usufruct over a stewardship in Zion. Since all stewardships
were theoretically of equal economic worth, all households in Zion would be on an equal economic footing; and since the law of consecration and stewardship contained rules for economic cooperation among the inhabitants of Zion, entering the order would naturally result in intense economic cooperation with its other members.

The steward in turn had jurisdiction within his own household by virtue of his control over the household stewardship. His wife and children were made dependent upon him for economic maintenance and to leave him was tantamount to losing rights in the stewardship. Thus by the provisions of the law of consecration and stewardship, the members of the household became linked to its head while he in turn was linked to the Church's hierocracy.

But while the application of the law of consecration and stewardship had consequences for domestic organization, the structuring of domestic organization was not itself a central feature of the formal system. This is demonstrated by the fact that while the law established covenantal ties between the household head and the bishop, it did not establish covenantal ties between the household head and either his wife or children. Thus, although the destruction of the economic basis of the system that accompanied the expulsion from Jackson County destroyed the operation of the system as a whole, it had no necessary effect upon domestic organization within the individual household.

The patriarchal order that emerged during the Nauvoo years continued to be based upon the concept of corporate salvation. Familial organization, however, now became basic to the dynamics of the entire system. Economic regulation was no longer the central binding power of covenantal association. It had been replaced by a combination of kinship amity and patriarchal priesthood authority. Salvation was no longer seen as a consequence of achieving economic unity but as a result of establishing relationships consistent with the pattern that had been established for the patriarchal family of heaven.

By substituting temple for land and kinship for economics, Mormon covenant organization achieved a degree of flexibility that was not present in earlier Mormon covenant organization. Mormon
solidarity was no longer incumbent upon maintaining economic relationships within a fixed geographic space. It was now possible for the Church to be broken up, to disperse, and then to regroup upon the basis of principles that were consistent with the enduring nature of kinship association.

The nature of patriarchal order rituals contributed significantly to participants' sense of exclusiveness. There were two basic reasons for this. The first concerned the manner in which the rituals involved kinship conceptions. To participate in such rituals entailed a separation from the Gentile community. This is perhaps best illustrated in the practice of polygamy but can also be seen in the religious as opposed to civil nature of the marriage covenant. Kinship association within the community thus became an aspect of its exclusiveness. The second reason centered upon the exalted but exclusive promises associated with the rituals. The expectations of eternal kinship association, exaltation, and godhead were held out to participants. These, however, could only be achieved within the covenantal framework of the patriarchal order.

Participants in patriarchal order rituals became encompassed by the hierocracy in two different ways. First, the hierocracy had to authorize all ordinances and prescribe the code of conduct to which participants had to subscribe. Violation of this code of conduct could result in the covenantal promises associated with the rituals being revoked. Since such promises were linked to kinship association, the regulation of kinship became fundamental to the regulation of the group. Second, participants were encompassed by the hierocracy through sealing networks that ultimately linked them back to members of the hierocracy. By receiving his second anointing, a member of the hierocracy was believed to have been given power to effect the salvation of all who became part of his family kingdom through the establishment of sealing ties. He presided over them as their priest and king.

After ordinance work commenced in the temple in December of 1845, the rituals of the patriarchal order were extended to the general membership of the Church. What had previously been a small secretive group now came to include much of the adult population of
the Nauvoo church. The elite nature of the group, however, was preserved to a degree. Participants were still expected to adhere to a code of conduct, and the concept of sacredness that had previously been identified with the Holy Order was now extended to include all that received their endowments. Thus the patriarchal order rituals became the means by which a sizable portion of the Church at Nauvoo became encompassed by the hierocracy.

This encompassment, however, was not complete. This was due to the fact that relatively few participants were linked through sealing chains to individuals high in the hierocracy. The reasons for this were probably the unexpected exodus of Church leaders from Nauvoo and the consequent closing of the temple to ordinance work. As a result, the sealing-based distribution of power and the concomitant creation of family kingdoms that it entailed bound the Mormon group together in only an incomplete way. The manner in which this should best be achieved was an issue that would not be resolved for many years.

Despite the incomplete nature of these sealing networks, the ideological model in terms of which they were ordered seemed to have been fully consistent with the social milieu in which the Mormon group was then existing. Simultaneously threatened by attack from without and schism from within, and confronted with a forced exodus that would lead them outside the territorial boundaries of the United States, it might be posited that the Mormon people were in need of a unifying paradigm expressive of intensive solidarity and based upon principles independent of territorial connotations. The patriarchal order with its concept of sealing ties grounded in kinship and familial association was readily adaptable to such a purpose.

As the Saints crossed the Mississippi, the essential elements of the patriarchal order were in place. Many of its details, however, had still to be worked out. The most important of these were as follows: (1) the relationship between patriarchal authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction; (2) the conflict between individualism and the corporate control associated with covenantal organization; and (3) the reconciliation of Mormon covenantal organization with American institutions. Each of these was in one way or another concerned with
encompassment and the distribution of power. The next chapter will be concerned with the manner in which these issues were resolved as the patriarchal order adjusted to the changing nature of the Mormon group.
CHAPTER VII

THE PATRIARCHAL ORDER AND MORMON GROUP COHESION:

THE POST-NAUVOO PERIOD

The president made another speech, showing the way to get along with business where [there are] many hands, namely by the principle of sealing, binding the children to the fathers, laying before them as an example his own family, containing about 200 persons. (Heber C. Kimball, ms c, 24 Apr. 1846)

As a system of government, the patriarchal order provides a maximum of opportunity with a minimum of structure and regulation.

--Dean L. Larsen (Ensign, Sept. 1982, p. 12)

The Migration to the Salt Lake Valley: 1846-1848

The Historical Context

From Nauvoo to the Missouri River

The Nauvoo covenant

As he had done when the Mormons were faced with expulsion from Missouri, Brigham Young had the Saints at Nauvoo enter a formal covenant that they would provide one another with assistance during the trek west. The minutes of the October 1845 general conference of the Church read:

President B. Young moved, that we take all the saints with us, to the extent of our ability, that is our influence and property; seconded by Elder Kimball, and carried unanimously.--Elder B. Young continued: if you will be faithful to your covenant, I will now prophesy that the great God will shower down means upon this people, to accomplish it to the very letter. (TS 6:1011)

In anticipation of the exodus and in a manner consistent with this covenant, the Mormons at Nauvoo were organized for the journey
and supplied with detailed lists specifying the provision that each individual was required to take. The premature departure of the Twelve from Nauvoo and the inability of the Mormons to sell their property at any more than rock bottom prices, however, wrought havoc with such plans.

Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and those leaders of the Church that crossed the Mississippi with them in mid-February established a base camp at a place called "Sugar Creek," some nine miles from Nauvoo. They remained there for approximately two weeks, waiting for the weather to improve and taking care of last minute business. In the meantime Mormons across the river in Nauvoo began flocking to the camp in an ill-prepared and disorganized fashion. Writes B. H. Roberts (1957 3:38, 41):

Many of the saints acted as if they feared the twelve and other leading elders would depart into the wilderness without the body of the church. Then again, so anxious were certain over-zealous ones to be with the very head of the movement, that they crowded themselves forward and upon these leaders in such a state of unpreparedness that they hampered the movement rather than aided it. Eight hundred men reported themselves at the Sugar Creek encampment, during the last two weeks of February, without more than a fortnight's provisions for themselves and teams.

By the first of March the weather had improved to the degree that the decision to start the trek was made, and those Saints who had congregated at Sugar Creek began to move west. New problems, however, now developed for the "Camp of Israel," as this initial wave of Mormon migrants was termed: the frozen ground thawed and the wagons and oxen became mired in the mud. As Eliza R. Snow records after her first day's journey west from Sugar Creek:

after starting on frozen ground & ice, the traveling in the afternoon was in mud & water. Journey'd 12 m[iles] & encamp'd in a field. . . . The last of the way being very bad, the last of the com[pany] only arrived in time for the next mor[ning's] start. (Smith, Eliza R. S., ms a, 2 Mar. 1846)

Progress was to remain painfully slow; during the first month out from Sugar Creek the camp moved on an average only three miles a day (Kimball, Stanley 1981:132). There were few bridges, roads were almost impassible, and sickness was rampant.
Migration organization

It was amid such difficulties that the basic organizational features of Mormon migration were solidified. There were three basic aspects to this organization: the company, the settlement, and the family. All had been in existence prior to the exodus from Nauvoo. As the Camp of Israel moved over the soggy plains of Iowa, however, each became relevant in novel ways.

The company. Antecedents of the company system might be detected in the quasi-military organization of Zion's Camp. In anticipation of the exodus, the inhabitants of Nauvoo had been organized into companies presided over by captains. The unsystematic manner in which the trek had begun, however, threw such organization into disarray. Toward the end of March, Brigham Young organized the burgeoning Camp of Israel anew into a hierarchically ordered company structure. At the head of the whole camp was Brigham Young. Under his direct supervision were three "captains of hundreds." Each of these had jurisdiction over two "captains of fifties." Each captain of fifty in turn presided over five "captains of tens." And a captain of ten was directly responsible for approximately ten nuclear families. Each individual in the camp was thus linked by a formal chain of command to Brigham Young. The company system with its captains of hundreds, fifties, and tens was to remain an integral part of Mormon migration (DC 136:2-3; Roberts, B. H. 1957 III:52-54; Smith, Eliza R. S., ms a, 28 Mar. 1846).

The settlement. By the time of the exodus, the Mormon people had had considerable experience with village organization. Unlike earlier Mormon communities, however, settlements along the route of the trek were designed as way stations for migrants. With the exception of the staging area at Sugar Creek, the first of these was established some 150 miles from Nauvoo at a place called Garden Grove. It evidently came into existence in part as a consequence of dwindling supplies and the difficulty encountered when attempting to move such a large body of people. Part of the Camp of Israel were
told to stay at Garden Grove, raise crops to provide provisions for themselves and the migrants that were still streaming out of Nauvoo, and then move on west when conditions permitted. Yet another way station was established thirty-five miles beyond Garden Grove at a place Parley P. Pratt named Mount Pisgah. Garden Grove, Mount Pisgah, and other such settlements were regulated by a system of government that combined ecclesiastical and civil responsibilities in a manner akin to the Nauvoo City Council.

The family. The family had the primary responsibility to provide for the economic sustenance of its members. This had been contemplated when plans were being made for the exodus. The manner in which the members of the Camp of Israel were using up the provisions of Church leaders, however, evidently hardened this policy. B. H. Roberts (1957 III:41) thus writes: "The head camp had not made more than one hundred and fifty miles west of Nauvoo, when President Young and the rest of the apostles who had started with a year's provisions for themselves and families had fed it all out to their less provident brethren." Eliza R. Snow records that about this time

Father Kimball spoke of the lavish manner in which provisions had been used by many, that to pursue that course would bring destruction upon the Camp & we should be scatter'd to the four winds. Said it was impossible to take all over the Mt.s—th at each one must help himself—he should divide no longer—the company voted to sustain him. (Smith, Eliza R. S., 19 Apr. 1946)

By establishing the family as the basic economic unit, it became the most critical element in Mormon migration organization. Given the importance of the family in general nineteenth-century American society and in the Mormon church in particular, this is not surprising. Prior to the exodus, however, ideology associated with the Mormon family had undergone complex development, and the ritual of sealing had established the means by which any number of individuals could become attached to a given family. That after such developments the family would now also assume such a critical role in the Mormon migration was to have far-reaching significance for Mormon group solidarity. This issue will be discussed at length in the following pages.
The Mormon Battalion and the settlement of Winter Quarters

By mid-June the Camp of Israel had reached Council Bluffs, some three hundred miles from Nauvoo. It was Brigham Young's intention to continue to push forward, establish other way stations, and perhaps reach his final destination by fall. While at Council Bluffs, however, the Camp of Israel was intercepted by members of the United States military. There initially was apprehension that these men were part of a government force that was being sent to prevent the Mormon western migration. The group, however, informed Brigham Young that President Polk was requesting that the Saints supply five hundred volunteers to form a "Mormon Battalion" to assist in the war with Mexico. Brigham Young decided to comply. In filling the quota he lost many of his best teamsters and more vigorous men. Under the circumstances he deemed it best to spend a year at the Missouri River before attempting to "go over the mountains."

The decision to establish the Mormon Battalion had in part been the result of lobbying efforts by James Little (Brigham Young's agent in Washington) to gain federal assistance for the Saints. The induction of migrating Mormons into the United States Army, however, was not what Brigham Young had in mind; and he was evidently taken by surprise. The calling up of the battalion was understood in various ways by individual Mormons. Peter Hansen reports a public meeting at Council Bluffs in which Colonel Kane, one of the military representatives, stated that he had

wanted to do something for our benefit, and being intimately acquainted with the president of the United States, he went to the City of Washington to see the president and laid before him our case, and the President being a righteous man did sympathise with him, and as the land of California was needing protection and it was concluded to send an army there, he gave Capt. Allen orders to get his regiment of soldiers of the Mormons on such conditions as it would be adventagous to us. . . . The brethren seemed to understand the manner well and manifested a spirit of ambition and willingness. . . . The United States has taken possession of the sea shore of California, but doing this we will have right claim on the land and we will be the majority of the people in the land. (Kimball, Heber C., ms c, 12 July 1846)
Erastus Snow (ms b), on the other hand, described the idea to organize the Mormon Battalion as

a subtle plan for our destruction devised by the government of the United States. . . . Should this request be refused, which they had every reason to expect would be the case, they would consider it of sufficient pretense for treating us as enemies to the government and cutting off our retreat to the Indian Country. On the other hand, were it granted they well knew it must leave hundreds of teams without teamsters and families without protection. And they fondly hoped that we should then be an easy prey to Hunger, starvation, disease and death.

And shortly after his arrival in the Salt Lake Valley, Brigham Young declared that the enlistment of the volunteers proved our temporal salvation at the time. For the governor of Mo. had already received orders not to let our people pass the Mo. river. If we did not enlist the government intended to destroy us from off the face of the earth. (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 30 July 1847)

An essentially balanced statement of the reasons why the Mormons agreed to the establishment of the battalion seemed to be provided by Norton Jacob (1949:28) when he records in his journal under date of 25 November 1846 that it "was a measure that seemed to be necessary in order to turn away the jealousy of the general government and secure its protection in some degree to the Saints."

Whether individual Saints chose to believe that altruistic or vicious motives underlay the government's plan to establish the Mormon Battalion, the Church's decision to comply with the request began a continuing relationship between the federal government and the LDS people. As discussed in chapter 6, at the time of the exodus, Mormons tended to regard themselves as religious exiles fleeing from a wicked nation that was soon to be destroyed. This perception was to persist for many years. The calling up of the battalion, however, set in place mechanisms that would result in the increasing reintegration of the Saints into American society. This was not to be readily achieved, and tensions would persist between the LDS people and the federal government at least until the end of the Reed Smoot hearing in 1906. The Saints, however, would never actually attempt to establish
an independent state; and by the mid-twentieth century, they would tend to regard themselves as the most patriotic of Americans.

One immediate consequence of the calling up of the battalion was that Mormon leaders ceased to fear that the government might "hedge up the way" and prevent their migration to a new location in the West. The imminent danger was over; and for the first time in the Church's sixteen-year existence, Mormons did not perceive that they were being actively pursued by hostile Gentiles.

As part of the agreement that was entered into between the federal government and the Church at the time that the Mormon Battalion was established, the Saints received the temporary right to occupy Indian lands. A provisional Church headquarters, called "Winter Quarters," was established at the site of present-day Florence, Nebraska. From here Brigham Young and the apostles directed the affairs of the Mormons who had congregated along the banks of the Missouri River or were still in transit from the now nearly abandoned city of Nauvoo.

Centrifugal tendencies among the Mormon migrants

By the time that Winter Quarters was settled, the basic organizational system of the migration was in place and the Mormon community had established the beginnings of a modus vivendi with the federal government. The exodus from Nauvoo and the trek through Iowa, however, had taken their toll; and the Mormons in many ways were suffering from a lack of internal cohesion. Journals from the period indicate at least three causes for these disruptive tendencies: (1) the abnormally high degree of sickness and death; (2) individualistic economic interests; and (3) forced proximity under difficult circumstances. Often acting in concert, these factors produced numerous volatile situations. While en route from Nauvoo to Winter Quarters, Eliza R. Snow thus confided in her journal: "It is a growling, grumbling, devilish, sickly time with us now" (Smith, Eliza R. S., ms a, 12 Aug. 1846).
An underlying source of difficulty was the lack of preparation with which the exodus was undertaken. Meager supplies quickly translated into sickness, malnutrition, and death. Journals make frequent mention of "canker," "black leg," "cholera morbus," and "paroxysm." Based on existing records dealing with the Mormon population at Winter Quarters, Maureen Ursenbach Beecher (1983:13) estimates the overall death rate of migrating Mormons to have been 82.1 per thousand. She contrasts this with the rate of 50 per thousand currently found in poorer third-world nations, the rate of 21 per thousand indicated in the 1850 Utah census. She places the infant mortality rate of Winter Quarters Mormons at 35.5 percent.

In personal terms, such statistics translated into debility, emotional stress, and grief. In mid-August 1846, Peter O. Hansen records incidents of sickness among Kimball family members now settled at Winter Quarters as follows:

12 [August] There is much [more] sickness among this people now than has been before because of the heat.
13 Peter [Hansen] got the chills today merely by not being careful enough, but when Father [Kimball] and Hosea [Cushing] laid hands upon him, his pain left him. Harriet [Sanders Kimball] is yet very sick. Hosea [Cushing] is yet very sick and [William] King gains but very slowly. . . .
14 Peter [Hansen] got the chills again and it was rebuked by his father [Heber C. Kimball] in the name of the Lord. Father [Kimball] feels very tired because of administering to so many sick and have so many other cares on his mind, and what is worst is the contrary spirit among the people.
15 Peter [Hansen] is now very sick again. Also Mary Forsgren. (Kimball, Heber C., ms c, 12, 13, 15, 17 Aug. 1846)

Joseph Hovey (ms a) writes in his own journal that while attempting to reach Winter Quarters the following month, his wife and he both became so ill that neither could drive their team. Brigham Young happened upon them and helped them to the settlement. During the next few days they became increasingly ill, and while members of the Kimball family were attempting to offer assistance.

I did not know what was going on around me, but I did heard them ask Martha what they should do with the little babe, and she said, "Let me have the dear little lamb, and you see to my dear husband.
as he is almost dead." This is the last time I heard Martha speak. I had such a fever I was out of my head for some time. About 10:00 o'clock in the evening Father Kimball came to the tent door and asked how we were. I told him I was better and I thought my wife was for she was asleep. When I awoke later, although I was very ill, the first thing I did was to go to the bed of Martha to see how she was. She was unconscious and did not move. Her eyes were half shut and she breathed very hard. Her pulse was close and she was cold as death in her lower limbs. I concluded she was struck with death.

Martha departed this life September 16, 1846.

Individualistic economic interests

While holding individual families primarily responsible for their own maintenance was probably the best practical solution to the serious problem of economic survival, it likely heightened the tendency toward individual economic self-interest that was manifest in the Mormon community during the Nauvoo period.

While looking out for their own economic needs, Mormons were under covenantal obligation to help the less fortunate and to cooperate with one another. That this ideal was not always reached is indicated by the numerous references regarding the need for unity as well as by statements concerning the selfishness manifest both by those who withheld support from others and those who asked for assistance when they were not doing all they could to provide for themselves. Eliza R. Snow thus records a sermon delivered by Heber C. Kimball in which

He strongly impress'd the necessity of union of feeling & action—said his feelings were wounded by reflections made by some respecting their teams [being sent] back for others . . . —said that those who were selfish about helping others would find their teams weakening & dying, & c.

And later, when she was left behind with other Saints at the Iowa way stations, she was to write: "I prefer stopping behind for the present that every possible means may be appropriated to liberate the Twelve from the oppression of selfish ones who never have made sacrifices for the truth's sake" (Smith, Eliza R. S., ms a, 12 Apr., 1 June 1846).

Given the communal nature of Mormon group life, the degree to which economic interactions were regarded as financial transactions is
surprising. George Laud (ms a) for example writes that in the spring of 1847 his adopted father, John D. Lee, suggested he secure a yoke of oxen. His father-in-law, Benjamin Megeness had a yoke of oxen and offered them to me for sale. I asked him what he would take for them. He told me that they was worth 35 dollars. But as it was me he would give them to me for 25 dollars. He told me that they was good cattle only poor. So I asked Father Lee about it. He told me I should buy them. I left word with his wife that if he would trade them for my watch and the remainder for pork & corn I would take the cattle. [That evening] he called me out and told me that he would trade me the oxen and take the watch at 12 dollars & take the remaining of the pay in salt corn and pork at 25 dollars and also said that I and him had not yet settled for the work of the house and barn I had done for him and if I would say nothing about that we would trade and he would try and favor me all he could in all other cases. I told him I had not intended saying anything about that settlement but see what he would do.

When Laud and Lee subsequently found that the oxen were bad, Lee told Laud to not pay for them. Laud then reports that when Megeness learned that it was Lee who had prevented payment "he called Brother or Father John D. Lee all the hard names he could think such as black leg, lyer, thief, robber, cheater and . . . Elizabeth Muclearly is a witness to this."

Forced proximity

Added to these difficulties were the conflicts that seemed to have arisen from the forced proximity under which the Mormon migrants had to operate. Journals are replete with instances of this sort. While many were petty, they reveal an underlying tension in the companies, settlements, and families.

For example, Peter O. Hansen records in Heber C. Kimball's camp journal that

Yesterday, Br. J.P. being jalous of Br. E. for him being ahead of him with his wagon, struck his oxen to drive them out of the way which made Br. E. angry and he struck br. J.P. After several stricks from both sides, in his eye so bad that he fell down and still he struck him. (Kimball, Heber C., ms c, 9 June 1846)

Eliza R. Snow, by direction of her husband, Brigham Young, traveled from Nauvoo to Winter Quarters with the Stephen Markhan
family. Her journal contains numerous references to conflicts within this group.

[April] 5th . . . In consequence of some disaffected feelings, Br. Markham's and br. Yearsley's families this mor. separate their table, br. Barney wishing to board with br. M[arkham] remains with us. . . .

[May] 18th . . . Our father who watches over his children's welfare will order all things for good if we will put our trust in him. . . . But I find from every day's experience that while we are thrown into the midst of all sorts of spirits it is my lot to have one about me that is a constant annoyance, one with whom I cannot & will not hold fellowship, thro' whose instrumentality much disquietude has been occasioned.

Sep. . . . I was taken sick on the last day of Aug of a fever which ran greatly . . . 40 days and stimulated in the chills and fever. During this time while suffering much in body & lying as it were at the gate of death [I was surrounded] with family discord which I think proper to call hell. . . .

[November] 23rd. This mor Warren [Markham] getting quite irritated at his father, threw out an insinuation that I had been talking to elder Kimball against his wife which is as false as hell. He call'd no names but said, "It is one that we have been supporting all the while & one in the family."

Is such the greatful returns which I am to receive for sharing the disgrace, & for all my exertions in upholding the reputation of this unfortunate family. . . ?

Yesterday the father & son separated so that W[arren] is to have his living charg'd by weight & measure until he can provide his own.

[November] 26th. The atmosphere a little modified Warren coming into the room I could scarcely avoid fastening my eyes upon him since the time of his insulting me on monday--he inquired why I look'd as though I would look him thro'. Understanding the spirit which prompted him I thought wisdom to keep silence. He said it was an imposition for me to look at him so & also he understood that I had accused him of accusing me of talking to Elder K[imball] &c which he said was a lie as he call'd no names.

[November] 29th . . . Last eve. br M[arkham] as'd me what I had written in my journal that W[arren] was scolding about so much. I gave him the journal to read after which he said it was truth. Br. M[arkham] said he did not think of W[arren] meaning me at the time. I told him I thought strange that he was silent—that I never was so abus'd in my life. . . .

[Today] I let sis. M[arkham] read it, after which she said, "Do you think you have been disgrac'd by living in the family? I should not think the Lord would require you to live where you would disgrace yourself. . . ."

I saw she had a wrong spirit, & made no reply to whatever she said and indeed I have not polluted my lips with the silly subject except what I said to br. M[arkham] last eve. (Smith, Eliza R. S., ms a, 5 Apr.; 18 May; Sept.; 23, 26, 29 Nov. 1846)
The Patriarchal Order as a Basis for Unity

Counteracting the centrifugal aspects of the exodus and migration were the ideology, ritual, and covenantal relationships associated with the patriarchal order. While not always successful in preventing specific disruptions and defections, the patriarchal order paradigm provided both a framework in terms of which the Mormon people conceptualized their distinctive unity and the institutional means by which to adjust individual desires to group needs.

That such a structure should be in existence at this particular point in Mormon history was highly significant. Various conditions that had traditionally tended to provide group stability within the context of American society were either seriously eroded or in a state of flux. Having already abandoned Nauvoo but having yet to establish a new center in the West, the Mormon group was without territorial focus. Economic conditions were unstable and economic relationships insecure. And Mormons felt alienated from the American people and their government. Fundamental to the patriarchal order, however, was the concept of cohesion grounded in kinship and familial association, a pervasive and persistent basis for unity within American culture. Cushing Strout (1974:134) perceived the similarity between solidarity within the Mormon group and within general American society when he wrote: "When the Mormons revived the practice of patriarchal polygamy . . . they were also participating in a widespread cult of the family as a focus for unaligned community, a temple at whose shrine even their enemies worshiped."

The operative patriarchal order that emerged during the period might be regarded as approximating a kinship polity. Its most significant aspect was the manner in which it merged hierocratic regulation with kinship ideology and idiom. The Mormons conceived of themselves as essentially a community of blood that ideally should interact in terms of the principles of kinship amity. Because it was believed, however, that this community should be bound together upon the basis of priesthood-administered divine law, leaders within the hierocracy were able to regulate the group in terms of what they perceived to be its goals and objectives.
At its most general level, the cohesive aspect of the patriarchal order paradigm is indicated in the name of the initial migrating group: the Camp of Israel. Having already identified themselves as the biological descendants of biblical Israel, the Mormons now readily associated their own migration with that of ancient Israel in their journey from Egypt to Palestine. Eliza R. Snow thus writes that while she was slowly moving westward with the Camp of Israel, "Charles Decker arrived in 4 days from Nauvoo altho it is nearly 9 weeks since we cross'd the river; our journey bearing some little resemblance to that of the Camp of Israel in former days" (Smith, Eliza R. S., ms a, 14 Apr. 1846). When Heber C. Kimball (ms c, 7 June 1846) addressed members of the camp who had gathered for Sunday worship, he "spoke of us traveling in the wilderness (like the children of Israel), that we are Israel because we are their children. But we are going to a land we know not where." Joseph Hovey (ms a) first reached the Camp of Israel shortly after its arrival at the site of Winter Quarters. His impressions upon that occasion were as follows:

I felt to thank my heavenly father for his kindness . . . that I once more had an opportunity to behold the Camp of Israel on a prairie far from her nativity. . . . To look upon the camp, to see the tents a blowing and the cattle a lowing, it led me to meditate upon Israel in Moses's day.

In more specific and intricate ways patriarchal order cohesion was a consequence of the various rituals and sealing relationships associated with the Nauvoo Temple. Brigham Young thus held that the lack of harmony within the Camp of Israel resulted from the failure of the Saints to remember the significance of the temple ordinances:

President B[ Brigham Y[ oung] stood up and spoke of that we were forgetting the giver of our blessings because our minds were all . . . taken up by our troubles. . . . [He said:] Now is the time to prove to be the Lord's or else go into the world or to Hell like fools &c. Also that we have forgotten our endowment &c. . . . I know the temptation in the camp &c that we have forgotten the signs and tokens of the priesthood. . . . One thing I want to tell you: that if this people will continue on as they have done . . . they will be blown up and scattered. (Kimball, Heber C., ms c, 24 May 1846)
The conceptual framework of the kinship polity

While the calling up of the Mormon Battalion would result in increasing accommodation of the Mormon group to the United States government, the Saints did not foresee this consequence. As has already been indicated, at the time of the exodus from Nauvoo the Mormon group's sense of alienation from America had resulted in a basic repudiation of human law. This attitude was to persist long after the battalion had begun their march to San Diego. Thus four days after his arrival in the Salt Lake Valley, Brigham Young stated that if the United States government "ever send any men to interfere with us here they shall have their throats cut and sent to Hell" (Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 28 July 1847).

Linked to this repudiation was an increased emphasis on divine law. Mormon priesthood, its earthly manifestation, came to be viewed as the only legitimate basis for political control. Thus Orson Spencer (1847a:1-2) was to write in September of 1847:

I shall . . . define priesthood to be that order of authoritative intelligence by which God regulates . . . all beings. . . . Out of the line of this . . . priesthood, there is no power whatever that is acknowledged and approved of God. Magistrates, rulers, kings, potentates and principalities, if not legitimately ordained and clothed with the authority of this priestly order . . . are usurpers. . . . The first object of this priestly order is to teach all nations to become loyal and good citizens of the kingdom of God. . . . Whatever orders of civil government . . . may contravene the established order of priesthood, the same must bow to the requisition of the inspired priesthood. . . . By this priesthood it is the design of God to establish a Divine government upon the earth, even as it is established in the heavens. All other forms of government have proved a complete failure.

Planning to soon leave the jurisdiction of the United States and regarding themselves as possessed of priesthood power, the Mormons at Winter Quarters believed that they were in the process of establishing a kingdom that would meet with divine approbation: "And this will be the best and greatest kingdom ever known this side of heaven. Its constitution, laws and methods of administration will be after the model of the heavenly order" (Spencer, Orson 1847a:2).
The basic unit within the Mormon "Holy Commonwealth" was identified as the family kingdom. It combined the nineteenth-century American understandings of kinship amity and domestic order with the Mormon concept of delegated priesthood authority. Each priest and king was thus to rule over his family kingdom as the nineteenth-century American father was ideally to regulate the affairs of his offspring. As Heber C. Kimball had declared while still at Nauvoo: "If we become to be kings & priests unto God we must make our children just as happy as they can be & we must be rulers over them, to give them their inheritance" (Laud, George 1978:177).

It was believed that such an ordering of relationships would produce the most potent form of social cohesion that could be achieved. As Orson Spencer (1848:168) was to write: "The strongest tie of government, of union, strength, and happiness in any confederation whatever, either in heaven or on earth, is that which springs from parentage." Basic to such cohesion was the organic solidarity that would be produced through the interdependency of fathers and children. Thus Brigham Young explained to those who had been adopted into his family kingdom:

I consider that we are all dependent on one another for our exaltation, that our interests is inseparably connected (for example) what can my family do without me? Supposing they were to all turn from me, I hold the keys over them through which they are to receive their exaltation. Would they not be like sheep that are without a shepherd and would be devoured by the wolves? ... Then let us change the position and say that I would cut off all my family, then what glory would I have with nobody to rule over but my own dear little self? To tell you my feelings I would rather be annihilated than to be in that situation. (Lee, John D. 1938:87; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 18 Feb. 1847)

Had apostasy never occurred from the days of Adam then all marriages would have been performed by priesthood authority and all children would have been born in the covenant. Then everyone by "birthright" would be part of a family kingdom, and each father would have eternal patriarchal jurisdiction over his own posterity. This pattern, however, had been disrupted. As a result there was a distinction between "legal heirs" and "heirs according to promise." A "legal heir" was one who actively participated in the Abrahamic
covenant and was part of an eternal family kingdom by virtue of essential ordinances having been performed. An "heir according to promise," on the other hand, was an individual who had rights to the blessings of Abraham but who was not actually included in the covenant nor part of a family kingdom because the qualifying sealing ordinances had not yet been administered. Adoptive sealing, however, provided the means by which individuals could become "legal heirs" by being sealed as children to worthy parents. As Brigham Young explained in February of 1847:

Had the keys of the priesthood been retained and handed down from father to son throughout all generations up to the present time then there could have been no necessity of the law of adoption, for we would all have been included in the covenant without it and would have been legal heirs instead of being heirs according to promise." (Lee, John D. 1938:81; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 16 Feb. 1847)

An objective of the Church became to employ sealing ordinances as a means to change its members from only heirs of promise to actual legal heirs. The fact that adoptive sealing could be employed to link Church members to individuals who were not their biological parents, however, potentially provided the means by which the entire membership of the Church might be related through sealing ties to the leading members of the hierocracy. There could thus be an actual merger between patriarchal order and ecclesiastical organization. The Mormon church, like its ideal celestial model, could consequently become one vast patriarchal family.

There was considerable discussion regarding how such a system might be operationalized. In a February 1847 family meeting with his adopted children, Brigham Young expressed his own feelings on the subject:

I will show you a rule by which you may comprehend the exaltation of the faithful. I will use myself as a figure and say that I am ruler over ten presidents (or rather kings), whereas before I was ruler over 10 subjects only. Or in other words I ruled over one kingdom whereas I now rule over 10. Then let each one of those ten get ten more and then I would be ruler of 100 kingdoms and so on continue through all eternity. (Lee, John D. 1938:87; also Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 16 Feb. 1847).
In the 15 January 1847 issue of the Millennial Star, Orson Hyde (9:23-24) presented the following drawing with the accompanying commentary:

**A DIAGRAM OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.**

The above diagram shows the order and unity of the kingdom of God. The eternal Father sits at the head, crowned King of Kings and Lord of lords. Where the other lines meet, there sits a king and a priest unto God, bearing rule, authority, and dominion under the Father. He is one with the Father, because his kingdom is joined to his Father's and becomes part of it.

... It will be seen by the diagram that there are kingdoms of all sizes, an infinite variety to suit all grades of merit and ability. The chosen vessels unto God are the kings and priests that are placed at the heads of these kingdoms. They have received their washings and anointings in the temple of God on this earth; they have been chosen, ordained, and anointed kings and priests to reign as such in the resurrection of the just. Such as have not received the fulness of the priesthood (for the fulness of the priesthood includes the authority of both king and priest) and have not been anointed and ordained in the temple of the Most High, may obtain salvation in the celestial kingdom, but not a celestial crown.

While this portion of eternity that we now live in, called time, continues, and while the other portions of eternity that we may hereafter dwell in, continue, those lines in the forgoing
Diagram, representing kingdoms, will continue to extend and be lengthened out; . . . All these kingdoms are one kingdom, and there is a King over kings and a Lord over lords. There are Lords many, and Gods many, for they are called Gods to whom the word of God comes, and the word of God comes to all these kings and priests. But to our branch of the kingdom there is but one God, to whom we all owe the most perfect submission and loyalty; yet our God is just as subject to still higher intelligences, as we should be to him.

And in November of the same year, Orson Spencer (1848:170-71) was to write:

The different federative unions of the whole family of heaven and earth, when organized according to the law of adoption, have their own respective patriarch or president to represent them in the grand council of the just, Jesus Christ being head over all things to the Church, in all ages. . . .

. . . The union of families, not according to the capricious and changeable institutions of men, but according to the laws of heaven, upon the basis of virtuous affection, and upon the confidence of permanent security in righteousness, will form a solid phalanx against the intrusion of discord and the spirit of alienation from God. The righteous will be bound together, by the ties of adoption and kindred, in the "bundle of eternal life." This united confederation of strength and affection will be peculiarly needed, in order to endure the shock which society must receive . . . in the last dispensation; for every tree that the Eternal Father hath not planted shall be hewn down, and the institutions of men shall come to nought.

One practical problem with such a concept of order was how to translate a pattern of delegated authority that included both the living and the dead into a workable hierarchy that included only the living. Under the "federative" principles of the law of adoption, it was believed that Joseph Smith would be the presiding priest and king of the dispensation of the fulness of times. This meant that all within the Mormon community should eventually come under his patriarchal jurisdiction by being linked to him through sealing chains. His right to this position was regarded as one of blood inheritance. As Brigham Young explained in January of 1845:

I will . . . set in order before . . . you the true order of the kingdom of God and how the families hereafter will be organized; you have heard Joseph say that the people did not know him; he had his eyes on the relation to blood-relations. Some have supposed that he meant spirit, but it was the blood-relation. . . . His descent from Joseph that was sold into Egypt was direct, and the
blood was pure in him. That is why the Lord chose him. . . . That blood which was in him was pure and he had the sole right and lawful power, as he was the legal heir to the blood that has been on the earth and has come down through a pure lineage. The union of various ancestors kept that blood pure. (Lund 1920:107)

The problem of course was that Joseph Smith was dead and Brigham Young was the actual power center within the Mormon group. Brigham Young suggested that like Joseph Smith, both he and Heber C. Kimball had the right to preside in the Church by virtue of blood inheritance. Thus on 16 February 1847 he declared: "I am entitled to the keys of the priesthood according to lineage and blood, so is Brother Kimball" (Wilford Woodruff, ms a, 16 Feb. 1847; Lee, John D. 1938:82). And Heber C. Kimball was later to teach that Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, and the apostles had the right to preside within the Church by virtue of descent from Jesus Christ:

Did you actually know Joseph Smith? No. Do you know brother Brigham? No. Do you know brother Heber? No, you do not. Do you know the Twelve? You do not, if you did, you would begin to know God, and learn that these men who are chosen to direct and counsel you are near kindred to God and to Jesus Christ, for the keys, power, and authority of the kingdom of God are in that lineage. (JD 4:248)

Despite such statements, Brigham Young never took measures to have the entire membership of the Church sealed either to Joseph Smith or to himself. His reluctance to do so might in part have been a consequence of his belief that he did not fully understand "the law of adoption" in terms of which cross-generational sealing ties were to be forged. On 16 February 1847, during a lengthy discussion on patriarchal organization, he thus stated:

This principle [of adoption] I am aware is not clearly understood by many of the Elders in this Church at the present time as it will hereafter be. And I confess but I have had only a smattering of those things, but when it is necessary I will attain to more knowledge on the subject. (Woodruff, Wilford, 16 Feb. 1847; Lee, John D. 1938:86-87)

He was later to maintain that the following day he received the visitation from Joseph Smith that has already been discussed in chapter 5 of this dissertation. On that occasion he reportedly informed Joseph Smith that "the brethren have a great anxiety to
understand the law of adoption or sealing principles; and if you have a word of counsel for me I should be glad to receive it" (Young, Brigham 1971:529). When he reported the incident to his fellow apostles on 23 February, he indicated that Joseph Smith had showed him in vision how the human family had been organized in heaven and the pattern by which they were to be organized anew. This visionary experience, however, might not have given him the answers that he desired. Joseph Hovey (ms a, 26 Mar. 1847) reports that when Brigham Young later informed the general membership of the Church about the dream, he indicated that he had told Joseph Smith that "the people wanted to know about the sealing power but Br. Joseph did not give him any answer on subject."

Another possible explanation is that Brigham Young felt that the Mormon people were not ready to implement fully the procedures that such a covenantal order entailed. This in 1862 he was to state:

I have had visions and revelations instructing me how to organize this people so that they can live like the family of heaven, but I cannot do it while so much selfishness and wickedness reign in the Elders of Israel. Many would make the greatest blessings a curse to them, as they do now with the plurality of wives--the abuse of that principle will send thousands to hell. (JD 9:259)

The general kinship polity thus remained only an ideological construct. Its existence as such, however, was to have important consequences for Mormon group solidarity during the years between the abandonment of Nauvoo and the settlement of Salt Lake City. As has already been stated, during this period the individual family was the basic unit of economic survival. The conception of a churchwide familial order was a way to give religious sanctity to individual family units, symbolically interrelate them, and subordinate them to the dictates of Brigham Young and the apostles.

The development of family kingdoms during the migration

As indicated in chapter 6, by the time that the Nauvoo Temple was closed for ordinance work, some 5,000 adult Mormons had received their endowments and close to 2,500 men and women had been sealed
together as husbands and wives. The children that these women would subsequently bear would be "born in the covenant" as "legal heirs" to the blessings associated with the patriarchal order. Among the men and women who had been matrimonially sealed, close to 600 had obtained their second anointings, thus receiving full rights as "kings and priests, queens and priestesses" over their posterity. On the other hand, only some 150 adoptive sealings had been performed to link living individuals cross-generationally. The immediate result was a patriarchally based "holy nation" with numerous "priests and kings" but few filial subjects who qualified as "legal heirs" (see Exod. 19:6; 1 Pet. 2:9).

"The Book of Adoptions and Sealings" lists only twenty-five men who had children linked to them through the ordinance of adoptive sealing while this ritual was being performed in the Nauvoo Temple. Of this number only fifteen are listed as having had children sealed to them that were not their biological offspring. Three of these (Joseph Smith, Hyrum Smith, and Robert Thompson) were deceased at the time the ritual was performed. Most of the remaining twelve held prominent positions in the hierarchy. Five (Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Willard Richards, John Taylor, and Amasa Lyman) were apostles. Two (Newel K. Whitney and George Miller) were the general bishops of the Church. Another (John Smith) was an uncle to Joseph Smith and would shortly be appointed patriarch to the Church. The remaining four (Alpheus Cutler, Samuel Bent, Winslow Farr, and Isaac Morley) were less prominent, although Cutler and Morley had both been members of the Holy Order during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. From other sources it can be established that John D. Lee also had individuals linked to him through adoptive sealing, and it is likely that the record likewise fails to mention a few others. The total number, however, was small.

At the time that the Nauvoo Temple was closed to ordinance work in February of 1846, baptism for the dead, the endowment, matrimonial and adoptive sealing, and the second anointing ritual all ceased to be performed. By mid-December of that year, however, matrimonial sealings were being performed at Winter Quarters (Lee, John D. 1938:43). As had been the case prior to the performance of
marriages in the Nauvoo Temple, all such sealings were done under the supervision of Brigham Young and as a result of his direct approval. During this period, however, Brigham Young would not authorize the performance of either adoptive sealing or second anointings. And it would not be until 1866 that second anointings would again be performed and until 1877 that the ordinance of adoptive sealing would be employed to link Mormons cross-generationally (Burger 1983:27-29; Irving, Gordon 1974:297, 306).

Such prohibitions restricted the development of family kingdoms in important ways. As has already been seen, the policy that matrimonial sealings could only be performed by authorization of the head of the Church had been established by Joseph Smith when he first introduced this ritual in the early 1840s. During the four weeks in which sealings were being performed in the Nauvoo Temple, however, the sheer number of matrimonial sealings that were being enacted generally restricted Brigham Young's regulation of these ordinances to a mere formality. The more tranquil routine that was now established at Winter Quarters enabled Brigham Young to once more personally regulate all matrimonial sealings. Thus no eternal family unit could be initiated without his direct permission. The fact that no second anointings were being performed meant that the husband and wife who headed these new units were not being given full religious qualification to preside as king and queen over their posterity. And by authorizing no adoptive sealings, family kingdoms could not rapidly expand as some had done while this ritual was being performed in the Nauvoo Temple. The overall result was a tendency toward increased concentration of power in the head of the Church and a concomitant loss of power within individual family kingdoms. It might be argued that the pattern which developed while the Nauvoo Temple was in operation had presupposed the possible disruption of the ecclesiastical organization of the Church by delegating a high degree of religious authority to the individual family kingdom, while the pattern that arose while the Church was centered at Winter Quarters resulted in increasing subordination of the family unit to the ecclesiastical organization.
In the absence of the actual performance of second anointings and adoptive sealings there emerged the practice of behaving essentially as if these rituals had been performed. Each Mormon elder was expected to preside over his wife (or wives) and children as patriarch whether or not they in reality were sealed to him. The expectation was that when the Saints had established their new gathering place in the West, a new temple would be built; and all rituals essential for the actual establishment of the patriarchal order could then be performed.

Potential sealing links could likewise be forged between a given man and other adults who were willing to accept him as their patriarch and leader. Church officials did not supervise the creation of such ties. Either party might initiate the request by consulting the other; and once both were in agreement, they were expected to behave toward one another as if they had been sealed together as father and child. Lists were compiled of individuals who had agreed to be adopted as children to particular men, and the understanding existed that when the new temple was completed the ordinance would be performed whether the parties involved were still living or not ("The Book of Adoptions and Sealings," pp. 787-94; Irving, Gordon 1974:297; Lee, John D. 1938:198; Young, Brigham 1971:493).

The seriousness with which some Mormons regarded this practice is indicated by a letter Brigham Young received from George Dykes (ms a). Shortly after leaving with the Mormon Battalion, Dykes wrote, requesting that he be included on the list of those to be adopted by Young. In the course of asking this favor he stated:

I am now an orphan wandering through a wicked world without a Father of promise. Shall my days be numbered and my pilgrimage ended I go to the silent tomb without a Father to call me forth from the deep sleep? or shall I enjoy in common with other citizens of the commonwealth of Israel the legal rights of adoption? . . . I, who have spent the prime of life in defending the truth and its votaries, alike willing to defend our holy institutions in the sacred desk, or on the Battlefield, shall I be forgotten in the day of choosing?

While many Mormon elders never actively attempted to have other men promise to be adopted to them as children and regarded such behavior as improper self-aggrandizement, others vigorously
"lextioneered" to increase the size of the family kingdoms over which they presided. Thus in July of 1846, Apostle Orson Hyde called a meeting and spoke at length ... on the law of adoption. ... He desired all who felt willing to do so to give him a pledge to come into his kingdom when the ordinance could be attended to but wished all to select the man whom they chose. (Stout, Hosea 1964 I:227)

And the following February, George A. Smith confessed to his fellow apostles that "he durst [not] say as Br. Pratt and Woodruff has, that he had not lextioneered, for I have with all my might, but if I have lectioneered to the injury and hurt of any man I am ignorant of it" (Lee, John D. 1938:93-94).

A relationship that had been established as the result of either an actual adoptive sealing ritual or of a promise to participate in such a ritual at a later time could easily be extended to include other kinsmen of the adopted son. Thus under date of 16 February 1847 John D. Lee (1938:76) records that

About 10 [a.m.] Chester Loveland one of my adopted children who was with me at the altar [in the temple] whom I had not seen since I left Nauvoo, came in. He told me that [he] had been prospered and that he, his father and family, Brother-in-law, and Bros. wife were all ready to be disposed of according to my council as they claimed me to be their counsellor.

And a few days later he writes that

quite a No. of families of my house were present. I reasoned with them upon the law of adoption. Bro. R. Allen proffered to go as a pioneer and take my team and that likely his father and connection would be attached to my family by the law of adoption. (Lee John D. 1938:104)

There appears to have been considerable flexibility in potential adoptive unions. Various degrees of commitment were possible, and individuals moved into and out of kinshiplike associations as circumstances changed. Based on existing sources, it is often difficult to determine if two particular individuals have been united by an adoptive sealing ordinance at the temple altar, have formally agreed to be so joined at a later date, are considering the possibility of doing so, or are just behaving toward one another as if such an agreement had been entered into.
Whether two individuals were bound by ties of common blood, by an actual sealing ordinance, or by only the promise to become thus linked, various characteristics ideally were expected to characterize their relationship. First, it was common practice to employ kinship terminology when addressing one another, and adopted sons often used their father's last name as their own (Irving, Gordon 1974:296). The use of kinship terminology could extend to the children of one's adopted children. John D. Lee thus refers to the children of his adopted sons as his grandchildren (Lee 1938:65, 66).

Second, two individuals thus united were expected to engage in reciprocal economic interaction. They might properly ask one another for assistance amid the difficulties of the migration, and an individual who did not come to the aid of an adopted father, son, or brother was regarded as derelict in his responsibility. Even when not involved in intensive economic collaboration, such individuals were often exchanging small gifts. Thus under date of 9 December 1846, John D. Lee (1938:32-33) writes that he paid Brigham Young a visit and then returned to his own house "having received a present from my father [Brigham Young] a good piece of pork." And the following day indicates that "President Young sent us a pail of first rate molasses." Agustus Farnham (ms a), another of Brigham Young's adopted sons, in the spring of 1848 sends his "father" a gift of spices, sugar, soap, and seeds from St. Louis with the accompanying explanation: "If you will accept of them from your children in the gospel I will try to make a larger present the next time."

And third, the patriarch at the head of each family kingdom was expected to have jurisdiction over its various members. When difficult issues arose, he was then to counsel either with the patriarch to whom he might be adopted as a son, or with ecclesiastical officials who had jurisdiction over him in the hierarchy. John D. Lee (1938:31-32) thus writes that on 6 December 1846

Sister Steavens came to me in tears requesting council to know what to do saying that she intended coming into my family and claimed me for her counsellor. The case was not only critical but difficult. I told her that I would lay the matter before my father in Iseral and get his mind. At 12 noon I was at Pres.
Young's [and] . . . interduced Sister Steavens case concerning Truman Gillet Lee. Obtained his feelings.

The next day he continues: "At 4 I went to Truman G. Lee counselled them relative to familie affairs." In January of 1847 Lee (1938:58) was to receive a critical letter from his second wife, Nancy Berry counselling me to take care of my family, having reference to herself, who was only on a visit to her father's. I was not pleased with the spirit of the letter, knowing that she had no right or cause to do so. I presented the letter to Father (B. Young) who was of the same mind and counselled me to treat her letter with silent contempt and by so doing she and her father and mother will find that something is meant. Practice of this, said he, and she will soon learn to attend to her own business and do as I should say.

While the individual family unit was clearly subordinated to the ecclesiastical organization of the Church during the migration, it provided one of the most essential means for cohesion within the Mormon group. From the smallest unit, consisting only of a husband and single wife to the large family kingdoms of Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball, each was regarded as patterned upon the eternal patriarchal family that would exist in the celestial kingdom. Each was theoretically regulated upon the basis of patriarchal priesthood: the husband/father was the presiding authority, and he in turn occupied a subordinate position either to the patriarch to whom he was adopted or to ecclesiastical officials to whom he was answerable for his conduct. Temporarily discontinuing adoptive sealing and replacing it with the promise to perform these ordinances at a later date brought increased flexibility to the system. Individual family groupings were thus freed to unite for intense cooperation or to separate to pursue their individual needs according to varying circumstances. Whatever the size of a particular family grouping at one point in time, it was still an element in the larger patriarchal order that was now essentially coterminous with the Mormon group.

The family thus provided a point of mediation between individual interest and group good. While the family remained the basic unit of economic maintenance and relationships between families tended to take the form of economic transactions, individuals within a family were expected to attempt to cooperate in accordance with the
principles of kinship amity. If a particular family lacked resources essential for survival, it was possible to become attached to a more prosperous family and various families could pool their resources and engage in intensive economic cooperation. And as the entire Mormon group was conceptualized as a group of interlocking family kingdoms, the needs of a particular family were not viewed as differing in kind from the needs of the group as a whole.

The general organizational pattern provided a flexible way in which authority, order, and group cohesion could be maintained amid the unsettled conditions of the migration.

The Kimball Family Kingdom and the Migration to Utah

Events associated with the migration of the Heber C. Kimball family from Nauvoo to the Great Salt Lake Valley illustrate various aspects of the family-centered organization that the Church was attempting to effect during this period. In February of 1847 Heber C. Kimball declared: "I look upon the law of adoption as being the means of uniting families together by the connecting links of the priesthood" (Lee, John D. 1938:91). Consistent with such an understanding, he was able to employ the ordinance of adoptive sealing and other beliefs and practices associated with the patriarchal order to unite a large number of individuals into an interdependent and cohesive body.

At the apex of the organization Heber C. Kimball presided as patriarch of his family kingdom. All other members were expected to obey his directions and follow his suggestions. As Peter Hansen (ms a) was later to describe his relationship to his adopted father: "I . . . subjected myself to his will & wishes & prided myself in obedience & often attained to a good understanding of the power & authority of the priesthood." Realizing that such submission was difficult for individualistic Americans to achieve, however, the Danish-born Hansen continued: "I have felt thankful for being brought up under a monarchical government."
Journey from Nauvoo to Winter Quarters

As his anticipated departure drew near, Kimball selected from among his numerous family those individuals that were to accompany him as part of the Camp of Israel. The others were to follow as circumstances permitted. On 12 February 1846, adopted sons William King and Hans and Peter Hansen, together with John Davenport (the son of adopted son James Davenport), crossed the Mississippi to prepare for the arrival of the rest of the family at the Sugar Creek encampment (Hansen, Peter, ms). Daughter Helen Mar remembers that when she and her parents arrived at Sugar Creek on 16 February, "father's men had pitched a tent and put up a sheet iron stove at one end. . . . When we had warmed ourselves we made our beds upon the ground and laid down with grateful hearts for so comfortable a shelter" (WE 12:82).

When Kimball left Sugar Creek on 1 March he was accompanied by some thirty members of his family, including his wife Vilate and all their children, eleven to thirteen additional wives, and various adopted children (Kimball, Stanley 1981:129). It was his responsibility to provide for the spiritual and temporal needs of this group as well as for other family members that would be joining them as the Camp of Israel slowly moved westward. In addition, the family of Bishop Newell K. Whitney was closely aligned to that of Heber C. Kimball, and in many matters they acted in concert throughout the migration.

When the Camp of Israel was divided into companies, Kimball was appointed a "captain of fifty" and placed in charge of a large company of migrating Saints. The familial ties that he was endeavoring to establish among those who had been sealed to him were now temporarily extended to others over whom he presided as captain, and members of the company began referring to him as "Father Kimball." Eliza R. Snow, a member of the Kimball company, thus recorded a few days after the company organization was effected:

Elder Kimball was passing my "study" to day when after the usual compliments, I told him as I was number'd among his children, I wished to know if he would acknowledge me as one. He said he
would & I told him that I should claim a father's blessing. He said he would give me one. I asked when? To which he replied, "now." I told him I was ready; he said to me then, "A father's blessing shall rest upon you from this time forth." From this time I call him "father." (Smith, Eliza R. S., ms, 7 Apr. 1846)

While it is unclear to what degree such kinship ideology militated against conflicts, it did provide the members of the camp with a model for social interaction that they could readily grasp.

The attempt to provide sustenance for all the members of the company, however, nearly depleted the supplies that Kimball had intended for his own family. Daughter Helen thus recalls that

We were put on rations, and had to lengthen out our flour and provisions in the most economical manner. During that time our sea biscuits, crackers, parched corn meal, etc., which were among the luxuries, molded, until finally they were fed out to our horses and cattle. (NE 14:66)

And on 12 May, Kimball was to write:

Here I am with thirty in my family and not one mouth full of meal nor have had for two weeks . . . . I am brought to this along with hundreds of others on account of so many coming on this journey without provisions to last them one week." (Kimball, Stanley 1981:136)

At Garden Grove, Kimball effected a more efficient organization among the members of his family. Writes Helen Mar:

Here they unpacked and sent out many valuables into the Missouri settlements and exchanged them for provisions and the most needful articles. They also traded horses for oxen and milk cows. . . . Father's and Bishop Whitney's families were divided up into messes, each tent having one or two women to cook for the teamsters, and wagons were provided for all the women and their little children to ride and to sleep in at night. Although we were not rid of hardships and vexations, consequent upon the moving of a great camp . . . we certainly had little cause for complaint compared with what we had experienced previously, and the rest of our journey was made with comparative ease. (NE 14:66)

At Mount Pisgah the decision was made to temporarily leave part of the Kimball family behind, and some of the male members constructed houses while others were occupied with additional trips into Missouri to acquire more supplies (Kimball, Heber C., ms c, 12 May-1 June 1846). The trip from Mount Pisgah to the Missouri River was then made with little difficulty as the various members of the
group cooperated in driving teams, standing watch, going on trading missions to nearby settlements, and cooking meals.

Family organization at Winter Quarters

After the Camp of Israel reached the Missouri River in mid-June, Heber C. Kimball increased his efforts to weld the members of his family kingdom into a cohesive body who were ordered according to the principles of patriarchal organization and who endeavored to act according to the interests of the group as a whole. On June 28 he called together members of his family group who were with him in the camp. In attendance were his wife Vilate, their biological offspring, members of the Newel K. Whitney family, and various men and women who had been sealed as children to the Kimballs in the Nauvoo Temple. Peter Hansen's summation of the remarks that Heber made upon this occasion indicates much of the philosophy underlying Mormon understandings of patriarchal family organization in the summer of 1846:

I have called my family together as many as are here for I want to have my family in an organized state & c. I want that you should have good feelings one toward the other and every one to have common interest for the good of the whole family & c. [He spoke] of his many burdens on his mind & c., that he had keen feelings for us, more so than we think of & c, & c. He wished that they [i.e. family members] should conduct themselves with propriety & c. As to the boys, I am very much pleased with their doing, and the course that they have taken has merited themselves and me; and it is an honor to me, and they have caused my smile [to be] upon their head, and as to the girls, it is just the same. I have become your father, and I am your priest, your head, your prophet, your apostle, and your revelator, and from none other man can you receive revelation, neither now nor in eternity. And I want your prayers that I may have wisdom, and that I may have visions, dreams and revelations that I may live long and your mother also &c and take care of one anothers clothes and things if you see it in danger of being destroyed &c have patience to wait for the blessings and not wish yourself death because you can't get the blessing to day for it is wicked, but be patient so that you may become righteous &c I don't want to die. No I want to live to see all my children as rich so that they can pay out gold by the bushels to pave the streets &c. And after many good instructions and advice to exercise a good spirit and shun all evil & he administered the sacrament unto us, and the meeting was closed.

(Kimball, Heber C., ms c, 28 June 1846)
It is unclear how many individuals were regarded as part of the Kimball family kingdom at any point in time. Evidently there is no document in existence that lists the various individuals who covenanted to be sealed as children to Heber, and he theoretically made no distinction among children who were his biological offspring, individuals who had been linked to him through adoptive sealing in the Nauvoo Temple, and those who had agreed to do so when a new temple was completed. Thus at a meeting he held with the male members of his family he stated that

"You are all my boys or mean to be, for those that are not sealed to me are the same as though they was, and those that are sealed to me are the same as those that came through my loins." Father asked if there was any in the room that had not made dedication to come into his family, and the answer was that there was not any. "Then [said he] I am your father and your counselor or leader." (Hovey, Joseph, ms, 24 Mar. 1847)

Heber C. Kimball as presiding patriarch

In certain respects this rather heterogeneous grouping of individuals attempted to regulate their interactions in a manner consistent with nineteenth-century American concepts of domestic organization. Heber C. Kimball unequivocally presided as husband and father. The record is clear that his decisions impacted significantly upon the lives of the other members of the organization. It was he who determined which of his adopted sons would or would not join the Mormon Battalion, and which would be involved in various economic activities in the Winter Quarters area. These sons even had to obtain his permission before they could marry. Previous to his marriage to Sarah Bailey in December of 1847, Joseph Hovey (ms a) thus records in his journal: "Br. Heber spoke to me concerning my intended Sarah Bailey, that he thought it was all right. He would see her, and he would speak to Br. Brigham, and he would get leave, and would seal us twenty [of December] in the evening."

While Heber believed that he ruled his family kingdom by divine appointment, he attempted to govern as would a loving (howbeit autocratic) father. The manner in which he attempted to manage the
affairs of his kingdom and the issues of family conduct that concerned him are indicated in a letter of instructions that he composed and then had Daniel Davis read before the assembled members of the family on 22 August 1846:

I Heber C. Kimball wish to give a few words of counsel to my family and to all that belong thereto, both male and female, old and young and what I say unto one, I say unto all, and what I do say unto you, I shall expect it to be heeded in the full sense of the word. Of late, there has been a great deal of carelessness, imprudence and slothfulness with many of the members of my family in neglecting their own persons... going without suitable clothing, without stockings in cold chilly weather, disregarding the counsel of Sister Kimball, sitting out of doors under the bower... exposing themselves to sickness and death. I have borne these things and spoke of them till I am actually ashamed to speak of them again in public or in private. I therefore consider myself aggrieved and the spirit of the Lord is aggrieved. I love my family and I have never faltered from the first time to seek their welfare to provide everything that lay in my power for their happiness and still intend to inasmuch as my counsel can be respected. Now I shall request these things at your hands, except circumstances shall otherwise direct. Cease from vanity, seek humility and meekness, bow before the Lord in the morning and at even, and in so doing your days shall be many. Peace and tranquility shall soothe bosoms, health and happiness shall dwell in my wagons, tents, wigwams and cottages while these things are observed. Cease from murmuring, or complaining, finding fault with your father, husband and friend, or with each other. I always do and shall expect... that those which constitute my house will remember me before the Lord, that I may have wisdom, health, patience and endurance to endure all things, that I may always give suitable counsel to my family, even that that shall proceed from the Holy Ghost, for I never wish to counsel by any other spirit. If they will do this instead of seeking to direct and counsel me they will find much more peace and happiness and the Blues will not be so frequent. As ever I remain your most affectionate husband, father and friend in the new and everlasting covenant, Amen. (Kimball, Heber C., ms j)

In many ways Heber acted as a mediating link between the hierocracy and the individuals who composed his family kingdom. He thus took the decisions that had been made by the leading ecclesiastical officials of the Church, presented them to his family group as the will both of the Lord and of himself as presiding patriarch, and then did all in his power to see that the members of the family complied. He thus explained to a gathering of family
members that "the word of his brethren [the apostles and other high church officials] was the word of the Lord unto him; and his family should be obedient unto him, for his word was the word of the Lord unto them" (Davis, Daniel, ms a, 11 Sept. 1848).

Central to his method of manning the affairs of his family kingdom was the holding of frequent family meetings. Such gatherings were essentially religious ceremonies. They were generally held on Sundays. Prayers were said, hymns were sung, and the emblems of the sacrament of the Lord's supper were blessed by proper priesthood authority and passed to the assembled family members. Heber was generally the principal speaker. His remarks centered upon three related themes: (1) the importance of maintaining union and harmony within the family; (2) the exigency of following his directions as patriarch; and (3) the necessity of unequivocally accepting the decisions of the hierarchy as God-inspired. Members were continually being told that they must cease from all selfishness and personal interest and that all their effort must be centered upon the advancement of the family as one of the organized units within the eternal system of patriarchal organization.

The position of Vilate Kimball

For her part, Vilate Kimball demonstrated motherly concern for the members of the family. They in turn tended to reciprocate with respect and esteem. Peter Hansen (ms a) relates that in the fall of 1846

I woke up one morning shaking with the ague and I became very sick. Mother Kimball tried all in her power to rid me of the fever, but nothing would help until one day I was told by a young couple who came to see me that they had broke the fever by taking a tablespoon full of mista [?] and vinegar. When I sent for Mother Kimball & told her of what I had heard . . . she went & fetched all she had left of the two articles and it filled two large spoons. I swallowed the whole & had the fever no more.

In the fall of 1848 Hansen journeyed from the Salt Lake Valley to assist Heber, Vilate, and the other members of the family that were en route from Winter Quarters. Along the way a man "got me to wash a shirt for him and gave me 1/2 lb of coffee for my work which I kept
for Mother Kimball as a precious thing." After finally reaching the members of the Kimball family, he relates: "I had a good deal of shaking hands to do, and than I brought my presents to Mother Kimball and she received them with gratitude and remarked that probably after this she would have to do without such, meaning the coffee."

When daughter Helen Mar lost her newborn baby, Vilate wrote to husband Horace (who was then traveling with the pioneer company to the Great Salt Lake Valley) to give him motherly comfort:

My dear Horace,

I deeply sympathize with you in your disappointment, and all the lonely feelings which you must have in the absence of your family at this trying time, but I can assure you that Helen has had everything done for her comfort that could be, and she has lacked nothing but your society, which is more to her, than everything else on earth. . . . I drop these few lines, that you may know I remember you with the tender feelings of a mother, and daily pray for your prosperity and safe arrival home. Give my love and best wishes to [your brother] Orson, and accept the same yourself from your mother and friend. (Kimball, Vilate, ms a)

The position of other family members

While some of Kimball's adopted children might well have harbored resentments at having to subordinate their own will so fully to Heber's, they likely saw the advantages of belonging to such an organization. As Peter Hansen (ms a) relates:

I was a poor chap, without means. How could I have undertaken such a journey on my own hook? I could not have done it. I would have had no other alternative than to go to St. Louis as many did, staying there for years laboring hard to get an fitout.

And beyond such immediate issues was the understanding that being adopted into the Kimball family might prove spiritually advantageous in the life to come. Heber thus promised family members in August of 1846 that "if they were faithful & obedient, they should be greater kings & queens than Victoria" (Davis, Daniel, ms a, 9 Aug. 1846).

Heber's biological offspring, his adopted children, and his plural wives appear to have interacted with one another essentially as brothers and sisters. The quality of this relationship is suggested by an incident that Peter Hansen (ms a) describes in his memoirs.
Shortly after his arrival in Salt Lake City in 1849, he encountered Heber's daughter, Helen Mar:

she rushed to me, embraced me and gave me a hearty kiss . . . [because] she was so glad to see me again and I had no time to mind that she was a man's wife and during the . . . [time] we were wont to talk about all our young women as the girls whether married or not and even would call them by their father's names instead of their husbands, hence the idea of them being married women was not firmly impressed upon our minds.

Journals kept during the Winter Quarters period are replete with references to the social interaction between various of Kimball's wives and adopted children. A single example from the Daniel Davis journal (ms a, 11 Aug. 1847) should suffice to illustrate this point:

Aug 11 I took breakfast with Sisters Powers & Baily. Went to Bishop [Newel K.] Whitney's and borrowed his carriage & Wm [Kimball] helped me to harness the horses. I then went and invited Sister Frances [Swan] to ride with me. She did. Sarah Lawrence, Helen, Harriet [Sanders] and Sarah Noon went also. We went to the mount where Sister Frances's babe was buried. Returned back by Br. Dayton's farm, rode through the city, went home, took supper at Sister Noon's. Br. Wm. Brown with several of the sisters went to the school house and had a meeting. I opened with prayer. Sang a hymn, several of the sisters spoke in tongues. Sister Frances interpreted. Sister Lorey & Frances blessed me. Sister Jennet did also bless me . . . At sundown we did close our meeting. I then went with sister Frances to Sister Christeen [Golden's] and took supper. Went home with Sister Frances. Stopped a short time. Sister Randel gave me some dried apples for Lucy [Walker]. Stayed at Father [Kimball's] all night.

Economic cooperation

Perhaps the most important cooperative activities of the Kimball family organization during their sojourn at the Missouri River centered upon survival and economic maintenance. Most entries in journals kept by family members during this period are comments regarding the progress of various work projects. A brief overview of some of the economic activities involving family members between August and December of 1846 will illustrate the nature of such enterprises.

Probably the most vital economic resource of the Mormons congregating at the Missouri River was their livestock. B. H. Roberts
estimates that "they had some 30,000 head of cattle besides horses, mules and sheep." The members of the Kimball family individually owned a considerable number of cattle. Soon after their arrival at Winter Quarters they decided to engage in a joint haying operation to provide the animals with feed. Horace K. Whitney (ms a, 10 Aug. 1846) thus writes:

Those immediately belonging to Br. Kimball's family were called together for the purpose of making arrangements about cutting hay for the winter. The calculation was made to cut 800 tons, which divided among the 64 men which were counted made 12 1/2 tons a piece. There was also estimated 350 head of cattle, 31 horse and mules and 48 sheep.

During the next few weeks there are numerous references to various members of the Kimball family jointly engaged in mowing hay, making hay frames, and stacking the hay to dry. Finally on 6 October, Daniel Davis (ms a) writes, "Our folks have been to the hay field for the last time." During the same period other members of the organization are involved in hearding and in searching for lost cattle. Then on 19 October, Horace Whitney writes (ms) that the cattle were taken across the river and driven to a wintering area some 70 miles from Winter Quarters. In the same entry he details the number of cattle owned by the various members of the Kimball organization, but he writes that each had been branded either "HCK" to indicate that it was part of the Heber C. Kimball heard or "HW" to indicate it was part of the Newel or Horace Whitney heard. Although both heards are placed under the general care of a "Brother Lathrop," much of the actual hearding is carried out by various of Heber's adopted sons, and the family are frequently sending them provisions while they are off with the cattle.

Another vital concern for the Mormons of Winter Quarters was the construction of adequate shelter. During the fall and early winter of 1846, members of the Kimball organization were engaged in the erection of houses for the various "branches of the family." The first to be completed was that which was to shelter Heber C. Kimball and a number of other family members. Under date of 17 October, Peter Hansen writes, "Father with his family did eat supper in the new house for the first time after dedicating it unto the Lord. He had worked at it as hard as any one to get it thus far builded" (Kimball, Heber
By the end of November some ten houses had been constructed for occupancy by members of the Kimball and Whitney families (Whitney, Horace, ms a, 30 Nov. 1846). And work continued on into December. While not all members of the organization lived in houses that had been constructed by family members, it appears that all were provided one way or another with adequate housing.

At the same time the cattle were being provided for and houses were being constructed, members of the organization were carrying out various trading missions to secure needed provisions. Daniel Davis (ms a) thus indicates that on 29 June 1846

Father came to me and asked me if I would take a team and go down into Missouri for some provisions, which I told him I would. And it came to pass that I and Brother John Davenport and Henry Forsyth took seven yokes of oxen and one horse and wagon and started at Twelve o'clock.

Along the way they happened upon Howard Egan, another adopted son, returning from an earlier trading mission. On 8 September, Daniel left on a second trading expedition. This time he traveled back to Nauvoo and didn't return to Winter Quarters until 11 November. On 1 December he writes that "Father gave me fifty dollars in gold to buy some beans & wheat with down in Missouri and some other things for our comfort." This time he traveled all the way to St. Louis where he "bought 52 bushes of white beans . . . and some few other articles." He was back in Winter Quarters on 22 December. On the 26th, however, he again "started down into Missouri."

Kimball family activities, January 1847—October 1848

The revelation on company organization

On 14 January 1847 Brigham Young recorded a revelation in which the Lord commands the members of the Mormon community then scattered across the Great Plains from the Mississippi to points some distance west of Winter Quarters to be organized into companies to prepare for the anticipated migration "to the place where the Lord shall locate a new stake of Zion." The organization of these
companies was to be essentially the same as that which had been employed the previous year, with captains of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens. Upon joining a company, each individual was expected to make a formal "covenant and promise to keep all the commandments and statutes of the Lord our God" (DC 136:1-10). Immediately after the contents of the revelation were made public, the organizing process began, and by 17 February, Heber C. Kimball (ms c, 23 Feb. 1847) was able to write to John Bernhisel that "we have already organized somewhere between twelve and fifteen hundred men."

As such organization was proceeding, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and other of the apostles organized what were referred to as "family companies." Such companies included members of their family kingdoms as well as additional individuals. There is some evidence that these large companies for a time were intended to be part of the family kingdom of the individual who headed them. Wilford Woodruff (ms a) thus recorded in his journal on 18 January 1847:

President Young met with his company or family organization of those who had been adopted unto him or were to be, and organized them into a company out of which may grow a people that may yet be called the tribe of Brigham. . . . He said no man should come into his company to work iniquity, they should break off from all their sins. And they did enter into a covenant with uplifted hands to Heaven with President Young and with each other to walk in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord our God.

On 19 January Heber C. Kimball organized his family company. It originally consisted of some 200 individuals, but the number was apparently later increased (Whitney, Horace, ms a, 19 Jan., 29 Jan. 1847; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 19 Jan. 1847). It appears that through effecting this organization, the attempt was being made to unite a number of smaller family kingdoms into a larger unity that was headed by Heber C. Kimball and which combined organizational principles previously separately associated with the company, the family, and the settlement respectively. Alpheus Cutler and Winslow Farr, two of the few nonapostles who had had adult men adopted to them in the Nauvoo Temple were appointed to two of the most important leadership positions within the organization. The company was supposed to conform as far as practical to a domestic model. Heber thus expected
the various officers and captains to "act as fathers in Israel; and he wished them to treat the people as children, and nurse them, and be careful of their feelings" (Whitney, Horace, ms a, 29 Jan. 1847). Included in the ranks of the family company were various wives of men in the Mormon Battalion and other individuals who for various reasons might find it difficult to migrate to the new center. It became the covenantal responsibility of other members of the company to provide them with economic assistance and what other help they could to prepare for the journey.

After the 19 January meeting, what had previously been referred to as Heber C. Kimball's "family" was now at times termed a "company" or "little company," while the "family company" that was established at that time was sometimes called his "family." As a result, it is not always clear from the literature which unit is being discussed. For the sake of clarity the smaller entity will continue to be referred to as Heber C. Kimball's "family," while the larger organization will be termed his "company."

The pioneer trek of 1847 and Heber's farm

The January 1847 revelation specified that out of the various companies a select "number of able-bodied men" should be selected to form a pioneer company that would head west in the spring, locate a new "stake of Zion," and there begin planting crops. They were to be followed shortly by others who were to assist them at the new location and begin large-scale agricultural operations in the spring. The bulk of the Mormon population, however, were to remain at the Missouri River, where as organized companies they were to plant crops and prepare for a general migration in the spring of 1848.

In mid-April, Heber C. Kimball, together with most of his fellow apostles, left Winter Quarters as part of the pioneer company. Among the approximately 144 individuals that composed the company was Heber's wife Ellen Sanders and 14 men who in one way or another might be regarded as part of his family. Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball entered the Salt Lake Valley on 24 July, and the site was designated as a new stake of Zion. The following day Heber called the members of
his family together, talked with them about the need for harmony and
unity, and set them to work planting crops, building houses, and
preparing for the arrival of the rest of the family. The intention
evidently was for the members of the family kingdom to reside in close
proximity in the Salt Lake Valley and to continue the pattern of
intensive cooperation that they had developed in the months since the
Nauvoo exodus. After spending a month in the Salt Lake Valley, Heber,
along with most of his "boys," left with many others of the pioneer
company for a return journey to Winter Quarters (Egan, Howard
1817:103-31; Kimball, Heber C., ms d, 24 July-26 Aug. 1846; Whitney,
Horace, ms a, 24 July-26 Aug. 1847).

Most of the remaining family members stayed in the Winter
Quarters area while the pioneer company was gone. In March a site had
been selected some ten miles north of Winter Quarters as a suitable
place for the members of Heber's company to farm (Davis, Daniel, ms a,
27 Mar. 1847), and it soon became known as "Heber's Farm." Heber told
his adopted sons that he wanted them "to conserve" their "force and
fence in a number of acres and move your families up there [to the
farm] and build your houses in fort fashion and put in your crops so
that when I return next fall I may have some pumpkins and potatoes"
(Hovey, Joseph, ms a, 24 Mar. 1847).

Consistent with his instructions, most of his adopted children
moved onto the farm site about the time that the pioneer company
left. Vilate and most of Heber's other wives remained at Winter
Quarters. Heber placed Daniel Davis in charge of family operations at
the farm while his son William Kimball evidently supervised family
concerns at Winter Quarters itself. Vilate appears to have been the
affective center of the family, and there was considerable interaction
between the adopted children at the farm and the wives at Winter
Quarters.

Farming was evidently a cooperative affair, with the produce
being shared among the adopted sons doing the actual farming and
Heber's wives at Winter Quarters. The enterprise appears to have been
a success. While admiring the farm on 31 August, Daniel Davis (ms a)
thus wrote in his journal:
Hearding cattle I sit on a high butt where I have a prospect of the country around me. How changed the scene since the 14th of April. Then a dry & barren prairie, now hundreds of acres of corn and buckwheat growing. I feel to say, the Lord has blessed us and our labors. Our company has had good health till the present. There has been but four deaths in our midst.

On 31 October, Heber C. Kimball, with a number of his adopted sons, returned to Winter Quarters. Daniel Davis (ms a) reports that "in the evening [we] had a meeting at Father's house. He spoke concerning the managing of his family in his absence. Approved of the same."

The 1848 migration

Until the spring of 1848, members of the Kimball family continued to reside both in Winter Quarters and at Heber's Farm. Their activities centered upon the planned migration to the Salt Lake Valley. In December of 1847 the First Presidency was reorganized as a quorum separate from that of the Twelve Apostles. Brigham Young now officially became president of the Church, and he appointed Heber C. Kimball and Willard Richards as his counselors. It was decided that the 1848 migration from Winter Quarters to the Salt Lake Valley would occur under three principal "divisions," each headed by one member of the new First Presidency.

Heber's division, consisting of some 662 individuals, left Winter Quarters in the latter part of May (Kimball, Stanley 1981:180). Kimball family members made up a "little company" within this division, with Joseph Hovey as their captain or "father." Hovey indicates that he was responsible for some 61 members of the Kimball family (Hovey, Joseph, ms a, 16 July 1847). Probably not included in the count were the offspring of Heber's adopted children. Although not all members of the Kimball family were migrating at this time, most who had been deeply involved in the affairs of the organization over the last several months were now moving as a group to their new home in the West. The division reached the Salt Lake Valley on 24 September. Writes Joseph Hovey (ms a) under that date:

Truely to look down upon the valley, it did my heart and body good. For the spirit of God did rest upon me, and I did feel that
"This is the place for me." We came down from the mouth of the canyon, some 300 wagons. . . . I asked Br. Heber if he would show me my lot. He showed me where to noon my wagons near the Temple lot, beside his lot.

Difficulties with Family Kingdoms

The migration of the Kimball family from Nauvoo to the Salt Lake Valley illustrates the degree of cooperation that could be achieved with the form of patriarchal organization with which the Mormon church was experimenting during this period. At one point Heber was so enamored with this form of organization that he contemplated having his kingdom increase indefinitely through sending his adopted sons on missions and then having the individuals they converted linked to them through adoptive sealing. Thus in an 1847 meeting he was led to speak of how a man's kingdom would increase by bringing individuals into the Church and said he, "When we get to a settling place [I] will send off my boys, every one of them, to preach the gospel to the nations of the earth, and they will bring their thousands unto Zion and they will say, 'Where is thy father's house,' and will be attached to me; still he who bringest them in will be their king. (Kimball, Heber C., ms c, 7 Feb. 1847)

Probably in reference to this statement, Joseph Hovey (ms a, 18 Feb. 1848) was to prophesy to Heber the following year that "I would have my thousands to administer and you, Brother Heber, will have your millions."

Despite such optimistic enthusiasm, there were serious difficulties with the law of adoption and the large family kingdoms that it generated. While such problems were diverse, most in one way or another involved the persistent conflict between individual desire and group allegiance.

First, some individuals were employing covenant making without the sanction of the Church for purposes inconsistent with the objectives of the hierocracy. Minutes taken at meetings of the Pottowattamie High Council (which had ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Mormon settlements on the east bank of the Missouri River) indicate some of the issues that were involved. Apostle Orson Hyde, who presided over the Pottowattamie High Council, maintained that by
virtue of his baptismal covenant, each member of the Church was answerable to ecclesiastical officials for all aspects of his conduct and that consequently no individual held autonomous religious authority. This position was born out in the various judgments that he made. Evidently some members of the Church had used covenantal associations as a way to engage in illegal activities. On 3 July 1847 Hyde declared that

all who were honest and had been drawn into any thing relative to counterfeit money or stolen property, he would absolve them from all covenants, and any person knowing anything of the kind and will not reveal it to him, the curse of God shall rest upon that house or person.

A week later a case was brought before him involving one William Carter. According to testimony, Carter had taken advantage of the "deep affliction" of the Joseph Meekham family by getting the daughter, Cordelia, to agree to marry him. When Cordelia later attempted to get out of the relationship, he told her that "she would be damned if she did not fill her contract with him." Joseph Kelly testified that on one occasion

Wm Carter introduced the subject of sealing and stated that he had obtained favor in the eyes of the Lord & with his servants and that he had adopted into his family a young [woman?] . . . and how others had covenanted with him and had broken their covenants, and they were cursed and would be till he redeemed them.

In declaring Carter's conduct to be improper, Hyde declared that "no man had a right to make any [marriage] covenant without first going to the president of the church and getting the word of the Lord and then going to the parents or guardian and obtain liberty from them" ("Pottowattamie High Council Minutes Book," 9 July 1847).

Second, many were reluctant to become subordinate children in other men's family kingdoms. It was regarded as improper to coerce anyone to become part of another individual's kingdom. As Heber C. Kimball explained: "To urge anyone to be adopted or sealed to you is like damming water to make it run up hill, it always breaks over unless [you] are all the time draining and is but dammed water at last" (Lee, John D. 1938:91). Left to their own initiative, many felt that were they to join another man's kingdom, their own exaltation
might somehow be diminished. In attempting to overcome such misgivings, Brigham Young stated that "it did not detract from a man's glory or reputation to be sealed to another, and added to them" (Whitney, Horace, ms a, 15 Aug. 1847). And in speaking to a gathering of Brigham Young's adopted sons, Heber C. Kimball stated:

I am aware that many have had trials for fear that they had given away their birthright when in fact they had none, not having been adopted. Consequently could not be heirs to the birthright. What you have done is the best thing you could have done. (Lee, John D. 1938:91)

Third, once they were part of a prominent elder's family kingdom, some Mormons felt that they had acquired a special status that allowed them to act independent of general Church regulations. John D. Lee (1877:198) thus writes that "Andrew Little . . . was . . . an adopted son of Brigham Young, and consequently did about as he pleased." And while addressing his family, Heber C. Kimball (ms i) said:

I do not calculate to screen you from the law and its officer. If you are guilty you must beare the lash. Remember the Lord spoke through Samuel to Eli and how he was blotted out because he did not restrain his family. There are families in this Israel that do the same thing and bring this trespass upon them.

Fourth, disagreements within family kingdoms could result in disruptions in the covenantal organization of the Church. John D. Lee was the center of a number of these disputes. The journal of George Laud chronicles his own transformation from Lee's adoring adopted son, who attempted to fulfill his father's every wish, to a rather disillusioned individual who broke with Lee and traveled to Missouri with the purpose of working for himself. As he confided in his journal a few weeks before leaving Lee: "I am determined that I will follow the council that shall be given from the authorities . . . that are ordained of God (But it seems this Council of Lee seeks its own interest and none else)" (Laud, George, ms a, p. 64). When Brigham Young left with the pioneer company, he appointed Lee to act as his business manager at the Young family farm. During the ensuing months there were numerous conflicts involving Lee and other members of the Young family kingdom. After Brigham Young's return, a trial was held
in which the situation was investigated; and the decision was made that all who had been sealed to John D. Lee could dissolve their covenants with him if they so desired (Irving, Gordon 1974:301; Lee, John D. 1938:132-97; Stout, Hosea I:277-78, 290; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 9 Dec. 1847).

And fifth, even when relationships were fairly harmonious in larger family kingdoms, the management of such an operation could be extremely taxing. In a meeting that Heber C. Kimball (ms i) held with the male members of his family shortly before the 1848 trek, he discussed some of the difficulties that he had faced in attempting to keep the family organization together. Perhaps in reference to the increasing size of the organization, he related a dream in which he had started to fish and then watched as fish swarmed around him from all directions, and he asked that family members not "proselyte" to get others to join the organization. No longer was he preaching that an individual's salvation was contingent on being sealed to him, and he was now stressing the importance of each member being "independent" and receiving revelation for himself:

You being mine by adoption will not save you neither will obeying Christ's commands unless you continue faithful. I cannot save you nor can Brigham unless you adhere to our council. You must be saved by harking to the council of the 12 . . . anyhow. You must act independently, have more courage, nor follow my base example, but stand on your own ground. You must save yourself.

He asked that they no longer refer to him as "father." "Act independent. When you come to see me call me Br. Heber or Br. Kimball . . . . I am only a guide to act as a father."

While this sermon did not not signal the end of the Kimball family kingdom as an organization complete with adopted sons and their children, it did indicate that important shifts had occurred in relation to its manifest purposes. It apparently was no longer viewed so much as a means for exaltation as an organization for mutual assistance and cooperation.

Juanita Brooks holds that the judgment that John D. Lee's adopted sons could abandon their sealing covenant with him undercut the religious significance of all such relationships and resulted in a decision by the Church hierocracy to cease to employ adoptive sealing
as a way to increase the size of family kingdoms: "The fact that all of Lee's adopted sons were set free was a death blow to the whole system of adoption. It meant that there was no tie more binding than personal desire.... Once in the valley, no one honored it, so that its very existence is now largely forgotten" (Brooks, Juanita 1972:122; Stout, Hosea 1969 1:290 note 59). Gordon Irving (1974:301, note 29) essentially agrees with this assessment "if adoption is viewed merely in terms of the social experiment of the 1840s." He goes on, however, to indicate that some individuals who had been joined by adoptive ties continued some forms of cooperation in the early Utah period (Irving 1974:304).

Brooks's position should not be accepted uncritically. First, the trial judgment permitted both Lee's wives and his adopted sons, if they desired, to sever their sealing ties with him. While Brooks holds that the decision destroyed the significance of lineal sealing between nonbiologically related individuals, she says nothing about its potential effect upon marital sealing, which continued to flourish. On the basis of her argument, it would seem logical to infer that it would have affected the one as much as the other. Second, statements recorded at the time adoptive sealings were being performed in the Nauvoo Temple indicate that it was anticipated that under certain circumstances they might be dissolved. Thus when the children of Newel and Elizabeth Ann Whitney were adoptively sealed to their parents, the temple recorder wrote that the children were "sealed up unto their parents for time and all eternity (with the usual reserve in case of mutual agreement)" ("The Book of Adoptions and Sealings"). The fact that some such sealings were subsequently dissolved should therefore not have struck a fatal blow to the entire system. Third, there appears to be no evidence that the hierocracy at this point decided either that adoptive ties would be generally abandoned or that family kingdoms would no longer increase through adoptive sealing. Although in the spring of 1848 Heber C. Kimball (ms i) asked family members not to "proslyte" others to join the group, he went on to say "let all men or women be sealed to me by choice," indicating that he didn't anticipate that there would be no more adoptions into his family. And "The "Book of Adoptions and Sealings,"
which contains a listing of individuals wishing to be adopted to Brigham Young, indicates that in 1854, he was still accepting formal requests from individuals wanting to become part of his family kingdom. And fourth, an examination of Kimball family activities during their first years in the Salt Lake Valley would certainly not lead one to conclude that "once in the valley, no one honored" adoptive sealing obligations.

Brooks is correct that subsequent to the 1847 trial of John D. Lee, economic cooperation among individuals linked by adoptive sealing tended to weaken and little was done to forge more relationships of this kind. The Lee trial, however, should probably not be regarded as the primal factor for this change.

Great Basin Isolation, 1848-1869

Historical Context

When the pioneer company entered the Salt Lake Valley in July of 1847 they were in Mexican territory. By the time Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Willard Richards returned with their large divisions in the fall of 1848, the entire region had been ceded to the United States. The fact that the Saints were once more at least under the nominal jurisdiction of the United States might have been disheartening to some. Thus a few weeks after his arrival in the valley, Daniel Davis (ms a, 8 Dec. 1848) heard Heber C. Kimball exclaim "that the United States had circumscribed us again." On the other hand, they appear to have been extremely pleased with the degree to which they were now isolated from Gentile society and with the large area in which they might expand:

Their new home was over a thousand miles from the western fringes of American settlement along the Missouri. Inhabited parts of Oregon and California lay almost as far beyond. The journey to Salt Lake City from the nearest populated areas took over twice as much time as that from Boston to London in the mid-nineteenth century. . . . The Mormons had, in effect, leaped beyond the line of American frontier settlement, moving to a region that others would not approach in significant numbers for three decades. (Arrington and Bitton 1979:112-13)
Within this isolated setting, religion was to pervade nearly every aspect of Mormon interaction. As Leonard Arrington (1958:39) has written in his seminal work on Mormon economic history:

Nothing was above the dictation of religion—nothing too trivial for its watchful care. This predominance of religious interest—this willingness of the individual pioneer to subordinate himself to the church—this subservience of every interest to the maintenance and perpetuation of basic ideals—explains the indestructibility of the solid phalanx of unity in Mormon thought and action in the face of the normal centrifugal forces of the frontier.

In reality of course, neither the domination of the hierocracy nor the isolation from the rest of American society was ever absolute. As early as December of 1848 Joseph Hovey (ms a, 17 Dec. 1848) was observing that "There is some contention among the brethren. Some are murmuring against the heads." And the following summer he was to witness large numbers of Gentiles passing through the Salt Lake Valley en route to the California gold fields:

The Gentiles are flocking to the gold mines by the thousands. A great many sell their wagons and goods very cheap. . . . Most of the Gentiles are not pleased with this place, but many say when they come back this way they will live here, and some do not wish to go any farther. (Hovey, Joseph, ms a, 1 July 1849)

Nineteenth-century Mormon expansion in the intermountain west, however, provides one of the best American examples of the large-scale development of an exclusive society under religious auspices.

Once the Salt Lake Valley had been designated as Mormonism's new central place, the Church leadership tenaciously were to pursue three basic objectives: (1) the migration of as many Mormons as possible to the new Zion; (2) the occupancy by Mormons of as much territory in the region as possible; and (3) the domination and regulation by the hierocracy of virtually all institutional arrangements within the Mormon group.

Migration and settlement

In 1849 some eight thousand Mormon refugees from Nauvoo remained on the Great Plains. Mormon leaders asked the Saints who had already completed the journey to come to their assistance, and some
$5,000 and various yoke of oxen were sent east from the Salt Lake Valley to help with the migration. The following year this basic idea was expanded into a comprehensive program for the migration of European Saints. Referred to as the Perpetual Emigration Fund, it operated on very simple principles. Saints in Utah would contribute to the fund. The money thus obtained would then be sent to Mormon agents in Great Britain and elsewhere, who would use it to assist Mormon converts who desired to gather with the Saints. Once in Utah these migrants were then expected to pay for the help that they had received by making contributions to the fund themselves. By the time the transcontinental railroad was completed in 1869, the Perpetual Emigration Fund had provided assistance to some 51,000 Mormon migrants from Great Britain and Europe, and before it was outlawed by the Edmunds-Tucker Act in 1887, this number had risen to at least 85,000 (Allen and Leonard 1976:282-87; Arrington 1958:97-108; Larson, Gustive 1961:101-17).

Incoming migrants were distributed among the various Mormon settlements that began to mushroom soon after the Salt Lake Valley had been designated as the new center of Mormon activity. The founding of such settlements was regarded as an aspect of the establishment of the kingdom of God on the earth, and colonization was under Church auspices. After it had been determined that a particular location was suitable, various Mormon families would generally be called by Church leaders to move to the area, lay out a town, and begin to cultivate the land. Although it was possible to reject such a call, to do so was regarded as an indication that one was weak in the faith and out of harmony with the leadership of the Church. Close to one hundred Mormon settlements were established within the first ten years. By the end of the century, the number was to increase to over five hundred. While some were abandoned, at their greatest extent they stretched from southern Alberta on the north to northern Mexico on the south and from San Bernardino, California and Carson Valley, Nevada on the west to the Big Horn Basin in Wyoming and the San Luis Valley in Colorado on the east (Allen and Leonard 1976:253-70; Arrington 1958:88-95).
Economic and political regulation

The hierocracy sought to regulate the Mormon group through the control of economic and political institutions. In economic matters a chief goal was the self-sufficiency of the Mormon community and the concomitant condition of independence from external economic influence. In order to bring about such a state of affairs, Brigham Young attempted to instigate the dual policy of minimizing trade with Gentile merchants while maximizing home production and local industrial growth. While neither condition was realized to the degree to which Church leaders would have liked, the concept of an economically independent Mormon commonwealth permeated Mormon thinking until well into the 1880s (Arrington 1958:96-349).

Mormon political history from 1848 through the end of the century is extremely complex. From one perspective it might be interpreted as an attempt by Mormons to maintain some semblance of a modus vivendi with the federal government while at the same time preserving as much autonomy as possible. Although the federal government was regarded as a real and present power, many Mormons assumed that it would soon dissolve into a state of anarchy or become subordinated to the kingdom of God and its earthly authority, the Mormon priesthood. A still unresolved issue in Mormon ideology was the proper relationship between human and divine law.

Utah Territory

In the months immediately following the settlement of the Salt Lake Valley, government in the area was a virtual theocracy. Wishing to bypass the external regulation that territorial status would impose, in 1849 the Mormons of the Great Basin petitioned Congress to admit them directly as a state to the Union. Expressive of the territorial ambitions of the Mormons of the period, the proposed State of Deseret (as the entity was termed) included some 16 percent of the total land surface of the United States. The federal government responded the following year by establishing the much-reduced Territory of Utah, with Brigham Young as its first governor (Arrington

On a much grander scale, the Saints had now accomplished much of what they had endeavored to achieve when in December of 1843 they had petitioned Congress that Nauvoo be granted territorial status (see HC 6:125-32). Not only were they now hundreds of miles from any significant threat from unfriendly Gentiles, but they had been granted the legal right to regulate important aspects of local political institutions. Not surprisingly many of the assumptions in terms of which the Mormons had attempted to govern the City of Nauvoo were now applied to the management of Utah, including the co-mingling of religious and political authority and the repudiation of political pluralism. In certain respects, the Territory of Utah might be regarded politically as a greatly expanded City of Nauvoo.

The probate courts

The first conflict between the federal government and the Mormons centered upon the judiciary. Two of the three men who were appointed as Utah's first federal judges were non-Mormon. After their arrival at Salt Lake City in July of 1851, they publicly took issue with the manner in which Mormon leaders were denouncing actions by the federal government; and the Saints rapidly became polarized against them. The Gentile judges abruptly left the territory in September and traveled to Washington, D.C. to file reports unfavorable to the Mormon people (Roberts B. H. 1957 III:516-44).

Suspicious of federally appointed Gentile judges and realizing that there was currently only a single federal judge to dispense justice in the entire territory, the Utah legislature in February of 1852 passed a law which authorized the appointment of a probate judge in each county and granted such individuals

power to exercise original jurisdiction both civil and criminal, and as well in Chancery as at Common law, when not prohibited by Legislative enactment; and they shall be governed in all respects by the same general rules and regulations as regards practice as the District Courts. (Utah Territory Legislative Assembly 1852:43)
As James Allen (1968:133) has written, by virtue of this act, county probate courts in the Territory of Utah were ... granted original jurisdiction in both civil and criminal actions. This had the unusual effect of giving them concurrent jurisdiction with the United States district courts in all civil and criminal cases.

Since the probate judges were to be selected by the popularly elected and consequently Mormon dominated Legislative Assembly, the law effectively transferred judicial control from federal appointees to the Mormon group. Not surprisingly, virtually all probate judges were Mormons, and most were either bishops or held other prominent positions within the hierocracy. The law thus allowed cases to be tried before men of the community instead of before federal judges from the East who were usually not in sympathy with local problems or with Mormon philosophy. Although district courts had appellate power over probate courts, comparatively few cases ever reached the federal district judges until after the probate court's original jurisdiction had been withdrawn by Congress [in the 1870s and 1880s]. (Allen, James 1968:134)

It was in part the authority granted the probate courts that for so many years prevented federal officials from successfully prosecuting Mormon polygamists.

The "Utah War"

When the Utah legislature granted such pervasive powers to the probate courts, they evidently were acting within the limits of the authority granted them by the Organic Act for the Territory of Utah. Various federally appointed judges, however, endeavored to circumvent the probate courts. Judge W. W. Drummond, who arrived in Utah in 1854, was particularly vigorous in this respect. In the spring of 1857 he left the territory and vociferously began to accuse the Mormons of being in a state of rebellion. Partly as a consequence of Drummond's statements, President Buchanan dispatched an army of some 3,500 troops to Utah for the purpose of asserting federal control. In response, Brigham Young placed Utah under martial law and began preparing his people for an invasion. For a time it appeared that the Mormons might either attempt to engage the federal troops in battle or
evacuate the territory in quest of yet another home. By the spring of 1858, however, an accommodation had been reached. The troops were permitted to enter the Salt Lake Valley without incident, but they then moved on to an encampment some miles distant from any Mormon settlement. And Brigham Young was replaced as territorial governor by the Gentile Alfred Cumming (Allen, James 1968:133-36; Bancroft 1964:481-542; Roberts, B. H. 1957 IV:181-451).

The events of the so-called Utah War resulted in the federal government becoming much more actively concerned with conditions in Utah. There ensued a period of conflict in which the Mormons endeavored to maintain local autonomy through their monopolization of the electorate, the legislature, and the probate courts while the federal government attempted to influence affairs in Utah through federal appointees, Congressional enactments, and a military presence. While the confrontation was often sharp, prior to the passage of the Edmunds Act in 1882 there was little direct interaction between representatives of the federal government and the rank and file membership of the Church. Most political processes that directly impacted upon the individual Mormon in Utah resulted from actions by the territorial legislature and the probate courts, and both of these were dominated by fellow Mormons. Thus while residing within a territory of the United States, the Mormon community in Utah to a large extent remained politically isolated from the rest of the American people.

The Patriarchal Order and Mormon Group Cohesion

Territorial control

Domination of individual Mormons by the hierarchy tended to assume two basic forms: territorial control; and the regulation of ordinances and relationships associated with the patriarchal order. As has already been seen, territorial organization had been central to Mormon social structure almost since its inception. But disruptions and migrations that had characterized early LDS history resulted in Mormon territorial organization remaining unstable and in a state of flux. Once the colonization of the Great Basin commenced, however,
the Saints began establishing settlements that would remain continuously occupied by predominately Mormon populations until the present time. The consequent stability greatly facilitated the routinization of Mormon territorial organization.

Ecclesiastical organization

In early Utah ecclesiastical organization became clearly ordered upon the basis of territoriality. The Mormons within each of the smaller settlements were organized into a basic ecclesiastical unit referred to as a ward. At the head of each ward the hierocracy appointed a bishop who was responsible for the temporal and spiritual affairs of the Church members under his jurisdiction. In larger centers, such as Salt Lake, the situation was much the same except the city itself would territorially be divided into a number of wards, each with its own bishop. A grouping of wards in turn were organized into an ecclesiastical association called a stake of Zion and presided over by a stake president and a high council. The stake presidents in turn operated under the direct jurisdiction of the president of the Church and the Quorum of Apostles.

The stake and ward organization impacted upon the individual Mormon in significant and far-reaching ways. Most important group activities were carried out under the auspices of stake presidents or bishops and executed in manners consistent with ecclesiastical forms. The bishop's court at the ward level and the high council court at the stake level adjudicated conflicts that arose among Mormons and had the power to disfellowship or excommunicate individuals deemed to be in gross violation of the LDS code of conduct. In nineteenth-century Mormon Utah there was scant territorial organization independent of the Church's ecclesiastical system.

The relationship of the family to territorial control

But while the ecclesiastical organization of the Church effectively organized the Mormon group upon the basis of territoriality, the Mormon family was to remain the fundamental unit
in both Mormon society and ideology. First, the family was the basic production unit within the economic system. Considerable attention has been focused on centrally regulated and large-scale cooperative enterprises within the Mormon economy. As Michael Raber (1978; 1980) has demonstrated, however, such activities were generally in the area of transportation and industrial production and had little direct consequences for the economic organization of the vast majority of the Mormon population. The Mormon economy was based primarily on agricultural production. While it took considerable cooperative effort to dig irrigation canals and manage water resources, agricultural pursuits per se were carried out almost exclusively by individual families.

Prior to 1869 the federal government did virtually nothing to regulate the distribution of land within the Territory of Utah, and the Mormon church was consequently left free to allocate agricultural lands as they deemed appropriate. Productive land adjacent to newly established Mormon settlements was generally divided into equal lots and divided among household heads. While each wife together with her offspring might be counted as a separate family "no family was permitted to draw more than one lot, thus eliminating land monopolization and inequality. Lots not taken were reserved for newcomers, who were almost invariably admitted to the community on the same terms as the original settlers" (Arrington 1958:90).

As Michael Raber has shown, however, once an individual had been allocated land, in most respects it was regarded as his personal property. Although he could lose rights to the land if he did not exploit its potential, he was free to sell it or trade it for a lot elsewhere. Even when an individual was excommunicated from the Church, he generally retained control over his agricultural land.

Not only was agricultural land essentially controlled by individual families, but there tended to be little cooperation among the families of a settlement in the actual cultivation and harvesting of crops. The original size of the lots was based on an assessment of what individual families could manage. And, as Michael Raber (1980:12) has written
all the harvests on these small farms occurred at about the same time. The only assured way of having one's own fields harvested at the right times appeared to be to do it with one's own household members, and by avoiding extra-household labor commitments. A logical counter-argument—that more hands meant less time and that it paid to harvest in large groups—does not seem to have had much weight with Mormon farmers at this time.

Second, while some Mormon families were to settle permanently in one community, many others were highly mobile and changed residence with considerable frequency. Thomas Green was in no way an atypical Mormon. He arrived in the Salt Lake Valley in 1850 and remained there for at least two years. By 1854, however, he was living at Fillmore, some 150 miles south of Salt Lake City. In 1856 he was residing in Cedar City, another 100 miles south of Fillmore. By 1858 he had moved to Beaver, 50 miles to the north of Cedar City. Two years later he was in Wellesville, 280 miles north of Beaver. He remained in the Wellesville area for approximately ten years and then moved another 40 miles north to the tiny settlement of Portage, where he died in 1875. While at each location he was a member of a particular ward, his affiliation with any given ward was temporary and transitory. As his frequent changes in residence illustrate, while ecclesiastical organization persisted through time, membership within particular ecclesiastical units was in a constant state of flux.

And third, despite the increased importance of territorially based ecclesiastical organization in Mormon social structure, there appears to have been no significant corresponding elaboration of territorial concepts associated with the Mormon view of the perfect and eternal social order. While leaders began teaching that from the beginning the Lord had reserved the Great Basin for the gathering of the Saints in the last days and poets began writing paeans to their mountain home, the celestial kingdom continued to be regarded as a vast familial order.

If anything, expressions regarding the biological basis of Mormon identity and the centrality of familial relationships to Mormon solidarity increased during this period. Many of the statements that were analyzed in chapter 5 in conjunction with the bases and ordering of relationships within the patriarchal order were made during this
period. Continually identifying the Mormon group as the gathered house of Israel and familial ties as central to Mormon group organization appears to have been a ready-made way to express the conceptual unity of a conglomeration of converts from diverse ethnic backgrounds who were being distributed among settlements scattered over a large geographic area.

The regulation of marriage and sealing relationships

Concurrent with the routinization of territorial and ecclesiastical organization, rules and policies governing sealing and marital relationships became more standardized. Involvement in a sealing network became increasingly regarded as diacritical of an individual's full inclusion in the LDS community. And the hierocracy's ability to regulate aspects of sealing and marital relationships had important consequences for the nature of the Mormon group's external boundaries and internal structure.

Modifications in the ritual complex

On 28 July 1847, only four days after his initial entry into the Salt Lake Valley, Brigham Young selected the site for a new temple. Construction, however, did not begin until 1853; and the building was not to be completed until 1893. In the absence of a temple, for several years marital sealings were performed at various locations in Salt Lake City and at other Mormon settlements in the West. As had previously been the case, they were highly regulated. Each was performed either personally by Brigham Young or by one of the few hierocrats to whom he had specifically delegated priesthood keys essential for the performance of this ordinance. With the expansion of the Mormon group, however, there was soon a relaxation of the regulation that Brigham Young personally had to authorize the performance of each marital sealing.

In 1855 a small structure called the Endowment House was completed on the block where the temple was being built. In many ways it served as a temporary temple while the larger edifice was under
construction. As its name indicates, the endowment ceremony was enacted within its walls. In addition, it had a baptismal font for baptisms for the dead and an altar where marital sealings were performed. Brigham Young, however, maintained that it was not actually a temple and therefore inadequate for the performance of adoptive sealings. As a result no such rituals were enacted at the Endowment House, and none were to take place anywhere in Utah until the St. George Temple was completed in 1877. In addition, no second anointings were authorized from the time the Saints left Nauvoo until 1866.

The failure of Brigham Young to authorize the performance of adoptive sealings and second anointings in early Utah continued a process that had begun at the time that Nauvoo was abandoned, and it would have extremely important consequences for the subsequent development of the patriarchal order. As detailed in chapters 5 and 6, during the Nauvoo period the sealing and second anointing ordinances were conceptually intertwined and together formed the ritual basis for a form of corporate salvation. By jointly receiving their second anointing, a husband and wife received the promise of exaltation and the right to preside as king and queen in their own kingdom. Through the forging of sealing ties, others might participate with them in their promised exaltation by becoming part of their family kingdom. By acquiring additional wives through plural marriage and additional children through adoptive sealing, the size of a man's family kingdom theoretically could increase indefinitely. In chapter 6 it was suggested that such a formulation might be regarded as consistent with a fear that the ecclesiastical organization might be shattered and the Mormons scattered.

Once the Nauvoo Temple was closed to ordinance work, adoptive sealings and second anointings ceased to be performed. It might be argued that this prohibition was in part a consequence of the potentially disruptive effect that the creation and expansion of essentially autonomous family kingdoms might have had for a religious organization that placed so much stress upon the centralization of power and authority. But while such rituals were not enacted, during the migration and sojourn at Winter Quarters there was no hiatus in
discussions by prominent Church leaders regarding the importance and nature of large-scale family kingdoms; and the size of individual kingdoms continued to expand through covenantal promises to establish adoptive sealing ties once a new temple could be completed. As suggested earlier in the chapter, there appears to have been at least two reasons for this. First, various centrifugal tendencies were seriously disruptive to the solidarity of the Mormon group. Some of the ideology and practices associated with the large-scale family kingdom concept militated against such tendencies. In this respect it is interesting to note the degree to which family-oriented sermons stressed the need to place group interest above self-interest and the often-mentioned concept that ultimately there was but one family kingdom, the Mormon group itself. And second, large-scale family organization provided a practical way to organize individuals to provide for the economic necessities of a large number of people and to prepare for the long trek to the Salt Lake Valley. The Kimball family organization provides an excellent example of this. But while the family kingdom concepts preached during the migration from Nauvoo to the Salt Lake Valley appear to have had positive consequences for the solidarity and maintenance of the Mormon group, attempts at their practical application generated various conflicts that themselves ran counter to the Mormon ideal of group unity.

Conditions in early Utah differed greatly from those that had impacted upon the Mormon group in the months between the abandonment of Nauvoo and Brigham Young's 1848 arrival in the Salt Lake Valley. Whereas before the difficulty had been one of maintaining unity while confronted with the various centripetal tendencies incident to a large-scale migration, the problem was now that of preserving group identity and solidarity among a collectivity of individuals from diverse ethnic backgrounds that were being intentionally dispersed over a large but essentially uninhabited region. The territorial organization that was implemented during this period provided for the orderly establishment of settlements, the regulation of community and intercommunity affairs, and the initial allocation of economic resources. The individual family, however, was established as the primary production and consumption unit, and its high degree of
geographic mobility necessitated that it be regulated at least partially on a nonterritorial basis.

Reduction in the size of family kingdoms. The regulation of individual families by organizing them into large-scale family kingdoms was basically incompatible with the socioeconomic conditions that prevailed in early Utah. First, a high degree of mobility was essential to the establishment and balanced management of the far-flung settlements of the Mormon commonwealth. Economic cooperation and regulation within large family kingdoms would have militated against such mobility because the individual's rights and duties vis-a-vis other family members would have tended to restrict sharply his ability to move from settlement to settlement. Second, from the beginning of Mormon colonization of the Great Basin, agricultural land was distributed by individual household units, and such a pattern of allocation proved adequate for the economic needs of the Mormon people. While it would have been theoretically possible to have allocated land upon the basis of larger family kingdoms, this was not attempted; and Raber's work suggests that small-scale household production was probably the most efficient and effective basis for agricultural output in early Utah.

Consistent with such developments, large-scale family kingdoms linked by ties of adoptive sealing were deemphasized in early Utah. Whereas during the migration Church leaders had frequently discussed the nature of such organizational units and had vigorously encouraged the Saints to join in this form of association, virtually nothing was now said on the topic. Some members continued to make covenants that they would become adoptively linked when a temple was at last completed. Given the facts that adoptive sealing was not performed in the Endowment House, that it was apparent that the Salt Lake Temple would not be completed for many years, that Church leaders were no longer encouraging members to establish such covenants, and that cooperation upon such a basis tended to be inconsistent with prevailing economic practices, the establishment of such linkages soon became rare and did not tend to result in cooperative interaction. At least some of the large family kingdoms that had earlier been
established continued as economic enterprises during the first years of Great Basin colonization. When confronted with prevailing socioeconomic conditions and ideology, however, such organizations tended economically to splinter, with each of the various families becoming an independent production unit.

The family kingdom and corporate salvation. Coupled with limiting factors affecting the effective size of the individual family kingdom was a change regarding the nature of the family as a unit of salvation and exaltation. This development appears to have been closely linked to the fact that there was a hiatus in the performance of second anointings. As has already been seen, during the Nauvoo period sealing was associated with a concept of corporate salvation based on familial association. A man and wife could secure their exaltation by receiving their second anointing, and this assurance could be extended to their children through sealing ties. At least part of the incentive to become part of a man's family kingdom was the expectation that by so doing, the participant might share in the patriarch's eternal blessings. Such a perspective persisted until well after the establishment of Winter Quarters. It underlay Brigham Young's admonition to his adopted sons that if they remained linked to him, he could lead them into heaven, while if they attempted to break their covenants with him, they would be like the devils who had cut themselves off from God (Lee, John D. 1938:87-88; Woodruff, Wilford, ms a, 16 Feb. 1847). That important modifications had occurred in this conception by the end of the Winter Quarter's period is evidenced by Heber C. Kimball's (ms l) 1848 remarks to his adopted sons that their salvation was contingent, not upon being sealed to him, but upon being obedient to the Mormon hierocracy.

That such a tendency continued during the early Utah period is not surprising given the fact that no second anointings were being performed. The ritual evidence that a man as a priest and king could effect the salvation of another lay in the fact that he had received his second anointing. In the absence of this ordinance, there was no clear-cut ritual advantage in being part of one individual's family kingdom as opposed to another. Salvation was thus much more
conceptualized in terms of obedience to the dictates of the hierocracy as a collectivity than in terms of the establishment of sealing ties with a prominent individual within the hierocracy.

The centrality of matrimonial sealing

With the deemphasis on adoptive sealing, the second anointing ritual, and the development of large-scale family kingdoms, matrimonial sealing now emerged as perhaps the most prominent element in the patriarchal order complex. Through the control of matrimonial sealing the hierocracy was able to regulate most of the important ways in which the various aspects of the patriarchal order during this period contributed to solidarity within the Mormon group.

The probate courts and family law. With legislative and judiciary power within the Territory of Utah essentially under Mormon control, there began to develop a more clear-cut relationship between civil marriage and matrimonial sealing. Coincident with their enactment of the 1852 law that granted the probate courts original jurisdiction in civil and criminal cases, the legislature passed various acts that specifically defined the role of the probate courts in the regulation of most aspects of family law (Utah Territory Legislative Assembly 1852:75-80, 82-84). Perhaps the most significant of these was an enactment dealing with divorce. The law specifically stated that "the Court of Probate in the county where the plaintiff resides, shall have jurisdiction in all cases of divorce and alimony, and of guardianship, and distribution of property connected therewith." After indicating that the petition for a bill of divorce was to be made in writing and could be submitted by an individual who was not actually a resident of the territory, the law went on to specify the various situations that might warrant a divorce. The most far-reaching of which was "when it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction and conviction of the Court, that the parties cannot live in peace and union together, and that their welfare requires a separation" (Utah Territory Legislative Assembly 1852:82-83).
Given such broad perimeters, the patriarchal order was able to operate within the context of civil law, as that law was defined and administered within the Territory of Utah. It was theoretically possible for an individual to obtain a divorce through Utah probate courts without having ever even resided in the territory. Because of the broad grounds upon which divorces might be granted, Mormon women could readily obtain civil divorces from nonbelieving husbands so that they might establish proper marital unions with Mormon elders. There was no longer need for women like Lydia Goldthwaite or Presendia Huntington Buell to remain civilly linked to an unbeliever while marrying a believer by the authority of the Mormon priesthood. Even so, for a number of years many Mormons continued to regard civil marriage and civil divorce as of little significance, and women who had left husbands behind in Gentile society evidently often felt little need to obtain civil divorces in the territorial probate courts.

The difficulties that could result from the Mormon attitude toward civil marriage and civil divorce are illustrated by the case of Eleanor McComb. Hector McLean, the man whom she had civilly married in 1841, evidently proved to be a sadistic drunkard. In 1854, while the couple were residing in San Francisco, she was baptized into the Mormon church. Evidently in retaliation, Hector had their three children shipped back to relatives in New Orleans. After an unsuccessful attempt to regain custody of the children, Eleanor migrated to Utah. In 1855 she was there maternally sealed to Mormon apostle Parley P. Pratt. In 1857 Parley and Eleanor traveled to the South intent upon getting the children and bringing them to Utah. While engaged in this attempt, Parley was murdered by Hector. In 1869 a reporter from the New York World asked Eleanor if she had divorced Hector before marrying Parley. She replied: "No, the sectarian priests have no power from God to marry; and as a so-called marriage ceremony performed by them is no marriage, at all, no divorce was needed. The priesthood with its powers and privileges can be found nowhere upon the face of the earth but in Utah" (Pratt, Steven 1975:233 note 26).
The process for participation in matrimonial sealing. A primary goal of Church leadership was to have all adult members of the Church matrimonially sealed. Since such sealings were only performed in Utah, at least part of the raison d'être for the gathering was that this ordinance might be completed. A husband and wife arriving together in Utah tended to be regarded by Church officials as being adequately married "for time," regardless of the basis of the authority that had matrimonially united them. They would be told, however, that in order to remain married eternally, it was essential that they be sealed together as husband and wife by proper priesthood authority. Before this could be done, however, various things had to occur. First, they both had to be baptized members of the Church. Second, the man had to be ordained to the Melchizedek Priesthood. And third, their local ecclesiastical leaders had to attest that they were both in compliance with the basic Mormon code of conduct.

This certification, or "recommend" (as it came to be termed) had its analogues in the earlier Mormon requirements that an individual had to be called by proper priesthood authority to go to Jackson County to receive his inheritance or to enter the attic story of the Nauvoo Temple for the purpose of participating in temple rituals. It was a device by which individuals were selected to become fully participating covenant members of the community. In this sense it was similar to the earlier Puritan practice that the members of a church covenant group had to determine who was qualified to join their ranks.

The qualities that an individual was supposed to manifest before being issued a recommend are indicated in an 1856 circular letter that Brigham Young (ms a) and his counselors sent to the bishops of wards situated in southern Utah:

The persons who can get their endowments must be those who pray, who pay their tithing from year to year; who live the lives of saints from day to day; setting good examples before their neighbors. . . . [They must] believe in the plurality [of wives]. . . . not speak evil of the authorities of the Church, and possess true integrity towards their friends.

Having received the proper clearance from their local ecclesiastical leaders, the man and woman then presented themselves at
the Endowment House in Salt Lake City. Unless for some reason they had previously received their endowments, they were now conducted through the rituals of the endowment ceremony where they were instructed in various aspects of Mormon theology and required to make solemn covenants that they would adhere to the Mormon code of conduct. Having been endowed, they were at last ready to be matrimonially sealed. This was generally done at an altar in the Endowment House. While being sealed, they received the assurance that the children the wife subsequently bore would be born in the covenant and thus lineally sealed to them for all time and eternity. As an aspect of priesthood ordination, the endowment, and the sealing ceremony, the man acquired priesthood-based patriarchal jurisdiction over his wife and children. As a result they were expected to follow his direction as their file leader. Since no adoptive sealings were performed in the Endowment House, children who might have been born to the man and woman previous to the matrimonial sealing could not now be lineally sealed to them. They were informed, however, that this could be done as soon as the temple itself was completed. In the Endowment House they also might be baptized in behalf of their dead ancestors, and have them matrimonially sealed as conjugal couples. Without the ordinance of adoptive sealing, however, there was no way to establish cross-generational ties among the dead or between the living and the dead.

A completely new marital union could be established by a matrimonial sealing in the Endowment House, provided that the groom held the Melchizedek Priesthood, and both he and his intended bride had received the necessary recommend from their local leaders and had gone through the endowment ceremony. A common practice, however, was for a couple to be married for time by a bishop or other Church official and then later be matrimonially sealed in the Endowment House. The interval might be only a day or two, or it could involve several years. While the pre-Endowment House marriage was regarded as only provisional, the less zealous might never get around to having the matrimonial sealing performed. No child, however, was regarded as having been born in the covenant if his birth occurred previous to his parents being actually matrimonially sealed.
Plural marriage. In August 1852, some six months after the locally controlled probate courts were given jurisdiction in matters regarding family law, the Church called a special conference. At that time the contents of the revelation dealing with plural marriage were made public for the first time, and the Church announced to the world its advocacy of polygamy as a religious principle. Thereafter Church leaders vigorously promoted plural marriage as the ideal marital arrangement, and it was widely taught that no one who was derelict in this commandment could hope to obtain the highest degree of exaltation in the celestial kingdom. Its practice, however, continued to be highly regulated. Before establishing a plural union, a man had to be approved by local ecclesiastical leaders and receive formal clearance from the president of the Church. A common practice was for select individuals to be called by Church leaders to take additional wives. In most instances a man could not enter polygamy without the approval or at least the acquiescence of his first wife. It is unclear exactly what percentage of Mormons were involved in polygamous unions. Stanley Ivins presents evidence that between 10 and 15 percent of adult Mormon men may have had more than one wife. In a more recent analysis, Arrington and Bitton conclude that 5 percent of the men and 12 percent of the women established such relationships. In many ways these individuals might be regarded generally as the most zealous, committed, and conforming members of the Church (Arrington and Bitton 1979:199-205; Bitton 1977; Hulett 1939; 1940; 1943; Ivins, Stanley 1967; ms a; Young, Kimball 1954).

The impetus to marry. Every normal individual in Mormon society was expected to marry. Young men were admonished to acquire a wife and begin having children as soon as they were in any position to provide for the economic needs of a household. Some single men complained that due to the practice of plural marriage, it was difficult for them to find suitable mates. But while polygamy might well have increased the competition for wives, the evidence at hand suggests that it did not force any significant number of men into permanent bachelorhood. It was not regarded as improper for a man to acquire a wife while serving a proselyting mission, and at least some
missions were evidently undertaken with this expectation (Campbell and Campbell 1978:10; Davis, Daniel, ms b; Kimball, William, ms a). Given the practice of plural marriage, a woman generally did not experience great difficulty in finding a husband; and she could probably be more selective than would have been the case in a system of strict monogamy. If she received no suitable offers of marriage, it was not considered improper for her to initiate a marriage proposal herself. Church leaders often regarded it as their responsibility to see that all women under their ecclesiastical jurisdiction were married. In some instances they either called men to marry women who might otherwise remain single or accepted the responsibility of marrying them themselves (Ivins, Stanley 1967:319). While there were some committed Mormons who remained single, they occupied an anomalous position in a society were eternal marriage was regarded as central to religious qualification (Anderson, Lavina 1983; Johnson, Jeffrey 1983).

The termination of matrimonial sealings. The establishment of a marital relationship through matrimonial sealing was regarded as extremely serious and as central to the Mormon social order. There were, however, at least three grounds upon which such a relationship could be terminated. First, apostasy automatically resulted in the cancellation of a matrimonial sealing. A woman who had been sealed to an apostate was free to become matrimonially sealed to a new husband without any formal action to dissolve her relationship with the first husband. Second, if a woman received an offer of marriage from a man who had more priesthood authority than her current husband, she could be matrimonially sealed to him provided the first husband agreed. Once again, no divorce or decree to abrogate the first sealing was needed. And third, if a woman's affections became completely alienated from her first husband, Brigham Young would issue her a "bill of divorcement" that would allow her to remarry. Brigham Young, however, taught that such a bill of divorcement did not abrogate the eternal aspect of the initial sealing relationship: if the first husband remained true to his covenants, he would still have claim on his divorced wife in the resurrection (Beck, James, ms a, 8 Oct. 1861;

Granting bills of divorcement to women whose "affection" had become "alienated" from their spouses and permitting women to be matrimonially sealed to men of higher priesthood standing than their initial husbands gave the system more flexibility than would otherwise have been the case. Women were often married at an early age and in situations where personal compatibility was not a prime consideration. A marital sealing was not infrequently regarded more as a means for establishing a proper position in the celestial kingdom than for achieving personal satisfaction in mortality. If a woman found a particular relationship to be irksome, however, she might change husbands without leaving the Mormon community and while still being assured that she would have a proper position within the patriarchal family of heaven. She might not be particularly pleased by the thought that the bill of divorcement did not release her from her eternal relationship to her first husband. She was informed, however, that if this man was judged worthy of the celestial kingdom, his personal flaws would be eliminated and if he was not found worthy of such a glory, she could there become linked to a fully qualified husband. That women not infrequently availed themselves of the opportunity to be released from incompatible husbands is indicated by the fact that Brigham Young granted at least 1,645 bills of divorcement during the years that he was president of the Church (Campbell and Campbell 1978:5).

The teaching that apostasy and excommunication resulted in the automatic termination of sealing relationships placed increased emphasis on sealing ties as basic aspects of Mormon identity and also enhanced the hierocracy's ability to control conduct through the regulation of familial relationships. For an individual to follow a course that would result in his excommunication meant not only that he had lost his place in the Mormon kingdom but also that the sealing ties that had united him with his spouse and children had been severed. While in some instances the termination of such ties was held to have reference only to a future existence, in other cases it
resulted in the discontinuance of familial ties in mortality. Thus when John Hyde was excommunicated for apostasy in January of 1857, Heber C. Kimball declared at a public gathering that Hyde has taken a course by which he has lost his family and forfeited his Priesthood; he has forfeited his membership. The limb is cut off, but the Priesthood takes the fruit that was attached to the limb and saves it, if it will be saved. . . . His wife is not cut off from this Church; she is just as free from him as though she never had belonged to him. The limb she was connected to is cut off, and she must again be grafted into the tree, if she wishes to be saved. . . . When a limb has got two or more branches or shoots is cut off, those shoots and branches, and their fruit, if any, are cut off with the limb. Why? Because they are attached to it. But they can all be taken and grafted right back again into the tree, or in the Priesthood. (JD 4:165)

And in March of the same year, a resident of Fillmore was to write to Brigham Young as follows: "My wife has been cut off from the Church and Bishop Brunson commanded me to have no more to do with her as wife that I was free from her, and go and get me a good wife, and a half a dozen of them if I wanted them" (Campbell and Campbell 1978:10).

Family kingdoms in early Utah

The patriarchal order appears to have been readily adaptive to socioeconomic conditions in early Utah. First, the individual family kingdom was more completely encompassed by the hierocracy than had previously been the case. This was due principally to three reasons. First, through the elimination of second anointings and adoptive sealings, salvation became much more identified with the Church as an institution than with particular individuals within the Church. In the terminology of Max Weber, there was a shift from personal to office charisma. Second, through the opening of the Endowment House and the routinization of requirements for participation in the endowment and sealing rituals, the patriarchal order ordinances became much more regulated by the hierocracy in a consistent and orderly manner. Gone was the secretive selectivity that had been associated with these rituals in the days of Joseph Smith and the frantic intensity with which they had been administered in the Nauvoo Temple. With the exception of Blacks, virtually any adult Mormon could at will
participate in the rituals of the Endowment House, but such participation was contingent upon compliance with regulations that were clearly delineated by the hierocracy. And third, excommunication from the Church was tantamount to the termination of sealing ties. Since courts consisting of members of the hierocracy determined who would or would not be excommunicated, it was the hierocracy who determined which sealing relationships were to be perpetuated. And since sealing ties were regarded as the basis of familial association, the continuance of the individual Mormon family was based in part upon conformity with the wishes of the hierarchy.

The development of the individual family kingdom

The smaller kingdom that characterized early Utah social organization was much more consistent with the American concept of individualism than was the macrofamilial organization that the Church had attempted to instigate during the last days at Nauvoo and the consequent migration to the Salt Lake Valley. From the perspective of the individual male, progress within the Mormon kingdom could in part be regarded as based upon a successful strategy for the establishment, maintenance, and development of his individual family kingdom.

First, his conduct had to conform sufficiently with the Mormon code of conduct to entitle him to ordination to the Melchizedek Priesthood. While such ordination came as a matter of course to any young Mormon male who complied with even the minimal requirements of religious participation, it was denied to any who were antagonistic to the hierocracy or indifferent to the Mormon gospel.

Next, he had to persuade a Mormon woman to become his wife. While this might not have posed a problem if he was energetic, ambitious, and religiously inclined, the fact that it was possible for Mormon women to obtain social status and religious security by becoming the plural wives of prominent Mormon elders necessitated that a prospective suitor have something to offer her.

Once an agreement to be married had been reached and the necessary authorization had been obtained, the couple could make arrangements to be matrimonially sealed in the Endowment House.
Incidental with the sealing ritual and the endowment ceremony that preceded it was the presentation of a pattern of patriarchal organization in which the man was identified as the presiding patriarch within his newly established family kingdom. He was expected to govern his family upon the principles of the Mormon gospel while his wife and children were expected to follow his dictates.

A newly established family kingdom could increase by two means: through the taking of additional wives and through the birth of children. As has already been indicated, plural marriage was highly regulated and was restricted to men deemed to be essentially in full compliance with the Mormon code. For one reason or another, most Mormon men remained monogamist. And most polygamists did not have a great number of wives. In a study of 1,784 Mormon polygynists, Stanley Ivins (1967:313) found that "66.3 percent married only one extra wife. Another 21.2 percent were three-wife men, and 6.7 percent went as far as to take four wives. This left a small group of less than 6 percent who married five or more women." The comparatively small number of wives in most family kingdoms, coupled with the fact that once married, children established essentially autonomous family kingdoms, resulted in most family kingdoms in early Utah being rather modest enterprises.

This familial association ideally was to remain a fixed unit within the greater Mormon kingdom. Under the management of the male head, it was involved in economic activity. As in the wider American society of the period, some Mormon households found the means to become wealthy while others slipped into poverty. Through the course of its lifetime, the family unit might change residence a number of times, moving in and out of Mormon settlements and changing membership from one local ecclesiastical unit to another.

While the male head was regarded as the presiding authority within his family unit, there were clear limitations to his power. First, he had to manage his family according to the Mormon code if he hoped to remain sealed to them in the next life. Second, if he failed to make his wife or wives sufficiently happy, they could separate from him with little difficulty. And third, if he grossly violated the Mormon code or unduly antagonized his presiding ecclesiastical
authorities, he might find himself summarily excommunicated from the 
Church with all sealing relationships to members of his family 
terminated.

Except for the practice of plural marriage, Mormon domestic 
relations did not differ greatly from those of their fellow 
Americans. What was distinctive was the manner in which such 
relationships were intertwined with concepts of Mormon identity and 
solidarity, with the regulation of conduct within the Mormon group, 
and with Mormon understandings regarding salvation and the cosmic 
order.

Comparison of the law of 
consecration and stewardship 
with patriarchal organization 
in early Utah

In a number of important respects the patriarchal order of the 
1850s and 1860s resembled the social order that emerged coincident 
with the attempt to establish the law of consecration and 
stewardship. Each involved the establishment of a covenantal order of 
fully religiously qualified individuals within the larger Mormon 
community. The ostensive purpose for the creation of both covenantal 
orders was the achievement of a form of corporate salvation. In both 
cases covenantal networks were established in terms of which the 
members of each family or household were linked together in terms of 
the principles of hierarchy and affirmative opposition, the husband 
being superordinate to the wife and the parents to the children. In 
both instances the male head of the family or household was in turn 
covenantally linked to the hierocracy: in the case of the law of 
consecration and stewardship this linkage was based in the economic 
covenant that he had established with the bishop; within the 
patriarchal order it existed by virtue of the priesthood that he held 
and was grounded in the oath and covenant of the priesthood. In terms 
of this linkage the household was encompassed by the hierocracy. And 
in both instances apostasy and excommunication resulted in the 
disruption of the family or household and the termination of its 
position within the covenantal order.
There were, however, important differences between the two systems. The most important of these was that sealing had replaced economics and territoriality as the basis for covenantal ties within the family. As a result it could change locations at will and be involved in diverse economic enterprises without having its position within the covenantal order being disturbed. Associated with this shift was the fact that economic equality among the various families or households was no longer regarded as a goal or ideal. Individual families consequently had much more economic autonomy and were able to pursue their individual goals without the religious obligation to consecrate their surplus for the good of the entire community. While women remained subordinate to men, their position within the system was much more secure under the patriarchal order than it had originally been with the law of consecration and stewardship. As first formulated under the law of consecration and stewardship, the economic covenant was established between the male head and the bishop. His wife was thus dependent upon him for economic substance. If he apostatized he lost his stewardship, and no provision was made for his wife. In the patriarchal order a woman was still dependent upon her husband for her position in the system. It was possible, however, for her to change mates; and if her husband apostatized she could readily be sealed to another man and thus establish a new position within the system.

The Kimball Family Organization and the Patriarchal Order in the Early Utah Period

Developments within the Kimball family organization provide ample examples of the nature of patriarchal organization during the early years of Mormon settlement in the intermountain west. In the following section an overview will first be presented of the processes of fission within the Kimball family organization associated with the suspension of adoptive sealing. The family life of various men who had been part of that organization will then be examined for insights into the nature of individual family structure within the context
of Mormon patriarchal organization for the time period under consideration.

**Fission within the Kimball family organization**

In the months immediately following Heber C. Kimball's 1848 arrival in the Salt Lake Valley, there is little indication that the members of the Kimball family kingdom were aware that the form of organization in which they were participating was being abandoned by the Church. Journal entries from the period indicate that family meetings continued to be held, that Heber C. Kimball's counsel continued to be sought after by his adopted sons, and that family members continued to engage in cooperative economic enterprise in a manner reminiscent of their activities at Winter Quarters. And on 1 July 1849 Heber called together many of his wives, his natural children, and various of his adopted children. He first "taught them in the order of the priesthood." He then proceeded to baptize and confirm each one by the laying on of hands for the purpose of renewing his or her covenants (Davis, Daniel, ms a, 1 July 1849).

Harsh living conditions and the need of each man to provide for his own wives and children, however, appear to have militated against extensive cooperation among family members. Certainly greater cooperation could have been possible, but the will seemed to be lacking. While seeking to help his adopted sons and to have them engage in collective labor, Heber C. Kimball did not organize them to the degree to which they had previously interacted. It is possible that he had more problems than he could handle attempting to provide for his wives and their children. Joseph Hovey (ms a, 18 Feb. 1849) relates that during his first winter in the Salt Lake Valley, he stopped in to visit with Heber.

He asked if I had enough to eat. I said we had plenty of meat but our bread was scarce. I thought we did not have over a pound of bread each day for all four of us. . . . Says Bro. Heber, I will let you have a bushel of corn. I arose off my seat and said, God bless you Br. Heber.
Peter Hansen (ms a) writes that the following Summer when he was called as a missionary to Denmark, he did not know how he could find a means of transportation to leave the valley. Abraham O. Smoot told him he would sell him a mule for forty dollars and that he should ask Heber C. Kimball for the money. Hansen replied "that I was rather afraid to mention it to him as he had great use for his money if he had any, and Br. Smoot said he would go and speak on my behalf and he did, and Br. K. willingly paid him the money."

Given such restraints, each man came to be more and more responsible for the management of his own household, and the large Kimball family organization gradually broke up. By 1857 Heber C. Kimball was wondering if the creation of a family kingdom through the forging of adoptive sealing ties between adult men might have all been a mistake all along. Wilford Woodruff (ms a, 3 Jan. 1857) records a conversation in which Heber stated that

He did not believe in this custom of adoption that had been practiced in the Church. No man should give his birthright to another but should keep it in the lineage of his Fathers. . . . Now unless a man is a poor cuss he should keep his priesthood and unite it with his fathers and not give it to another. The Lord will save our Fathers. Every man that got his patriarchal blessing and Priesthood, he becomes the patriarch of his own family and should bless his own family.

Despite such reservations, Heber expected those who had been adopted to him to show him proper respect and to take to heart the counsel that he saw fit to give them. Sarah M. Kimball (ms a), one of Heber's adopted daughters, thus describes a visit that she paid to the Kimball home in 1867.

About a week ago I called on Mother Kimball. . . . She was just preparing dinner, she said for her children that were around her. . . . She claimed me as one of the number of which I have ever been proud. . . . Father Kimball had been all day in the Endowment house. He came in while we were at table. He took me down by saying that I had always been too haughty to acknowledge my adoption. I thought I was misunderstood but did not indicate my cause. I have always felt proud to say Father Kimball. I have smarted and withered under his fatherly admonitions, but I hope and believe that I have never rebelled against them.
Records left by Daniel Davis, David Candland, Peter Hansen, and Joseph Hovey provide excellent detail on the breakup of the Kimball family organization.

Daniel Davis

In many ways Daniel Davis's experiences are the most atypical of the four. Unlike the others, he remained an effective member of the Kimball family organization until Heber's death in 1868. Daniel ran the Kimball grist mill. The frequent mention in his journal of interaction between himself, Heber, and Heber's wives and children indicates that he was essentially regarded as a member of the family. For example, under date of 21 June 1864, he records, "I take some eggs to Father's, then go with him to the historian's office, stay there two hours; from there back to his home and dine" (Davis, Daniel, ms a). And on 18 Jan. 1865, he writes, "This morning Father, Mother, brothers Samuel and Golden came up and had dinner with us. Father gave me some good instructions."

On 1 Sep 1867 he described the nature of his relationship to Heber and Vilate Kimball in the following terms:

I call President Heber Chase Kimball and his wife Vilate Kimball my father and my mother because I have been adopted to them in the order of the Holy Priesthood. And I shall so call them from this time forth as I have done from the time of my adoption to them in the Nauvoo Temple.

The rather unusual status that Daniel enjoyed among Heber's adopted sons is illustrated by the facts that he was the only one within this group that served as a pall bearer at Vilate's funeral (Davis, Daniel, ms a, 24 Oct. 1867) and the only one to inherit part of the Kimball property when Heber died the following year (Kimball, Stanley 1981:318-19). This suggests that by 1868 he was the only adopted son who was still an active participant in the Kimball family organization.

David Candland

David Candland (ms a) was at the opposite end of the spectrum from Daniel Davis; he was never more than a marginal member of the
Kimball family organization. Having been called on a mission shortly before the exodus from Nauvoo, he did not arrive at Winter Quarters until August of 1847. While there he participated in some of the activities of the Kimball family organization. He thus records in his journal that in the winter of 1847-48 he "taught school at president H. C. Kimball's farm." The following spring, however, he did not go west with the main body of the Kimball family; and he was not to reach the Salt Lake Valley until 1852.

Thereafter he records various instances of seeking counsel from Brigham Young, but none from Heber C. Kimball. There were some interactions between the two men, however. In 1857 Candland purchased a city lot from Heber. And Heber performed the sealing ceremony between Candland and three of his polygynous wives and preached the funeral sermon when his first wife died in 1859 (Candland, David, ms a, 29 Oct 1852, 25 Dec. 1853, Nov. 1855, Apr. 1857, Feb. 1859).

The lack of interaction between Candland and Kimball during the Utah years was probably in part a consequence of their having never known each other well. In 1855 Candland happened to be at Fillmore, the territorial capital, during the legislative session. He writes, "I boarded with Brother Heber C. Kimball, and I realized much pleasure in the same for we became acquainted." While he thus seems to have held Heber C. Kimball in some esteem, the fact that he had been adopted to him at Nauvoo apparently never had great significance for him.

Peter Hansen

Peter Hansen is the only one of the four who experienced a sudden cleavage in his relationships with Heber C. Kimball. After he left for his mission to Denmark in 1849, he continued to regard himself as part of the Kimball family kingdom. During the five years that he spent in Denmark he wrote a number of letters to Heber and Vilate, telling them about his experiences and asking for their support. In some, but not all of the letters, he employs kinship terminology. For example, in an 1853 letter he addresses Heber and Vilate as "Dear Parents." He then proceeds to state that "I this
evening set myself to write you a letter; intending to do it like a child of yours, with respect for my parents." And he refers to himself in closing as "your most unworthy and as yet home sick, but for release, pleading child" (Hansen, Peter, ms b). While on his mission, he marries Ann Kofoed, a Danish convert, and a child is born to them. He sends wife and child on to the Salt Lake Valley for Heber to provide for. In writing Heber regarding their impending arrival, he exclaims:

When you see this little . . . boy of mine . . . you will be apt to think that Peter is not the most useless branch of your house, and you will perhaps give one . . . by the bye a little "more good" soil that I may have room and strength to sprout and bear much more such fruit, to beautify the house of Heber. (Hansen, Peter, ms c)

And he assumes that upon his return to Utah his relationship to Heber C. Kimball will be essentially as it had been at Winter Quarters.

Where you will put me when I get home is something I don't trouble myself much about; for whatever you tell me, is the law and gospel and to obey it, is the way of salvation to me and my family.

After his return to the Salt Lake Valley in the summer of 1855, Peter immediately began working once more for Heber C. Kimball, and his reminiscences make reference to a number of other adopted sons who during this period were still active participants in the Kimball family organization. Peter and his wife soon found themselves herding the Kimball family sheep on Antelope Island, situated in the Great Salt Lake. Upon his arrival on the island, one of his first concerns was that he be granted permission to marry a Danish girl that had arrived in the same immigration company as himself. Heber was the person whose permission he sought: "Now I am going to ask you for one thing, which is wanting in my being fully satisfied and that is to let me have that woman which I fetched with me" (Hansen, Peter, ms d). Heber wrote to say that he was willing to perform the ceremony. Shortly thereafter, however, Vilate sent a letter stating that Heber was soon leaving for the legislative session at Fillmore and that Peter had better get right into Salt Lake City if he wanted the sealing to be performed. Following this advice, Peter left for the city as soon as possible.
When I got to father Kimball's he was gone. I felt sorrowful but the noble lady [Vilate] talked to me like a good mother and made me feel comfortable. (Hansen, Peter, ms a)

At least temporarily having to be content with only one wife, Peter spent approximately a year tending sheep on Antelope Island. During this period he evidently continued to regard himself as part of the Kimball family, and his writings indicate that his own son addressed Heber as grandfather. The situation on the island, however, was difficult for both him and Ann, and he came to feel that a change was essential. Evidently the only way that he could do this was to cease working for Heber C. Kimball. He writes:

I concluded to leave Elder Kimball's service to go somewhere south to make myself a home. . . . I told him of my conclusion and he did not like it. Nevertheless he told me that his teams were going to Battlecreek and they could take me along.

It is probably significant that at this point in his narrative, he referred to Heber as Elder Kimball rather than as father. His decision to leave Heber's "service" resulted in a rupture in the relationship between the two men, and there is no evidence from Peter's writings that he ever sought his advice again.

This does not mean that he did not continue to hold the Kimballs in high esteem. The year after they left the island, Ann gave birth to a daughter. They named her "Helen Vilate," and the next child was named "John Heber." When later writing about the death of Vilate Kimball, Peter stated:

In September [1867] Mother Vilate Kimball died. I say mother because I was her adopted son, and surely she was worthy of that title. She was a good mother not only to her offspring but to her husband's whole family.

And when Heber died the next summer, Peter was disappointed that he could not attend the funeral. He thus indicates that on June 23 I received word that father Kimball had departed from this life of trouble in the night previous. The funeral was to take place on the 24th, hence I could by no means get down there in time to attend. (Hansen, Peter, ms a)
Joseph Hovey

The events of Joseph Hovey's life indicate that he gradually gained increased freedom from Heber C. Kimball while never actually cutting off his relationship with him. When Hovey (ms a, 26 Sep. 1848) first arrives in the Salt Lake Valley, he assumes that he will receive his allocation of land through Heber C. Kimball and therefore asks him "if he would show me my lot." He receives two lots but finds neither to be suitable for cultivation. The next spring he discusses the problem with Heber, and he "counsels me to keep the lots. Therefore I am fencing them" (5 Apr. 1849).

In 1850 he moves to southern Utah as part of a colonizing mission. While visiting the southern settlements

Bro. Heber stopped at my house and asked if I would like to settle here. I told him I was willing if it was council. He said he would buy my improvement at home [in Salt Lake City]. I made up my mind to settle in this place, hence I had better fix up and go back with him [to make arrangements for the land transfer]. (10 May 1851)

Once they arrive in Salt Lake, however, Heber now decides that it would be better for Hovey to reside in Salt Lake than in southern Utah. Following Heber's counsel Hovey trades his southern Utah property for a city lot in Salt Lake. Shortly thereafter he sells his original Salt Lake City lots to Heber. He does not seem to be pleased with the transaction:

I gave Br. Heber possession of my improvements for two hundred and sixty-five dollars. . . . It was barely what the house and stable cost me. (18 Oct. 1851)

This is the last record that he makes of any economic transaction with Heber C. Kimball. He appears, however, to have had great respect for him throughout his life. His son records that when he was fatally ill in the spring of 1868

One afternoon he said to me, "James go up to Br. Heber C. Kimball's and ask him to come and see me before I die." I went and when Brother Kimball came into the room, he said, "Joseph, you are a very sick man." Father always thought a great deal of Brother Kimball and said, "Brother Heber, do you have any ill feelings toward me?" Brother Kimball said, "None whatever dear Joseph." Father then asked Br. Kimball to bless him before he
died. With tears in his eyes, Bro. Kimball gave Father a wonderful blessing. That night, May 6, 1868, Father died. (Hovey, M. R., ms a, p. 117)

Heber C. Kimball preached Joseph's funeral service; and then, as Daniel Davis (ms a, 6 May 1868) indicates in his journal, "he was buried in Father's burial ground as one of the family."

Concluding statement on the Kimball family kingdom

The personal records of Daniel Davis, David Candland, Peter Hansen, and Joseph Hovey indicate that the large Kimball family kingdom, held together by ties of adoptive sealing, did not suddenly break apart at any one point in time. A conscious decision was probably never made to discontinue the organization. Rather as the interests of Heber C. Kimball became different from those of a given adopted son, each went his separate way without any particular animosity or conflict. Until, by the end of Heber C. Kimball's life, perhaps only one of his adopted sons was still an active participant in the organization. Such a development was consistent with the advice that Heber had given his adopted sons at Winter Quarters that they become more independent. The gradual way in which this transpired gives strong support to the idea that this form of familial association was less efficient than the smaller family grouping for conditions in early Utah.

The individual patriarchal family in the early Utah period: case studies from the Kimball family organization

The disintegration of large family organization eliminated any intervening structure within the patriarchal order between the individual family (consisting of a man, his wife or wives, and their minor children) and the hierocracy. Each individual family was thus left free to develop within the context of the patriarchal order according to the interaction between its own internal idiosyncrasies and the mix of external factors that in one way or another impinged upon it.
A fundamental obligation of the adult Mormon male was the creation and development of a family as a basic unit within the patriarchal order. As detailed in the section of this chapter entitled "the patriarchal order and Mormon group cohesion," the successful achievement of this task required the individualistic marshaling of economic resources, the ability to attract and maintain the loyalty of wives, compliance with the basic Mormon code of conduct, and the maintenance of proper relationships with both local ecclesiastical officials and with those higher up in the hierocracy.

It is a basic thesis of this dissertation that the dual position that the Mormon male occupied as both household head and participant within the hierocracy had far-reaching consequences for Mormon group solidarity. He was thus the principal link between the Mormon group as a whole and the individual Mormon family. In this way each family was left free to develop in an individualistic manner while still remaining part of the larger Mormon kingdom.

Relationships within Heber C. Kimball's individual family and those of his adopted sons Daniel Davis, David Candland, Peter Hansen, and Joseph Hovey illustrate the dynamics of this process. Each individual's life might be regarded as a case study of a nineteenth-century Mormon male's attempt to establish and maintain a family kingdom within the context of the patriarchal order. Although the purpose for presenting the following examples is to provide insight into the nature of Mormon patriarchal organization between 1848 and the coming of the railroad in 1869, some of the events described occurred at a somewhat later date. These, however, are not inconsistent with conditions during the precise time period under consideration.

Heber C. Kimball

The size of the Kimball family. Heber C. Kimball seems to have had little problem acquiring wives and children. He married at least forty-three women. Thirty-eight marital unions were established prior to his departure from Nauvoo. The remaining five marriages occurred in Utah. His last wife, Mary Smithies (a daughter of his
adopted son James Smithies) was sealed to him in January of 1857. He sired sixty-five children by the seventeen wives who bore him offspring. Thus, even if only Heber, his wives, and biological children are counted, his family still consisted of 109 individuals. In addition, ten of his wives had given birth to some 53 children prior to their marriage to him. And as has already been discussed, some forty adopted children were also regarded in varying degrees as part of the Kimball family (Kimball, Stanley 1981:228, 307, 313).

Economic viability. Although Heber ceased being economically responsible for most of his adopted children shortly after his 1848 arrival in the Salt Lake Valley, providing for his wives and biological children was still a considerable burden.

During the winter of 1848-49 and for several years thereafter, his families lived in the one-room homes within the fort, with other families, in tents, wagon-boxes and other temporary shelters. (Kimball, Stanley 1981:233)

Because of Heber's favored position as a member of the First Presidency and because of his prudent management of resources, however, the economic condition of the family slowly improved. And when he died in 1868 he left an estate valued at $100,580 (Kimball, Stanley 1981:317).

Religious motivation for the familial system. Although he attempted to provide for their needs, Heber never evidenced a strong attachment to any of his wives but Vilate. In his view plural marriage was a religious principle that added to the glory of God and to the exaltation of those properly involved in its practice by increasing the size of family kingdoms structured according to the principles of patriarchal organization. In an 1849 letter to Vilate, Heber C. Kimball (ms k) thus explains his reasons for practicing polygamy in the following terms:

What I have done is according to the mind and will of God for his glory and for mine. So it will be fore thine. Let me say unto you Vilate Kimball, every son and daughter that is brought forth by the wives that were given to me will add to your glory as much as it will to them. They are given to me for this purpose
and for no other. I am a Father of lives to give life to those that wish to receive. Woman is to receive from the man. What I have done has been in stolen moments for the purpose to save your feelings. . . . God has put power into my hands for the purpose to get honor to myself and those that he has given me.

### The ordering of familial relationships.

Heber saw himself as the basic link between the hierocracy and his wives and children. He was thus to follow the counsel of the president of the Church; his wives were to follow his counsel; and the children were to follow the counsel of their mothers. If all acted according to counsel, then all would be saved. In an 1855 letter written to three of his wives, he thus states:

> I have no time to teach children. I teach you and you teach them and my head teaches me. This is your calling and learn to hear me and listen to my voice as you would like to have your children listen to you in all things that you tell them. Now if I listen to my head, and you listen to your head and the children listen to their head, how long will it take to make a heaven on earth? (Kimball, Heber C., ms 1)

At least some of his wives agreed with this concept of familial exaltation. Adelia Wilcox, for example, in an 1896 autobiography explains what motivated her to become sealed to Heber in 1856:

> Now I began to think seriously upon my condition, upon this state and my future state of existence and felt that I should choose one that would not only be able to save himself, but me also. That is one who by his daily walk and habits and good counsel would make such impressions on my mind that I would want to walk the same path that he trod. . . .

> Now I could think of no persons that could fill this responsible place better than Heber C. Kimball for I had always looked upon him as being as near perfect as a man could be and live in the flesh. So I concluded to become his wife. (Kimball, Stanley 1981:239)

### Familial discord and its resolution.

Of course not all interactions within the Kimball family neatly conformed to the patriarchal pattern of superordination and subordination. There is considerable evidence of disagreements between Heber and various of his wives. In 1852 he wrote in a private memorandum book:
The Spirit said I should devote my time to the church... and I should not be under the Law of Lawless women any more in time as I have fulfilled the Law and am now free from such Spirits. (Kimball, Stanley 1981:231)

Some sixteen of his forty-three wives were to leave him, and there is no indication that he was at all reluctant to see them go. He had more than enough to keep him occupied with the family that remained.

Thus, although Heber C. Kimball's system of family government was not without problems, it was sufficient to be the basis for the management of an expansive family kingdom within the context of Mormon group organization.

Daniel Davis

Difficulties in becoming matrimonially sealed. Daniel Davis had a much more difficult time establishing a viable family kingdom than did his adopted father, Heber C. Kimball. He married his first wife, Azeneth Babcoc, about the time he left Nauvoo in May of 1846. He was thirty-five at the time. There is no record of their being matrimonially sealed. For reasons that Daniel does not record in his journal, Azeneth left him while he was managing the Kimball farm at Winter Quarters (Davis, ms, 7 May 1846).

Because of his management of the Kimball grist mill, Daniel was able to achieve a condition of relative financial security early in the development of Utah. For some reason, however, he seems to have had problems finding a wife. While on a mission to England, William Kimball (ms a) suggests to his father that Daniel might have better luck in the British Isles: "Tell Dan I think if he was in this country he could get married, for according to the census there is 150,000 more women than men." Shortly thereafter Daniel is sent as a missionary to England. While there he apparently gives some thought to William's advice, but concludes that the girls back home would make more suitable wives. He thus writes from England:

I was glad to hear that the boys is obeying council & marrying the daughters of Zion for they are the ones to marry every time. I think if there was not any one to think any more of marrying than I do in this fare off land there would be little of it done. (Davis, Daniel, ms b)
His difficulty in finding a wife evidently was not a consequence of not wanting to establish a patriarchal family kingdom. Under date of 31 March 1854 he thus records in his journal the following revelatory experience:

In the night I had my mind lighted up by the spirit of the Lord and had blessings shown me I might receive and enjoy if I would be humble, faithful, and peaceful... I... had shown me... that I should have three women for wives that should be virtuous and not given to the lusts of the flesh... I dreamed of being in an apple orchard & picking some very beautiful and fine good apples. The apples represented my children. They should be beautiful and faire & honorable.

Daniel Davis as patriarch. Finally in February of 1859, when he was fifty years old, Daniel Davis married for the second time. Although in his journal Daniel refers to the ceremony as a "sealing," it was only for time. Another ten years would pass before the sealing for eternity would take place. Daniel finally records that on 20 January 1869 "I and my wife Charlotte went to the city of Salt Lake and went into the Endowment House about twelve o'clock to be sealed as husband and wife according to the order of the holy priesthood."

By this time three children had been born to their union. Since lineal sealings were not being performed in the Endowment House, it was impossible for these children to be sealed to their parents. These sealings would not take place until 1894, two years after Daniel's death. A fourth child, Da Ka, however, was born four months after his parents were sealed in the Endowment House. According to Mormon understanding he was consequently born in the covenant.

Daniel, however, gives no indication that he differentiated between the child that had been born in the covenant and those that had not. As each came along, he would fulfill his office as family patriarch by bestowing father's blessings. Journal entries indicate that he would bless each child shortly after his or her birth and then hold a blessing meeting about once a year where the children were given additional blessings. Such blessings both established his position as family patriarch and the child's identity as part of the Mormon group. For example, he writes under date of 18 September 1862:
I took my first born son in my arms and blessed him in the name of Jesus Christ that he might be preserved from the destroyer and the powers of darkness and evil that he might live long on the earth to do great good in the Church of Jesus Christ and receive a fulness of the Holy Priesthood.

And for 17 November 1864 he records:

My wife gave birth to a daughter about 3 o'clock in the morning. . . . I anointed her and blessed her according to the order of the priesthood and the spirit of the Lord that was with me to live long on the earth and be healthy and fill out her creation in righteousness.

But while such blessings helped establish the Daniel Davis family as a basic unit in the Mormon group, Daniel Davis's patriarchal authority did not give him power to prevent his children from acting contrary to his counsel. He thus writes under date of 12 October 1879:

My daughter Charlotte Vilate was married to Charles Longhurst in Salt Lake City without my consent.

By in large, however, Daniel's domestic relations appear to have been happy. He contented himself with a single wife who remained loyal to him. And when grandchildren began arriving in the 1880s, he blessed them as he had their parents. Numerous journal entries indicate that his Mormonness in large measure was expressed in domestic terms.

David Candland

Acquiring wives. David Candland's journal reveals the triumphs, vicissitudes, and defeats of a nineteenth-century Mormon patriarch attempting to manage an expansive family kingdom. As already indicated in chapter 6, he married his first wife, Mary Ann Barton, in 1844, and they were matrimonially sealed in the Nauvoo Temple. After his arrival in Utah in 1852 he became a merchant and ran a public house. His economic success and the loyalty that he manifest toward the hierocracy evidently qualified him to participate in plural marriage, and between October of 1852 and April of 1858, he was to be sealed to six additional wives.
Journal entries regarding his marriage to his fourth wife, Bertha King, indicate the various conditions that had to be met before a patriarch in early Utah could acquire a plural wife.

May [1854]. I obtained consent of the President to take another wife which I purpose doing. I hope to obtain consent of Mrs. Hannah King to take her daughter, Bertha Mary. . . .

June . . . I received a note from Mrs. King acquiescing very reluctantly to my having her daughter. But she evidenced so much ill feeling, making Bertha feel very unhappy, that we thought mutually to separate for the time being and live in hope. . . .

December . . . On the twenty-first . . . I received a note from Mrs. Hannah King asking an interview which I eagerly granted. The interview was satisfactory to all parties and resulted in my obtaining full consent for the consummation of hopes entertained in June last. I quited the house in pursuit of Bertha, she being on a visit. From her I also obtained consent. Christmas day was fixed upon for the celebration of the ceremony. By particular request of Pres. Young we convened on the morning at the office in the upper room. . . . Pres. Kimball performed the ceremony and I received by the hands of my [first] wife [Mary Ann according to the order of the church, Bertha Mary King [as wife].

Familial discipline. Candland attempted to manage his family according to his understanding of strict patriarchal discipline.

Under date of 14 October 1857, he records:

I gave to my family certain rules for their guidance which are as follows:
1. All articles of clothing that I bring into the house I will dispose of to my judgment.
2. Same to apply to groceries. My [first] wife is to have some under her charge for general company, and she will deal out weekly supplies to each woman as her week to do work comes around.
3. Ann and Hannah to do work every alternate week . . . but in case of sickness or company then as I shall direct or by mutually helping one another.
4. A candle to any one sick. . . .
5. Visits to mothers or sisters once a week; elsewhere, once a month.
6. The company of any who I shall deem improper for my folks to associate with to be given up.
7. All at visiting times or any time must be home by dusk.
8. Prayer in each wife's room, such as have children to call them around her, and those who have not by themselves, every evening. And every morning a general assembly for prayer. . . .
9. Any matter of dispute to be referred to me openly for a fair investigation.
10. I strictly prohibit any presents or anything loaned from the rations by any woman being made to any one, even members of the
families with whom by marriage I stand connected, except they take
due care to see it properly returned.
My family voted to comply and took the rules generally pretty well.

Domestic discord. Candland's system of family management did
not produce the type of domestic harmony that he might have hoped, and
his journal is replete with references to family quarrels. Only a few
examples will be cited.

Feb. 1858. I had a serious conversation with my wife Hannah &
her parents. . . . She promised amendments and I hope she will.
March 1859. I find much annoyance and vexation of spirit as
well as the schooling of feelings in polygamy. My wives Anne and
Hannah are much dissatisfied one with another and hence jealousy,
bickering and strife is the result.
March 1860. I do not enjoy good health and I regret to say
lack of business and peace in my family tends much to discompose
me.

As was their privilege, two of his wives had Brigham Young
issue them bills of divorce:

1855. My wives Lucy and Bertha became so possessed of evil as
to demand a bill of divorce. After much persuasion & counsel, and
the sanction & approval of Pres Young and all who knew the matter,
I gave them the bill.

Expectations for posterity. One of Candland's greatest
attractions to the concept of a family kingdom appears to have been
the promise of a large posterity. During his early years in Utah he
appears to have been particularly saddened by the death of various of
his children. He apparently found comfort in the thought that they
would still be his in eternity. When his son David Samuel was at the
point of death, he dreamed that he entered a room where his second
wife, Mary Jane Webb (who had died five weeks before) was seated.

She came forward upon my entrance and we embraced. . . . Just then
my wife Mary Ann entered and gave me my boy David which I handed
to Mary Jane, who promised to take charge of it and seemed pleased
that she had something belonging to me and said it was the
commencement of my kingdom there. Just then Mary Ann awoke me and
said that David was dying. By this I felt prepared for his death.
(1853)
Realizing that his third son, Samuel Charles, would shortly die, he wondered if perhaps the domestic difficulties that he had experienced were a consequence of his patriarchal blessing indicating that he did not belong to the most favored lineage:

I marvel sometimes why it is that God prospers me in somthings and not in others. Now in the Celestial Order of more wives and I fondly hope more children, yet I have had wives & they left me. I have had children and though fair and healthy & lovely to behold, they die till I have no boy. Now the query. Bro. Hyrum Smith blessed me and said I was of Levi. . . . Has my being a Levite any thing to do with my apparent ill luck in the plurality? (29 Nov. 1857)

Move to San Pete County. Early in 1861 Candland discussed his various difficulties with President Brigham Young. Young counseled him to move to San Pete County, some one hundred miles south of Salt Lake. He accordingly moved there with his remaining three wives and their children who were still living.

In many ways the move proved to be highly advantageous. Because he had made the move by the specific counsel of Brigham Young, local ecclesiastical leaders allocated him some very choice land. And he was soon able to acquire a rather extensive cattle ranch. In all he fathered some thirty-seven children, at least twenty-four of whom were still living at the time of his death in 1902.

He was still beset by domestic difficulties, however, and two of the three wives that moved with him to San Pete County were later to separate from him. As his children married, they too went their separate ways. "And so," as his daughter Grace relates, "the sweep of years brought David back to his first estate with one little country home and but one wife by his side" (Jacobson, Grace, ms a:113).

Peter Hansen

In some respects Peter Hansen's (ms a) rather frank reminiscences reveal the most complicated marital history of any of Heber C. Kimball's four adopted sons whose lives have been examined in this dissertation.
Early attempts at acquiring wives. As indicated in chapter 6, Peter's first attempt at marriage occurred shortly before the exodus from Nauvoo when a girl "who had been a little unfortunate" asked him to marry her. Brigham Young disapproved of the union, saying that Hansen would be going on a long mission to his native Denmark and should marry while there.

Three years later he was again considering marriage. While he was en route to Utah in 1849, a non-Mormon traveling with the company was accidentally killed. Peter felt concern for the man's Mormon wife. He proposed marriage to her. In her zeal to comply with biblical injunctions, however, "she told me that it was her wish to be married to her husband's brother, otherwise she would have had no objection.... This ended my courtship."

Shortly thereafter he left for a five-and-one-half-year mission to Denmark. While there he was civilly married to Ann Kofoed on 19 September 1851. "And for to please the saints we were [also] married by [Mission] President [Erastus] Snow in the [Church] meeting on the 21st." This religious ceremony, however, was not an eternal sealing. The following summer Ann gave birth to a son. And, as has already been indicated, some six months later Peter sent both mother and son to Utah.

After Ann had left Denmark, a young woman by the name of Emilie Fieldstad began to frequent the mission office. She and Peter soon became infatuated with one another. While this was going on, the doctrine of plural marriage was made known to the Danish Saints for the first time. Emilie was in the office when the revelation on the subject was read. She asked Peter if the revelation was correct. When he answered in the affirmative, she inquired:

"Then can I not be your wife?" And I said, "Yes, if the Prophet will allow it." And this answer made her exceedingly glad.

Peter's promise to marry Emilie, however, was regarded as untoward by Danish Saints who did not regard polygamy in as favorable a light as himself. He soon concluded that it would be best to also send her to Utah, and she left with a company of Saints. He later received a letter from Emilie
by which I learned the sad fact that she, after being very badly treated and even called Hansen's whore, had concluded to live in St. Louis along with a family from Norway who treated her kindly and were not Mormon.

Peter was never to see her again, but years later he did name one of his daughters Emilie.

In November of 1854 Peter left Denmark at the head of a company of immigrating Danish converts. In the group was a Sister Hageman "whom I was taking along with the intention of having her for a wife by and bye." Others in the company partly became dissatisfied with his leadership because they felt that he was becoming too intimate with his intended wife. While crossing the plains they happened upon former Danish mission president, Apostle Erastus Snow. He made an investigation of the issue and found that I had acted very imprudent by sleeping in the same tent with the girl and thus exposed myself to suspicion. . . . I felt sorry for my faults and humbled myself before God & my brethren and I have many times since felt thankful for not being led deeper into transgression and losing my standing in the Church.

When Peter and the Danish saints arrived in the Salt Lake Valley in June, Erastus Snow was on hand to greet them. He "brought my wife down in his light carriage while he jocked her a little about having to divide Brother Hansen now with another one." Ann was not amused, and the two women did get along well. "Finding my wife tried and tempted by the prospect of another wife, I grieved and felt discouraged."

As already related in the previous section, Peter soon found himself working on Antelope Island and from there wrote Heber C. Kimball asking if he might be sealed to Sister Hageman. Although in his letter to Kimball he stated that "I know she will behave well toward Ann, and I think Ann would treat her well" (Hansen, Peter, ms d), Ann was evidently a rather unwilling participant. When the letter came from Heber stating that the sealing could take place, "It put her in a bad humor" (Hansen, Peter, ms a).

Peter, however, was never to marry Sister Hageman. As already related, Heber had left for Fillmore before Peter was able to get to Salt Lake City. And before his return, the Mormon women with whom
Sister Hageman was staying "had filled her heart with fear of polygamy" to the degree that she refused to go through with the marriage. Even so Peter was never able to quite get over her. His reminiscences make reference to various dreams that he subsequently had regarding her. And he seems to have had the expectation that she would eventually become his wife.

Marital discord. Peter's marriage to Ann Kofoed was not a happy one. After leaving Heber C. Kimball's service in the summer of 1855 they attempted to settle in Provo. Peter started to build a house

When my wife saw the foundation, she said the house would be too small and she would not live in it. Soon her brother came along from Fort Ephraim in Sanpete Valley... He strengthened her in her rebellious notions & took her along on his return [to Sanpete].

The next spring Peter went to Fort Ephraim, and there was more or less a reconciliation between the two. During the next few years the Hansen family lived at various locations in Sanpete Valley. They were extremely poor, had various conflicts with local ecclesiastical leaders, and couldn't get along with one another. In August of 1865 things came to a head, and Ann moved out, taking the four children with her. Ann was granted a divorce by the probate court and gained legal custody of the children.

Some time after Ann moved out, Peter learned that she was planning to remarry. This greatly disturbed him. He and Ann had not been matrimonially sealed, and the children consequently had not been born in the covenant. He was fearful that if Ann was now sealed to another man, the children might end up being sealed to her and her new husband. He consequently would be left in eternity without posterity. He sought out Brigham Young so that he might be enlightened on the issue:

I asked him whether in case she was sealed to another man, the children could be sealed to that man? And he asked me on my own saying: don't you know that never could be done. They got to be grown up first and choose for themselves. He tapped me on my shoulder and said, "You be of good cheer, no man can take your children." He then advised me to visit them when I had a chance & send them little things to please them.
Latter attempts at acquiring wives. Thus assuaged, Peter began actively searching for another wife. In 1868 he proposed marriage to a widow with three children and she accepted. When he paid a return visit, however, he found that somebody had scared her and she broke the agreement. I took the disappointment rather hard . . . but I said to myself, "The Lord has seen my willingness and he does not require me to shoulder the responsibility."

The next year he received a letter with portrait from a Sister Isabella Harper of Santaquinn proposing to marry. She informed me that her husband had got weak in faith & had turned her away, and that she had three children, ten acres of farming land & two city lots with an adobe house on each, but no wheat to sow nor to eat.

For unknown reasons, Peter apparently did nothing to pursue the relationship.

Later the same year he was looking though the list of Danish immigrants expected to arrive in the Salt Lake Valley. Among them was the name of Augusta Dohl, whom he had known while on his mission to Denmark. "I remembered that the girl used to think a good deal of me and thought perhaps she might like me yet." He was waiting for the immigrant train when it arrived in the valley, and shortly thereafter they were matrimonially sealed.

Peter's marriage to Augusta appears to have been happy. His wife soon began encouraging him to practice plural marriage. She indicated that it was surely time for me to obey that commandment being an old member of the church and [she] insisted that I was just as able to take a second wife as I was to take her when I did.

When he was matrimonially sealed to Margareta Thomsen in 1875, his long-time ambition of becoming a polygamist was at last fulfilled. It was probably with a great deal of satisfaction that he recorded in his journal:

Thanks be to God the Eternal Father for He hath suffered me to obey the great commandment to take more wives. Help me Father that I may learn wisdom and stand under my trials & live my allocated time for Christ's sake. Amen.
When he attempted to have both wives live under the same roof, his hopes for marital happiness were undermined:

Eight weeks after arriving in my new home the peace of my family exploded. I had to rent a little house for my wife . . . which took thirty-six dollars a year out of my small earnings. My life was now very unhappy.

On this disconcerting note, his narrative comes to a rather abrupt end.

Joseph Hovey

Marriages. As already indicated, Joseph Hovey's (ms a) first wife, Martha Ann Webster, died at Winter Quarters. He shortly thereafter married Sarah Currier Bailey. Since Sarah had already been matrimonially sealed, it was impossible for him to establish an eternal union with her, and the one child that she bore him was born in the covenant to her and her deceased husband, Daniel Bailey.

In 1850 he was permitted to take a plural wife:

Nov. 28. . . . Bro. Heber C. Kimball, Bro. Thomas Bullock, recorder of marriages, came to my house according to appointment. Bro. Heber made a number of remarks on the principles of the gospel, on marriage, and on the sealing powers. About eight o'clock Bro. Heber sealed Sarah Louisa Goodridge to me for all Time and all Eternity.

Sarah Louisa was to die in childbirth in September of 1851. The following January her sister, Lusannah Emaline Goodridge, was sealed as a wife to Joseph. She was the last woman that he was to marry.

In 1856, however, he gave permission for his eldest daughter to become the plural wife of Levi Hancock, a prominent member of the Church hierocracy. In so doing he was evidently following the direction of Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Jedediah M. Grant, the Church's First Presidency. He thus records that at the time of the ceremony they

seemed well pleased and said to me that I had never slipped from any council since I had been in the Church or had disgraced my Church calling. (21 Feb. 1856)
**Blessings, wishes, counsel, and prayers.** Joseph's attitude toward the patriarchal order is manifest in the blessings, wishes, counsel, and prayers that he recorded in his journal.

Before departing from his wife Sarah Bailey to embark on a colonizing mission, he gave her a lengthy blessing. Among other things he said:

> I feel to seal a husband's blessing upon thee. . . . In as much as thou will give heed to my counsel thou shalt be blessed and thy little one, even with health and strength, with visions and dreams. (8 Dec. 1850)

On 1 January 1853 he made the following resolution:

> I do feel as one, that with the help of the Lord, to reform with the commencement of the New Year to try and overcome my propensities and passions and preside over myself and family in a way and manner that will entitle them to me in the Morning of the Resurrection.

While on a local preaching mission he stopped by his house on 20 November 1855:

> I called my families together and talked to them of the necessity of becoming one and laying aside all jealousies and to be obedient to my council, for if I was directed by the Holy Ghost, I would council them in righteousness. I blessed them in the name of Jesus Christ.

And after bringing his journal up to date on 5 May 1856, he wrote:

> I have come up with my record to date. . . . I record some few facts that my children may see that I am not altogether idle. . . . I pray my Heavenly Father . . . that my seed may have no end and my record which I have kept and keep hereafter may be preserved down through my posterity to the last generation.

**Economic activity and geographic mobility.** Joseph's life does not appear to have been plagued by the domestic conflict that David Candland and Peter Hansen described. He appears to have had only meager means, but he managed to escape the poverty in which Peter Hansen became enmeshed. During his early years in Utah he moved a great deal. In 1860, however, he settled his wife Lusannah and her children on a farm in Cache Valley in Northern Utah and his wife,
Sarah Bailey, in Salt Lake. After that he attempted to divide his time between farming in Cache Valley and working as a day laborer in Salt Lake City. According to son James, his attempt to provide for his families in both locations destroyed his health, and he died of stomach ulcers in 1868 (Hovey, M. R., ms a:27).

Concluding statement

In some respects Heber C. Kimball, Daniel Davis, David Candland, Peter Hansen, and Joseph Hovey might be regarded as atypical of Mormon men in the early Utah period. Whereas perhaps only 10 percent of Mormon males practiced plural marriage, Daniel Davis was the only one of the five to remain a monogamist, and although very few of the general Mormon population ever established actual adoptive sealing ties, each of the five was involved in this practice as either a father or a son.

In other ways, however, their experiences might be seen as typical of highly committed Mormons of the period. After having accepted the Mormon church, there is no indication that any of the five ever entertained doubts about its truthfulness. And each in his own way regarded the patriarchal order as the ideal pattern to which human relationships should conform. In these respects they were similar to many other Mormons of the period, both polygamist and monogamist.

It is therefore possible to regard their lives as case studies illustrating the consequences of patriarchal organization for Mormon group solidarity during the early Utah period. Having presented a brief outline of each man's domestic history during this time span, a few general conclusions are now in order.

First, the religiosity of each man was expressed in two basic ways: (1) the willingness to follow the counsel of those higher up in the hierocracy; and (2) the desire to successfully preside as patriarch within a properly ordered family unit. As a result of this dual positioning, each served as a link between the hierocracy and the other members of the family.
Second, the properly ordered family unit was to a degree dependent upon the hierocracy for its creation and development. This was due to the fact that no matrimonial sealings could take place without the permission of the leaders of the Church. Under the rules of the system, it would have been impossible for Peter Hansen to have been sealed to his beloved Sister Hageman or to anyone else without proper authorization.

Third, the system allowed for considerable diversity and individuality. It accommodated both a Heber C. Kimball with his forty-three wives and sixty-five children and a Daniel Davis, who remained a monogamists and sired only four children. The flippant Peter Hansen, the austere David Candland, and the pious Joseph Hovey could all regard themselves as engaged in the same enterprise.

Fourth, domestic activity itself was regarded as distinctively Mormon religious behavior. The patriarch saw himself as presiding over a family kingdom that was a fundamental unit within the larger Mormon group. All activity within the family unit in one way or another had religious significance, and it was thus impossible to separate the domestic sphere from the religious sphere. This is perhaps best exemplified in the texts of the blessings that men like Daniel Davis and Joseph Hovey gave to their wives and children.

Fifth, domestic failure did not necessarily influence the position of the individual family unit within the Mormon group. Domestic conflict, as opposed to sin or apostasy, was regarded as essentially a natural and expected, howbeit disagreeable, aspect of human behavior. As a result family units in various stages of disintegration and conflict were still enmeshed within the Mormon group. David Candland was thus allowed to take additional plural wives even after two of them had left him, and Peter Hansen was ensured by Brigham Young that he might still have his children in eternity.

Sixth, although wives were formally subordinate to men, they had considerable freedom of action. They did not have to marry contrary to their will, their husbands had no practical way to force them to follow their counsel, and they had the right to leave any husband whom they found undesirable. Given the practice of polygamy, a woman who found living with one man to be intolerable generally had
little problem in finding another man to marry. In this way she remained part of the system and just rearranged her marital alignments. Thus Ann Kofoed was sealed to Jehu Cox shortly after her divorce from Peter Hansen.

And seventh, except for the element of polygyny, Mormon domestic behavior did not differ greatly from that of other mid-nineteenth-century Americans. What was distinctive about the Mormon family concept was the way in which its elements merged with peculiarly Mormon notions of religious group identity.

Reintegration 1869-1894

While Mormon society was developing and continuing to expand in the relative isolation of the Great Basin, opposition to various practices of the LDS church was mounting in the East. Such opposition would lead to yet another period of conflict for the Saints. The political aspects of this conflict can be better understood if it is assumed that essentially a reversal had occurred between the Mormon group and the federal government over the issues of popular sovereignty and states' rights. During the 1830s and 1840s the Mormons had frequently petitioned the federal government to intervene in the affairs of the states of Missouri and Illinois in order to redress the wrongs that they felt they had suffered. Consistent with the states' rights doctrine of the time, however, the federal government had maintained that it had no jurisdiction in issues between a particular state and its citizens. When Utah was established in 1850, the Mormons became the predominant popular force within an organized territory of the United States. Consonant with this development, their position was now that the citizens of a territory or state should have the right to regulate their internal affairs and establish and administer their own laws. In part through a desire to increase such local control, they repeatedly petitioned Congress that Utah be granted statehood. Although beginning in 1858 federal troops were garrisoned in Utah, during the 1850s and early 1860s, the central government allowed the citizens of Utah considerable leeway in managing their own affairs. Consequent to the
emergence of the reformist Republican Party and the consolidation of federal control accompanying the Union's Civil War victory, however, the federal government was to become increasingly involved in the regulation of conditions in Utah. The result was a period of confrontation between the LDS people and the federal government. In the end, the Mormons reconciled themselves to federal authority and adjusted their institutions accordingly. And after Utah had manifested that it had become sufficiently "Americanized," it was at last granted statehood in 1896 (Lamar 1971; Larson, Gustive 1971; Wolfinger 1971).

While the conflict to a degree assumed the guise of federal control versus local autonomy, the central issue remained that of American individualism and pluralism versus Mormon corporativism and group solidarity. In the popular mind, Mormonism came to be regarded as a monolithic, anti-American, and sinister force whose leaders were exercising despotic control through theocratic domination, secret penal oaths, and economic monopolization (Davis, David 1960). The Mormons, for their part, regarded American pluralism as a threat to their group integrity, and opposition to their institutions as a product of the devil's continuing effort to destroy the kingdom of God.

The first federally enacted law attempting to proscribe the activities of the Mormon church was the Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act of 1862. It outlawed the practice of polygamy in U.S. territories and set the penalties for contracting such marriages at up to $500 in fines and five years' imprisonment. It annulled acts passed by the Utah legislature incorporating the LDS church and empowering it to regulate and perform marriages. And it stipulated that no religious organization in U.S. territories could hold property in excess of $50,000 (Arrington 1958:258; Bancroft 1964:606-7; Larson, Gustive 1971:58-60; Roberts, B. H. 1957 VI:43; Smith, Joseph Fielding, Jr. 1942:529).

The act had few immediate consequences for the people of Utah. Preoccupied with the Civil War, the federal government made no efforts to have the law enforced. Church property was discreetly transferred to Brigham Young and other prominent hierocrats. The Church continued to perform marriages as it had previously done. And
given the probate court system and the fact that grand juries in Utah were composed almost exclusively of Mormons, no one was convicted of bigamy. The act, however, brought the Saints into direct conflict with the United States law, and during the ensuing decades the federal government would have ample opportunity to devise means to bring the Mormons of Utah into compliance with federal regulations.

The United Order and the St. George Temple

While the Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act portended of things to come, during the late 1860s and early 1870s, the Mormon hierocracy was more concerned with an assault on the economic front than on the political front. Brigham Young and other LDS leaders regarded private merchandising and mining as imimical to Mormon group solidarity. As a result these economic niches in early Utah were filled largely by Gentiles, who as "outsiders" were free to operate independent of Mormon sanctions. Thus an economic opposition between Saint and Gentile was superimposed upon the religious polarization. Since most civilian Gentiles in early Utah were in one way or another associated either with merchandising or mining, they tended to be regarded by the Saints, not only as religious outsiders, but as individuals bent upon the economic exploitation or disruption of the LDS group (Arrington 1958:81-84, 201-5, 293-94; Peterson, Charles 1971:60-61, 72-73; Roberts, B. H. 1957 V:61-69).

While Brigham Young welcomed the railroad as a means to facilitate the migration of Mormons to Utah, he was extremely apprehensive about the impact that it would have upon the economic solidarity of the Saints. He was fearful that it would radically alter the merchandising channels within the territory, cause the Mormons to become economically dependent upon Gentiles, greatly expand the mining industry, and result in a large influx of outsiders antagonistic to the Mormon group. In anticipation of this onslaught, shortly before the arrival of the railroad in 1869, he began to instigate various measures designed to increase the economic exclusiveness, self-sufficiency, and solidarity of the Mormon people (Arrington 1956:235-56; Roberts, B. H. 1957 V:216-25, 239-49).
The United Order

One outgrowth of such measures was an attempt to organize the membership of the Church into an economically based covenantal order. Referred to as the "United Order of Enoch," it began to be implemented in earnest in 1874. In all, some 221 separate United Order communities were established. While such local orders were allowed considerable leeway in determining exact procedures, they were all under the general management of the Church hierocracy and each took the 1830s law of consecration and stewardship as its basic operating model. The head of a household would consecrate his property to the order and in return would receive a stewardship consisting of real property that he was expected to use for the economic well-being of the members of his family. Membership within the order was at least theoretically open only to the ethically qualified. Upon entering the order, an individual had to promise to abide by various regulations. Many of these did not differ greatly from the qualifications for receiving a recommend to participate in the ordinances of the Endowment House. Among the rules that the members of the United Order agreed to keep were the following:

Rule 1. We will not take the name of the Deity in vain.
Rule 2. We will pray with our families morning and evening, and also attend to secret prayer.
Rule 3. We will observe and keep the Word of Wisdom.
Rule 4. We will treat our families with due kindness and affection. (Arrington 1958:323-49; Arrington, Fox and May 1976:135-310, 394-419)

The St. George Temple

While plans were being laid to establish the United Order of Enoch, the decision was made to begin construction on a second temple. Situated in the Mormon settlement of St. George, the temple was pushed through to completion at a rapid pace. It was dedicated in the spring of 1877, and within its walls the complete set of temple rituals began to be enacted for the first time since the abandonment of the Nauvoo Temple in 1846.

Baptisms for the dead, endowments, and matrimonial sealings had been routinely performed in the Endowment House at Salt Lake City
since 1855. The only important change that came with the commencement of their administration in the St. George Temple was that endowments now began to be administered on behalf of the dead for the first time in the history of the Church. Brigham Young had reinstigated the administration of second anointings in December of 1866 (Buerger, David 1983:29). But prior to the completion of the St. George Temple, very few individuals were receiving this ordinance. Once this building had been dedicated, however, its administration became fairly commonplace. Between 1877 and the end of 1893 this ordinance was performed for some 3,415 living individuals and by proxy administration for 2,439 deceased persons. Only matrimonially sealed couples with great integrity and dedication to the truth were felt to be qualified to participate in this ritual, and each person receiving his or her second anointing had to be individually approved by the president of the Church. With proper recommendation from local ecclesiastical leaders, however, such approval was generally forthcoming.

The reinstigation of adoptive sealing

Perhaps the most significant development that accompanied the dedication of the St. George Temple was the reinstigation of adoptive sealings. For the first time since the abandonment of Nauvoo, it was possible for individuals not born in the covenant to be sealed as children to parents. But whereas very few individuals had actually participated in adoptive sealings in the Nauvoo Temple, the practice was now to become widespread. From the time that adoptive sealings were first performed in the St. George Temple until the close of 1893, some 19,000 living persons were adoptively sealed to their biological parents, 1,200 living persons were adopted to members of the Church who were not their biological parents, some 16,000 deceased individuals were adopted to their biological parents, and another 13,000 deceased individuals were adopted to other than their biological parents (Irving, Gordon 1974:308-9).

A number of precise rules were devised to regulate adoptive sealing (Irving, Gordon 1974:306-10). An individual was to be adopted
to his biological parents if these had joined the Church, regardless
of whether or not they were still living. On the other hand, if his
parents had not joined the Church while living, he was to be adopted
by some other Mormon couple (living or dead) who had been
matrimonially sealed. The reason for this policy was quite simple.
It was felt that it was most proper for an individual to be sealed to
his biological parents. The understanding persisted, however, that an
individual was to a degree dependent for his salvation upon the
patriarch to whom he was lineally sealed. He should therefore not
take the risk of being sealed to someone who might not accept the
gospel in the spirit world. A correlate of this regulation was the
rule that a woman could not be sealed by proxy to her deceased husband
if he had not joined the Church in mortality. Instead she was
required to be sealed as a wife to a man (whether living or dead) who
had joined the Church in mortality.

If an individual's deceased parents had not joined the Church,
they might be adopted as children to a Mormon couple. The next
ascending generation, however, could not be so adopted. A convert to
the Church could thus see to it that all essential sealing ordinances
were performed for his deceased non-Mormon parents, but he could not
extend such ordinances to other generations. It was not regarded as
anomalous for an individual to have his deceased non-Mormon parents
adopted as children to the same Mormon couple as himself. Likewise, a
woman might have her deceased non-Mormon husband adoptively sealed as
a son to the man to whom she was sealed as a wife. In this way they
might all be part of the same family unit in the celestial kingdom.

In cases where an individual could not be sealed to his
biological parents, virtually any faithful elder and his wife were
regarded as qualified to serve as parents, provided that they had been
endowed and matrimonially sealed. If the couple so selected were
still living, they had to agree to act in this capacity and be
physically present to participate in the ordinance. If the couple in
question were deceased, approval had to be obtained from their
officially designated family representative or "heir" before proxies
were allowed to act in their behalf. Thus in 1891, Barbara Ann Evans
(ms a), the wife of David Evans, wrote Joseph F. Smith as follows:
Have you any objection to David Evans of Lehi being adopted to the Smith family, also my father Pleasant Ewell was a faithful Latter-day Saint died here in Lehi being well acquainted with [the deceased] Br. George A. Smith we have chosen him. I am getting up in years and am going to the Manti Temple in about ten days. I would like to attend to it as life is uncertain. Please answer soon.

Unlike the intense social and economic cooperation that developed among individuals who had been linked by ties of adoptive sealing in the Nauvoo Temple, adoptive ties established among nonbiologically related individuals subsequent to the dedication of the St. George Temple appear to have resulted in little social interaction. It was not uncommon for an individual to travel some distance to a temple, there be adoptively sealed to a temple official that he had never seen before, then return to his home and have no more contact with the man whom he believed would now act as his father throughout eternity. While certain popular hierocratics were in particular demand as adoptive fathers, the most sought after appear to have been deceased. Not unsurprisingly, the most popular was Joseph Smith (Iving, Gordon 1974:309-10). Given such circumstances, the various individuals that happen to be adopted to the same father might well be unaware that in terms of the patriarchal order they were related to one another as brothers. And even if they were aware of this fact, it appears to have had little consequence for their interaction with one another.

Competing covenantal systems

The simultaneous existence of the United Order of Enoch and the sealing pattern associated with the St. George Temple might be interpreted as providing the membership of the Church with two alternative covenantal patterns for group solidarity. In each the small-scale family kingdom that had developed during the early days of Mormon colonization in the Great Basin was now incorporated into a larger covenantal collectivity. Involvement in neither of these modified existent structural relationships within the Mormon family; members continued to be bound together by the principles of hierarchy and affirmative opposition, and the husband/father retained his
position as head of the household. Both types of collectivities were believed to consist of an elite within the Church who had agreed to abide by ethical principles not required of the nominal membership of the Church. The two covenantal collectivities, however, operated upon different principles. The United Order community involved only temporary mortal relationships. It was, however, an effective cooperative group. Its objectives were primarily economic. It was designed to create a boundary between Mormons and Gentiles by involving order members in intense economic cooperation and by cutting them off from economic contact with non-Mormons. The sealing collectivity, on the other hand, was based upon the establishment of eternally enduring relationships. A collectivity consisted in all who had been sealed to a particular pivotal patriarch. Beyond the individual family unit, however, such relationships had little or no consequences for actual social interaction. Believed to involve relationships in a future existence, the significance of suprafamilial sealing ties for the here and now were largely conceptual in nature.

The coexistence of the two covenantal systems indicated two alternative ways in which the Mormon group might now have attempted to maintain its distinctiveness from the rest of humanity. The first was an actual economic and social isolation from a profane world. The second was more symbolic and linked Mormon distinctive identity primarily with the distinctive ideology of the patriarchal order. Confronted with an end to geographic isolation, for a short time the Mormon church attempted both approaches.

The United Order of Enoch proved to be short-lived and transitory. It essentially ran counter to the direction in which Mormon economic organization had developed since the expulsion from Jackson County in 1833. Had an attempt been made to institute its provisions at the time that the Mormon colonization of the Great Basin had begun, there might have been some possibility for its successful implementation. By the 1870s, however, the Mormons had become too economically diverse and too accustomed to the form of individualistic enterprise associated with privately owned family farms. While some of the United Order communities were quite successful, many of the internal conflicts and legal difficulties associated with the earlier
attempt to instigate the law of consecration and stewardship began to reappear; and the Mormons once more manifest that their economic values did not basically differ a great deal from other Americans.

On 29 August 1877, some five months after the dedication of the St. George Temple, Brigham Young died at his home in Salt Lake City. The leadership of the Church now passed to John Taylor, the senior apostle. While in many ways a religious conservative, Taylor apparently did not share Young's affection for cooperative economic enterprise; and under his leadership most existent United Order communities were disbanded (Arrington, Fox, and May 1979:311-335). Conceptual solidarity had essentially won out over economic solidarity, and the patriarchal order was to remain the predominate basis for Mormon group identity and solidarity.

The Manifesto and the Salt Lake Temple

John Taylor's administration was characterized by a deepening conflict between the federal government and the Mormon church. The legal foundations for this conflict had been established with the 1862 Morrill Anti-Bigamy Act. In 1874, at the height of the attempt to establish the United Order, Congress passed the Poland Act. This law was designed to overcome conditions that prevented the enforcement of the Morrill Act within the Territory of Utah: it granted district courts exclusive jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases and it abolished the offices of territorial marshal and territorial attorney general and merged their previous responsibilities with that of federally appointed United States marshal and district attorney general (Larson, Gustive 1971:77). With Gentiles effectively in control of the courts and the territorial law enforcement agencies, it would now be much more difficult for Mormons to block the conviction of polygamists.

Mormon leaders, however, continued to maintain that the Morrill Act was unconstitutional because it violated the right to freedom of religion guaranteed by the First Amendment. The opportunity to test the law in the courts came when two months after the passage of the Poland Act Mormon polygamist George Reynolds was
The Edmunds Act, passed in 1882, was designed to strengthen the Morrill Act. It outlawed not only the contracting of polygamist marriages, but also the act of polygamist living, which it defined as "illegal cohabitation." Polygamists were disenfranchised and barred from public office. Anyone who believed polygamy to be right could be disqualified from jury duty. And all election and registration offices in Utah Territory were declared vacant (Larson, Gustive 1971:95; Roberts, B. H. 1957 VI:43-44).

Coincidental with the passage of the Edmunds Act, the attempt to apprehend and convict Mormon polygamists was greatly intensified. There ensued the period of Mormon history commonly referred to as "the raid." To avoid arrest individuals known to be practicing plural marriage "went on the underground," where they would assume different identities and move frequently from hiding place to hiding place to avoid apprehension by the "feds." The Mormon community as a whole tended to act in concert, helping those on the underground and attempting to keep the "feds" from knowing of their whereabouts. Since most prominent Mormon administrators ended up either in prison or on the underground, many of the normal operations of the Church were disrupted.

In July of 1887, John Taylor died after having been on the underground for some two and one half years. The same year Congress passed the Edmunds-Tucker Act. Among other things it made voting, holding office, and serving on juries contingent upon taking an antipolygamy test oath that many Mormons regarded as offensive; abolished woman suffrage within the territory; specified that illegitimate children were disinherited; disincorporated the Church; and required the attorney general to have Church property in excess of $50,000 escheated (Larson, Gustive 1961:213-14).

During the ensuing months conditions for the Mormon church became more difficult. In all, some 1,300 Mormons would be convicted
of polygamy and over 12,000 disenfranchised (Larson, Gustive 1961:214). In May of 1889 the constitutionality of the Edmunds-Tucker Act was upheld by the Supreme Court. And there was considerable agitation for the Congress to pass even stricter measures against the Mormon people.

The Manifesto

Mormon leaders were becoming painfully aware that if the Church was to continue as an institution, the practice of polygamy would have to be discontinued. On 25 September 1890, President of the Church Wilford Woodruff was to write in his journal:

I have arrived at a point in the History of my life as the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints where I am under the necessity of acting for the temporal salvation of the Church. The United States government has taken a Stand and passed Laws to destroy the Latter-day Saints upon the subject of polygamy or Patriarchal order of Marriage.

On the same day he issued what had become known in the Church as the Manifesto:

Inasmuch as laws have been enacted by Congress forbidding plural marriage, which laws have been pronounced constitutional by the court of last resort, I hereby declare my intention to submit to those laws, and to use my influence with the members of the Church over which I preside to have them do likewise. (DC Official Declaration 1).

With this declaration the Church officially abandoned the practice of plural marriage. But while the Manifesto specifically dealt only with this issue, in actuality it signaled a fundamental change in the manner in which LDS leadership would endeavor to orient the Mormon group to secular society. At its most profound level it indicated that at last the Church was subordinating itself to human law. Such subordination would have numerous ramifications in Mormon practice. For the first time in the history of the Church, members were encouraged to become politically diversified. The People's Party (the Church's political arm) was disbanded, and members of the Church were encouraged to become affiliated with national political parties. Church-sponsored cooperative enterprises were discontinued, and LDS
leaders would become staunch advocates of capitalism. Mormons were now discouraged from migrating to Utah, and by in large the Church discontinued its colonizing attempts. In short, Mormon leadership was now endeavoring to facilitate the integration of Mormons into mainline America.

While the Manifesto was accompanied by far-reaching changes in the relationship of the Mormon church to secular society, the official abandonment of plural marriage in itself had little immediate impact on structural relationships within the patriarchal order. All that was entailed was that the Church would no longer officially permit its male members to be simultaneously married to more than one woman. All the various rituals associated with the patriarchal order were still being performed. The relationships within the order of children to parents, wife to husband, and father/husband to Church hierocracy were not altered. And a man might even still be sealed to a second wife provided that the first was dead or legally divorced from him. Thus while the issuance of the Manifesto had profound consequences for the development of the Mormon group, it did not have the disruptive impact on Mormon group identity and solidarity that had been entailed in the expulsion from Missouri.

The 1894 revelation on lineal sealing

On 6 April 1893, some two and one half years after the Manifesto was issued, the Salt Lake Temple was at last dedicated. One year later President Wilford Woodruff was to announce that he had received a revelation concerning sealing procedures within the Church. In discussing this revelation he stated:

The duty I want every man who presides over a Temple to see performed from this day henceforth and forever, unless the Lord Almighty commands otherwise is, let every man be adopted to his father. When a man receives the endowments, adopt him to his father; not to Wilford Woodruff, nor to any other man outside the lineage of his fathers. . . . We want the Latter-day Saints from this time to trace their genealogies as far as they can, and to be sealed to their fathers and mothers. Have children sealed to their parents, and run this chain through as far as you can get it. When you get to the end, let the last man be adopted to Joseph Smith, who stands at the head of the dispensation. This is
the will of the Lord to this people. (Deseret News Weekly, 21 Apr. 1894, p. 542)

The policy was both a refinement and an expansion in the sealing procedures that had been established in the Saint George Temple. Rather than taking care to be adopted to faithful members of the Church, each individual was to be adoptively sealed to his biological parents, and these in turn were to be linked by sealing ties to their own parents back through the various generations. While Wilford Woodruff indicated that the last ancestors for whom genealogical information was available should be adopted to Joseph Smith, these instructions were soon set aside. The goal became to bring as many ancestors as possible into the patriarchal order through the ordinance of proxy sealing with the expectation that at some point enough information would become available to link them back to Adam.

Such a procedure seems to have been well suited for the type of solidarity that the Church was attempting to achieve in the days following the Manifesto. Through the instigation of sealing practices outlined in the announcement, the committed members of the Church would become involved in a unified covenantal order that was instigated and regulated by the Church and which would theoretically link them all back to Adam. By having each individual lineally linked to his deceased ancestors, however, the various family units would effectively be independent of one another. Heads of households would receive direction from the hierocracy regarding the management of their personal family units and at the same time be free to pursue their individualist economic and political ends. The individual families within the Mormon kingdom were thus freed to make their own way in pluralistic American society while at the same time conceptually remaining part of the patriarchal Mormon kingdom.

The Patriarchal Order and Twentieth-Century Mormonism

The issuance of the Manifesto and the various changes in Church policy that accompanied it resulted in the resolution of many of the conflicts between the Mormon group and general American society. Although not all problems were solved immediately, the basis
for accommodation had been established. In 1893 President Harrison
granted amnesty to Mormon polygamists who agreed to abide by the
various federal enactments forbidding polygamous living. In 1894 Utah
was granted statehood. And in 1896 what remained of the Church's
escheated property was returned to its control.

Early Twentieth-Century Developments

The last protracted traditional Mormon-Gentile conflict
centered upon what has become known as the Reed Smoot case. In
January of 1903 Mormon apostle Reed Smoot was elected as U.S.
senator. Various non-Mormons of Utah protested his seating primarily
on the grounds that as a Mormon apostle he was a high official in an
organization that they held was essentially anti-American and
antagonistic to the American government. From January of 1904 until
June of 1906 the Senate committee on privileges and elections
investigated the allegations. This involved a detailed examination of
numerous Mormon beliefs and practices. In the course of the hearings
it was discovered that high Mormon officials were continuing to permit
the establishment of a few plural marriages. During the investigation
considerable anti-Mormon sentiment was expressed in the press.

At the close of the hearing the committee recommended that
Smoot not be allowed to serve as senator from Utah. The full Senate,
however, voted against the committee recommendation, and Smoot
retained his seat.

Near the close of the hearings, then president of the Church
Joseph F. Smith issued what has become known as the "second
Manifesto." It was a much more strongly worded statement than the
Woodruff Manifesto and indicated that any member of the Church who
either solemnized a plural marriage or entered such a relationship
would be excommunicated from the Church. With this statement the LDS
church as an institution at last put polygamy behind it.

In February of 1907 the Church issued what it termed an
"Address of the Church to the World." This document was essentially a
policy statement regarding the Church's relationship to the state.
Among other things it affirmed:
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints holds to the
doctrine of the separation of church and state; the
non-interference of church authority in political matters; and the
absolute independence of the individual in the performance of his
political duties. (Roberts, B. H. 1957 VI:436)

With the resolution of the Reed Smoot case, the second
Manifesto, and the Address of the Church to the World, adjustments
that had been occurring in Church administration since the Woodruff
Manifesto were essentially formalized and finalized. Henceforth the
official policy of the Church would be noninvolvement in politics and
a willful subjugation to civil law. Coupled with this was the fact
that with the abandonment of economic communal enterprise, each member
of the Church was essentially left to his own devices to succeed or
fail within the context of the American economic system. In economic
and political matters, no longer would the Church disavow American
pluralism.

The changing relationship between civil and eternal marriage
provides one of the best perspectives from which to examine the manner
in which twentieth-century Mormonism has accommodated itself to
secular society. As has already been seen, during the early days of
Mormonism, priesthood-instigated marriage was regarded as having
precedence over state-instigated marriage, and a civil marriage
ceremony came to be viewed as having little or no validity. When the
Mormons gained control of the probate courts in territorial Utah,
civil marriage gained increased status in Mormon thought. It was
still not essential, however, for individuals to be married civilly in
order to be matrimonially sealed. In the twentieth century, however,
the policy became firmly established that for two individuals to be
matrimonially sealed, it was essential for them to be legally married
from the perspective of state law. Eternal marriage was in no sense
abolished, but the sealing power was now viewed as having to operate
within the constraints of state regulation.

Writing in the early 1930s, Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith,
Jr., explained:

Marriages among Latter-day Saints are eternal marriages, if they
are properly performed, because the Eternal Father gave the
covenant of marriage which is received by couples who go to the temple to receive this blessing there.

It is necessary that marriages be regulated by civil law. Under the present world conditions the state must have power to form the laws governing marriages because of their close connection with the social structure of the state. . . . When the kingdom of God is set up on the earth in all its fulness, and Christ comes to reign, marriage, like all other ordinances, will be controlled by the law of God. . . . Under present conditions when "the powers that be" have jurisdiction in the earth, all men, no matter what their religious beliefs or lack of them may be, must be subject to the governments which exist. When Christ comes he will bring the "perfect law of liberty" and in it all the faithful will be made free and happy.

In terms of the internal operations of the patriarchal order little had changed. Eternal marriage still had to be performed by priesthood authority delegated by the president of the Church, and only members of the Church regarded as being in full compliance with the Church code of conduct could enter such a relationship. From an eternal point of view, even polygamy had not been abolished. A man could still be matrimonially sealed to more than one woman. This might occur if his first wife died and he subsequently was sealed to a second or if he was civilly divorced from a living wife and then sealed to a second without having the sealing relationship with the first terminated.

The Contemporary Mormon Church

The patriarchal order has continued to have important consequences for Mormon group identity and solidarity within this context. The concept of putative Abrahamic descent has provided members of the Church with a basis for perceiving themselves as distinctive. This concept has been fortified through the enactment of sealing networks by which members of the Church become tied to deceased ancestors from generation to generation. Thus the Mormon Church is conceptualized as a vast association stretching far into the distant past. Outside of individual nuclear families, however, such networks have little consequence for existent relationships. Thus while being embedded in a sealing network, each individual Mormon
remains free to pursue his own economic and political objectives within the context of pluralistic American society.

The fact that the basic form of Mormon covenant organization became centered upon individual families has enabled the Church to give up attempts to regulate the economic and political activities of its membership while continuing to maintain control of individual members through supervising their activities associated with sexuality and family life. The Church thus allows members essentially to fit into the national political and economic systems as they desire. It provides far-reaching guidelines, however, on proper familial ties. Mormons express their Mormonism primarily in familial terms. An often repeated statement is that the Church exists primarily for the perfection of families.

Temple rituals continue to play an important role in Mormon belief and practice. In order to participate in such rituals, a Mormon must still receive a recommend from his local ecclesiastical authorities. Most questions associated with the granting of such a recommend center upon proper familial conduct. It is still believed that a family who has been sealed together can be perpetuated eternally only if its members abide by the ethical rules established by the Church. This belief provides considerable incentive for members to keep the Church's established code of conduct.

As the Mormon church has expanded worldwide, the rituals of the patriarchal order have been made available to members of the Church through the building of temples throughout the world. Church leaders regard this development as sufficient reason to discontinue any attempt to physically gather the Saints into fixed geographic locations. Accompanying the expansion of temple building has been an increased emphasis on the gathering of genealogical data for the purpose of performing temple rituals for the dead. While individual members of the Church are still encouraged to engage in personal genealogical research, much of the data is now collected by the Church and temple work is performed for dead individuals whether or not their descendants are members of the Church. The emphasis is now more on the Church as a body redeeming all the dead than on individual members of the Church redeeming their individual deceased ancestors. It is
still believed, however, that sealing ordinances must be performed to link the living and dead into familial associations and that eventually such sealing ties will link all the righteous posterity of Adam into one great family.

Two important changes have occurred within the patriarchal order during the twentieth century. The first has been a sharp reduction in the number of people receiving second anointings coupled with the policy that any couple receiving their second anointing cannot tell anyone else that this has happened. This has resulted in all individuals who have received their endowments and established proper sealing relationships to be on an equal ritual footing within the patriarchal order.

The second and more important modification has been a policy change that now allows blacks to hold the priesthood, receive their endowments, be sealed, and thus achieve a condition of formal equality with other members of the Church. The change occurred when in June of 1978, Church President Spencer W. Kimball announced that he had received a revelation which permitted the ordination of the blacks to the priesthood (DC Official Declaration 2). This development for the first time has permitted the Church at least conceptually to become universal. It can now proselyte all people and allow them to enter the Church on an equal footing.

While the patriarchal order has provided a means for integrating the worldwide membership of the Church in terms of a unified covenantal system, at the present time it is confronted with at least two fundamental problems. The first involves the issue of sexual equality. The formal subordination of women within the patriarchal order runs counter to the emphasis upon sexual equality within contemporary American society. This has posed a serious problem for many members of the Church. The second concerns the issue of the increasing number of unmarried adults within the Church. The family is unequivocally regarded as the basic unit within the Church. Most Church teachings in one way or another concern families. Coupled with this is the continuing belief that full salvation in the next life cannot be achieved by an individual who has not been matrimonially sealed. In conflict with such beliefs is the reality of
many single-parent homes and adult Mormons who for one reason or another never marry. The problem is particularly acute for active single adult women. They far outnumber active single men and many have little chance of ever being matrimonially sealed. They are thus excluded from full participation in the patriarchal order and often feel that, through no fault of their own, they are on the periphery of a church that places so much emphasis on the fundamental significance of ritually ordered and properly formed familial units. Given the flexibility evidenced in Mormon covenant organization over the last 150 years, there is reason to suppose that ways will be devised to deal with these two issues.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Examination of Assumptions

In chapter 1 of the dissertation four basic assumptions were made regarding the relationship between Mormon group cohesion and Mormon covenant organization: first, that the Mormon church is a peripheral group within American society, characterized by localized values, elite personnel, and institutional arrangements that are not completely informed by more general American society; second, that identity and solidarity within the Mormon group in large measure are achieved through the Church's covenant system, which is centered upon the Mormon group's particularistic values, institutions, and elite personnel, which provides the basis for a localized pattern of deference, and which establishes a mechanism in terms of which Mormons can relate themselves to the Mormon church in contrast to the national society in which they also participate; third, that modifications which have occurred in the covenant system might be characterized as adjustments necessitated by the Mormon group's changing relationship to secular society; and fourth, that the Church's covenantal system has facilitated the preservation of Mormon group cohesion within a context of flux and change.

These assumptions will now be examined in terms of the analysis that has been presented in the body of the dissertation. In order to accomplish this objective Mormonism will be compared and contrasted with Puritanism, and the various stages in the development of the Mormon group will be discussed.
Assumption 1

The Mormon church is a peripheral group within American society, characterized by localized values, elite personnel, and institutional arrangements that are not completely informed by more general American society.

Edward Shils's basic determinate of peripheralness is the degree to which a group is not attached to the central values, institutions, and elite personnel of a society with which it is at least nominally aligned. Such lack of attachment might be regarded as a consequence of two different conditions: first, the lack of access to the center resulting from inadequate power or information; and second, the existence within the peripheral group of a localized charismatic center in terms of which group members form particularistic attachments.

A given peripheral group's relationship to larger society may be influenced by both conditions. Both Puritanism's and Mormonism's changing relationship to the larger societies in which they emerged might be meaningfully discussed in terms of the relationship between these two conditions. It is therefore useful to regard them both in important respects as peripheral groups.

Puritanism

The origins of Puritanism's peripheralness within English society might be understood more as a consequence of the movement's lack of access to the center of English society than to the existence of a localized charismatic center. It began essentially as a protest movement growing out of conflicts regarding the proper form of ecclesiastical organization within English society. For some time the prevailing expectation among Puritan leaders was that the crown would instigate the religious reforms that they regarded as essential. Had James I's religious inclination been more consistent with their own, there is reason to suppose that Puritanism would have flourished at the center of English society. As events unfolded, however, the episcopacy was preserved and Puritanism was relegated to the margins of English society.
The establishment of Massachusetts Bay Colony created a situation in which a peripheral group within one society was transformed into the central group within a smaller society that was a political appendage of the larger metropolitan society. New England Puritanism thus became simultaneously both central within a localized context and peripheral within larger British society.

At the core of Massachusetts society a well-developed distinctive charismatic center rapidly developed. It made no ultimate claims to either religious or political exclusiveness. Consistent with Shils’s (1975:127) concept of charisma, however, the elite personnel within Massachusetts society, the values they espoused, and the institutions they established and maintained were understood by faithful Puritans to be intimately connected with the Calvinist God, the ultimate order-determining power in the universe. Massachusetts society was thus perceived as a manifestation of God’s eupraxia, and one’s position within that society was regarded as isomorphic with his relationship to deity.

The relationship of Massachusetts society to metropolitan England and its relative peripheralness changed according to historical circumstances. During the early years of the colony, its founders regarded it in a sense as the true center of English society and thus in opposition to the societal order maintained by the power elite in London. To them it was a "Citty upon a Hill," an entypical manifestation of the divine pattern to which the rest of English society should conform. Governing magistrates in London of course understood the colony in rather different terms as a way to develop the coasts of New England while ridding England of a potentially subversive element. The years of the Crowellian protectorate witnessed the greatest convergence and least opposition between colony and metropolis with Puritans occupying the predominate positions of power in both centers. The Restoration, however, greatly increased the peripheralness of New England Puritanism; and the application of power by the central government eventually resulted in the revocation of the first Massachusetts Bay Colony and the consequent loss of the New England Puritan elite's ability to monopolize local political
power. This in turn led to the disintegration of the New England Puritan societal order as a unitary and integrated system.

Mormonism

In contrast to Puritanism, virtually the first element that developed in Mormonism was an exclusive charismatic center. Mormon concerns about its relationship to the center of American society emerged only as it became frustrated in its attempts to achieve its self-defined goals. As in New England Puritanism, the Mormon societal order has been understood to be imbued with charismatic qualities through the connection of its elite personnel, values, and institutions with the Divine. Unlike the Puritan movement, from the time that their church was organized, Mormons have regarded this charismatic connection to be exclusive and unique to Mormonism. Central to this concept is the belief that Mormons alone are in possession of priesthood, which is regarded as the divine power to order and to regulate. Mormon particularism may in large measure be understood as derived from this understanding.

Elitism within Mormonism is basically understood in terms of an individual's possession of priesthood power and keys. Priesthood is distributed only among members of the LDS hierocracy. Consequently, the Saints view their elite in qualitatively different terms from the way they do the elite within general American society, while individuals outside the group do not recognize the charismatic authority of the Mormon elite.

The preeminent elite individual within the Mormon group is the president of the Church, who as "prophet seer and revelator" is regarded as the only person who can express the Divine will as it has application for the entire group. The doctrine and values that he espouses are the official ideology of the Church, while the social arrangements that he establishes and maintains become its basic institutional forms. Thus for believing Saints, Mormon ideology and institutions, like its hierocracy, are imbued with charisma through their perceived connection with the ultimate source of power and order within the universe. As such they are of a different order from the
values and institutional forms that are prevalent in secular society. At the same time, their association with Mormon concepts of prophetic insight and priesthood authority preclude their being understood by individuals outside the group in the same way they are by believing Mormons.

Much of the conflict that characterized Mormon-Gentile relationships during the nineteenth century might be interpreted as interactions generated by two competing centers. On the one hand was the national center with its popularly supported leaders, values, and institutions. On the other hand was the localized Mormon center characterized by an exclusive priesthood and particularistic doctrines and institutional arrangements. In chapter 3 of this dissertation it was hypothesized that Mormonism emerged as a means to establish cohesion amid the socioreligious flux of the Second Great Awakening. Chapter 4 drew on this hypothesis by interpreting Mormon-Gentile conflicts of the 1830s in terms of incongruities between the democratic individualism of Jacksonian America and Mormon attempts at group solidarity. Essentially the same theme was pursued in later chapters as examinations were made of conflicts associated with such things as Joseph Smith's interpretation of the Nauvoo Charter, Brigham Young's management of Nauvoo during the months prior to the exodus, and Mormon attempts to control the judiciary and territorial legislature in the early Utah period. The basic issue was not that Mormons valued cohesion more than their fellow Americans or that they were less democratic. It was rather that they were attempting to establish social forms that were both at odds with those in larger society and which were ordered in terms of a particularistic charismatic center that made claims of autonomous authority. It was not until Mormon institutions were brought into line with the rest of American society and Mormon leaders defined their jurisdiction in ways that were acceptable to the national elite that the conflict was resolved.
Assumption 2

Identity and solidarity within the Mormon group in large measure are achieved through the Church's covenant system, which is centered upon the Mormon group's particularistic values, institutions, and elite personnel; provides the basis for a localized pattern of deference; and establishes a mechanism in terms of which Mormons can relate themselves to the Mormon church in contrast to the national society in which they also participate.

Both the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay Colony and the Mormons of nineteenth-century America might be characterized as cohesive groups with well-developed localized charismatic centers. As has been demonstrated in the body of the dissertation, each likewise has a complex covenant system. It is a basic contention of the dissertation that in both cases the covenant system contributes to group cohesion by relating the individual group member to the group's charismatic center. The manner in which this is achieved will now be summarized.

Identity and solidarity within the Mormon group are largely achieved through a covenant system

Identity within both the Puritan and the Mormon system is primarily associated with issues that, in the body of the dissertation, have been discussed under the headings of "covenantal myth" and "bases of relationships." Solidarity in one way or another is associated with all aspects of covenant organization. It can, however, begin to be examined in terms of these two general topics.

Covenantal myth

Myths are integral to Puritan and Mormon covenant organization. In both systems the instigation of the Abrahamic covenant is the basic mythic narrative. This narrative, however, is interpreted in terms of its relationship to other myths. For the Puritans the most important of these are the Biblical narratives dealing with the creation, the fall of Adam, the history of the house of Israel, and the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In Mormonism, the Abrahamic covenantal narrative is linked to these same myths, but the mythic corpus is elaborated in ways not found in
Puritan covenant theology: the creation myth is expanded to include a spiritual creation of all life forms prior to the physical creation of the earth and a preexistent council of all spirits that would occupy human bodies in mortality; the story of Adam is expanded to include the instigation of an Adamic patriarchal order reflective of the proposals established in the preexistent council; the history of Israel is expanded to include the peopling of the Americas by Israelites and the mixing of the blood of Ephraim with that of the Gentile nations; events associated with the death and resurrection of Christ are expanded to include an account of how he visited the world of disembodied spirits and there provided for the redemption of those who did not have the opportunity to accept his gospel while in mortality; and finally, as a culmination to Mormon dispensational history, an anticipatory myth looks forward to the end of time when a reinstigation of the Adamic order among all his righteous posterity will be effected.

From a theological perspective, these myths provide a basis for a theistic interpretation of history, define the individual's relationship to deity, and explain the grounds for religious salvation. Within the context of group identity and solidarity these same myths describe the form of association that group members should ideally maintain, the nature of the covenantal rituals that link them together, and the nature of the distinctive attributes they believe themselves to possess. It is this second series of issues that has been of interest to this dissertation.

**Form of association.** Both Puritan and Mormon myth assume a divine pattern that ideally should be replicated in earthly social organization. Each group's existent covenant system is viewed as an attempt to replicate that pattern. Such a position provides an essentially Platonic basis for covenant structure and links it as a totality to the charismatic center of the universe. Since existent structure is not regarded as a completely perfect manifestation of the divine pattern, it can be pragmatically modified without necessarily undermining belief in the ultimate validity of its heavenly archetype.
In Puritan ideology the divine pattern is represented by the preexistent platform that provided the conceptual basis for the creation of the visible universe. The relationship among its parts is consistent with the medieval concept of hierarchy and the logic of Petrus Ramus. Prior to the fall of Adam there was perfect isomorphism between the preexistent platform and the existent universe. Adam's transgression destroyed such consistency. An express goal of New England Puritanism was to establish a form of social organization more in line with the divine pattern than that which was current in metropolitan England. A basic device in this endeavor was the creation of appropriate covenantal ties among individuals participating in Puritan social institutions.

Mormon beliefs regarding the nature of the divine pattern have undergone complex development. In their earliest form such understandings centered upon the concept of the gathering of Israel described in the Book of Mormon. To these beliefs were soon added teachings regarding the spiritual creation of all life forms prior to the creation of the physical universe. Consistent with the instigation of the patriarchal order was the emergence of beliefs dealing with the establishment of a patriarchal order during a grand council in heaven, its earthly instigation in the days of Adam, and its reestablishment at the end of the final dispensation. The various forms that Mormon social organization have assumed have been regarded as attempts to bring the Mormon group into a more consistent relationship with this pattern.

Nature of covenantal rituals. Both Puritanism and Mormonism are characterized by ritual observances associated with the establishment of covenants. In both instances these rituals are justified in terms of mythic narratives. The raison d'être for the rituals, however, differs greatly in the two systems.

There are three basic rituals associated with the Puritan covenant system: (1) baptism, which is linked both to the narrative of God commanding Abraham to circumcise himself and his male descendants and to the narrative of John the Baptist baptizing Jesus Christ; (2) communion, which is linked to the narrative of the last
supper of Jesus Christ prior to his crucifixion; and (3) marriage, which is linked to God establishing a marital union between Adam and Eve prior to their expulsion from the Garden of Eden. According to Puritan belief, it is impossible for mortals to instigate binding covenants with God. As a result, Puritan rituals associated with such relationships are regarded only as "seals" or outward expressions of covenants already established by God. Thus communion is a seal of the covenant of grace, while baptism essentially became regarded as a manifestation that an individual was endowed with federal holiness. Marriage is the only basic covenant ritual that might be regarded as a performative. It establishes a relationship between two mortals rather than between a man and God, and it is the only basic covenant ritual that is performed by civil rather than by religious authority.

There are a number of rituals associated with Mormon covenant organization. The most notable of these are (1) baptism; (2) confirmation; (4) patriarchal blessing; (4) ordination to the priesthood; (4) the endowment; (5) eternal marriage and sealing; and (6) the second anointing. Mormons believe that the entire ritual complex was established in the days of Adam as a means by which men might return to the presence of God their Father and there be exalted to the status of godhood. Unlike Puritans, Mormons maintain that through proper priesthood authority, men might instigate binding covenant relations with God. Consequently all Mormon covenant rituals are performatives and must be enacted by duly authorized Mormon functionaries, while no ordinances instigated either by civil authority or by ministers of other religions are regarded as valid within the Mormon covenant system.

Distinctive attributes. Both Puritan and Mormon covenantal myths define and explain distinctive attributes that are understood to characterize group members. This is done by describing living individuals in terms of mythical persons and events. The attributes thus defined become diacritical markers of group identity.

Puritan identity is grounded in the Abrahamic covenant myth as interpreted within the context of Puritan understandings regarding the fall and redemption of man. In terms of such perception three basic
types of persons are identifiable: (1) those who are in a state of complete depravity as a consequence of their descent from Adam; (2) those who have achieved a state of real holiness through God having personally established with them his covenant of grace; and (3) those who, as a consequence of their descent from individuals who have achieved a state of real holiness, are imbued with federal but not real holiness.

Puritan group structure at its most elementary level is based upon the interrelationship among these three categories of persons. At the core of the Puritan group are individuals who, through their ability to manifest real holiness, have qualified for membership in the church covenant community within the local congregation and for the status of freemen within the political system. At the next level are baptized members of the church who have been born in the covenant and are thus endowed with federal holiness, but who have not manifest real holiness. And finally there are all the other members of the colony who through their perceived degeneracy are denied access to both religious and political power.

Mormon group identity is associated with two sets of myths: those concerned with the instigation of the baptismal covenant and those involved in one way or another with the Abrahamic covenant. The baptismal covenant is linked with narratives associated with the baptism of Adam, that of Jesus Christ, and that of Joseph Smith. The establishment of a baptismal covenant is regarded as the only means by which an individual can both receive forgiveness of his sins and become a member of the Mormon church. The Abrahamic covenant in its widest sense is linked not only to biblical texts dealing with the life of Abraham and the history of the house of Israel, but also to narratives concerning the spiritual creation of man, the grand council and the war in heaven, the curse of Cain, the ranking of the sons of Noah, the blessings Jacob bestowed upon his sons and grandsons, and the dispersion of the house of Israel. Mormon understandings of myths associated with the Abrahamic covenant result in the identification of various diacritical attributes. These can be classified into two basic categories: those associated with blood inheritance and those manifested in premortality as aspects of innate spiritual qualities.
In the post-Missouri period, ideology tied to the Mormon concept of blood inheritance results in a tripartite classification of the world's population into Israelites, Gentiles, and Negroes and the further subdivision of Israelites into Ephraimites, Manassehites, and Jews. Innate spiritual qualities are linked with an individual's receptivity to the Mormon gospel, his leadership ability, and his right to occupy certain positions in mortality. A general isomorphism is achieved between categorization by spiritual qualities and categorization by blood inheritance through the belief that an individual is foreordained to be born into a particular blood inheritance category by virtue of the spiritual qualities he manifested in the preexistence. As a result of such isomorphism there is a merging between the two forms of classification and a coincidental vagueness about whether a given attribute is the manifestation of an innate spiritual quality, or of blood inheritance, or of both.

In its most elementary form, Mormon group structure is derived from the superimposition of categorization by baptismal covenant upon categorization by blood inheritance and innate spiritual qualities. The baptismal covenant results in a general boundary separating those who have been baptized into the Church and thus have the potential for being forgiven of their sins from the rest of mankind, who by not making such a covenant are not yet in the position to be forgiven of their sins. All humanity, however, are likewise classifiable in terms of blood inheritance and innate spiritual qualities, independent of whether or not they have been baptized. As a result, although all members of the Church are bound together by the fact that each has been baptized, they are distinguishable both in terms of their particular blood inheritance and in terms of innate spiritual qualities. Classification by baptism is linked to classification by blood inheritance and by innate spiritual qualities through two beliefs: first, through the generally held understanding that those individuals with the proper blood and spiritual qualities will tend to be drawn to the LDS church, accept baptism, and become the most active participants in the Mormon group; and second, through the less pervasive view that Gentiles who are baptized into the Church will
have their blood changed so that they will literally become part of the biological house of Israel.

Bases of relationships

As explained in the Introduction, for the purposes of this dissertation, the term "bases of relationships" has reference to the attributes believed to be shared by individuals who are joined through covenantal ties. Concern with this issue is in part derived from Max Weber's (1968:1164) characterization of the sect as "a community of personally charismatic individuals." As indicated in the previous section, both Puritans and Mormons perceive themselves to be imbued with distinctive attributes. Whether any or all of these attributes might appropriately be regarded as "personal charisma" in the Weberian sense, is an issue that needs to be clarified.

It would be possible to analyze these distinctive attributes in terms of categories strictly derived from the covenantal myths in which they are identified and explained. For reasons already indicated in the Introduction, however, in this dissertation they have been examined in terms of an approach based on the methodology employed by David Schneider (1968; 1969; 1972) in his analysis of American kinship. There are two basic aspects to this approach: first, the bifurcation of the cultural universe between the orders of nature and of law; and second, the classification of relational categories in terms of the presence or absence of characteristics from each order. The employment of this approach has greatly facilitated comparative analysis between Puritan and Mormon covenant structure and has suggested ways in which each differs from Schneider's depiction of American kinship.

Puritanism. The presupposition that the Puritan cultural universe is bifurcated between the orders of nature and law is consistent with the data analyzed in the dissertation if it is assumed that the Puritan order or nature is itself divided into two suborders: primeval and contemporary. Such a conception is necessitated by the Puritan belief that the fall of Adam resulted in a
radical change in nature, transforming it from its primeval to its contemporary degenerate state.

Once such an assumption is allowed, relational categories within Massachusetts covenant organization can be adequately described in terms of the absence or presence of characteristics from the two general orders and the two suborders within nature. Documents from the period explicitly state that there are three bases for relationships: covenant, violence, and nature (Morgan 1966:26). In Puritan Massachusetts both covenant and force were clearly within the order of law: covenant was based upon mutual agreement between two parties and necessitated a reciprocal code of conduct; violence was technically associated only with relationships involving involuntary servitude and was governed by strict legal procedures. Relationships based in nature are more problematic. According to Puritan thought, the parent-child bond was the only human relationship within the contemporary order of nature that preserved the directing power of natural law. By definition all other societal ties were based either in covenant or in violence. As is the case in current American kinship, the Puritan parent-child relationship was conceptualized in terms of the sharing of biological substance. Through its association with understandings regarding the Abrahamic covenant and the primeval order of nature, however, it was imbued with additional complexity not present in current American kinship ideology. As a result of such association, this solitary natural relation was central to Puritan notions of group identity and cohesion.

According to Puritan thinking, the covenant of grace that God established with Abraham had at least two basic consequences: first, Abraham at least partially overcame the natural depravity with which mankind had become imbued at the time of the Fall; and second, his posterity were included with him in a distinctive covenantal relationship with God. The first was referred to as real holiness and the second as federal holiness. Because each consequence involved the removal of conditions brought on at the time that nature was transformed to its contemporary state, both were associated with the primeval suborder of nature. As such both were understood as divine
devices to partially transform elements within the order of nature back to their primeval state.

Natural depravity and federal holiness are conceptually related because each is understood to be transferable from parent to child, the only human relationship within the order of nature. An individual thus acquires the condition of natural depravity by virtue of his descent from Adam and the condition of federal holiness by virtue of his descent from an individual with whom God previously established a covenant of grace. Both conditions are within the order of nature: natural depravity is an aspect of the contemporary suborder of nature; federal holiness, on the other hand, derives its significance from its association with the primeval suborder of nature.

Puritan understandings regarding natural depravity and federal holiness presuppose an order of nature radically different from current American understanding. In Puritanism nature is not immutable, and the life experiences of a procreator can affect the nature of his offspring. That this essentially Lamarkian formulation is basic to Puritan ideology should not be surprising given the nature of seventeenth-century scientific thinking.

Neither federal holiness nor natural depravity fit Weber's definition of personal charisma since neither is regarded as an extraordinary quality with which a person is endowed as a unique individual. Both, however, are discussible in terms of Weber's (1968:1135-39) concept of hereditary charisma. The relationship is most apparent in the case of federal holiness. Weber regards hereditary charisma as an impersonal form of charisma that is transferable through blood lines by virtue of which kinship groupings are perceived to be endowed with a "qualifications unattainable by natural means." Federal holiness fits this definition because it is the product of divine intervention and is transmitted from generation to generation. At first glance natural depravity does not seem to qualify as a form of hereditary charisma both because it is general to mankind and because it is perceived as a negative rather than as a positive attribute. Like federal holiness, however, it is the product of divine intervention and is transmitted from generation to generation. Because of such similarity, it might be regarded as a
special case of hereditary charisma necessitated by the Puritan desire
to classify all mankind in terms of their relationship to Deity.

Real holiness, on the other hand, appears to be consistent
with Weber's conceptualization of personal charisma. It is an
extraordinary attribute with which Deity personally endows each
individual with whom he establishes a covenant of grace. While the
attribute of federal holiness increases the possibility that an
individual will eventually obtain a condition of real holiness, real
holiness itself is not cross-generationally transmittable.

With certain reservations, the Massachusetts Puritan church
polity fits Weber's depiction of the sect. The human population is
distributed among three natural charismatic categories: those endowed
exclusively with natural depravity; those endowed with federal
holiness, and those endowed with real holiness. Baptism serves as a
boundary mechanism separating individuals endowed with federal
holiness from the depraved. The church covenant and its associated
closed communion in turn separate the personally charismatic group
endowed with real holiness from the general church membership.
Whether or not one chooses to classify this form of organization as a
sect, it is certainly a societal form in which charismatic
qualification is central to group identity and solidarity.

Mormonism. Discussion of Mormon relational categories in
terms of the orders of nature and law is facilitated by the assumption
that in Mormon ideology there are two suborders within the order of
law: the suborder of human law and the suborder of divine law. The
need for this amplification is a result of the Mormon understanding
that their church is uniquely in possession of priesthood authority.
Various conflicts both within the LDS community and between Mormons
and Gentiles might be regarded as disputes over where human as opposed
to divine law has jurisdiction. In this dissertation special
attention has been paid to the ambiguity in Mormon ideology concerning
the relationship between marital unions grounded in human law and
those grounded in divine law. The degree to which the Church has
failed to recognize humanly based civil marriage has been regarded as
a measure of the Mormon group's peripheralness within American society.
Priesthood authority, as the earthly representation of divine law, is essentially consistent with Weber's (1968:1139-41) conception of office charisma. Although Joseph Smith manifested aspects of personal charisma, his right to organize and manage the Mormon church was grounded in the understanding that he had been ordained to priesthood office by divine beings. And since the earliest days of the Church, position within the hierocracy that he established has been based on the formal transference of priesthood keys and authority.

General Mormon identity might be conceptualized in terms of the interrelationship between the suborder of divine law as manifest in the baptismal covenant and the order of nature as manifest in the various Mormon blood inheritance categories. What distinguishes this method of categorization from general American classification schemes is not so much the presence of a suborder of divine law as a depiction of nature that resembles the Puritan order of nature in important respects. Unlike Puritanism, Mormon covenant ideology does not divide nature into primeval and contemporary suborders. Like its Puritan counterpart, however, Mormon nature is mutable; and elements within it can be changed through divine intervention. This is demonstrated in the beliefs that Deity has changed the skin color of various racial groups, that the blood of a Gentile convert to Mormonism might be modified, and that the ethical characteristics manifest by pivotal ancestors might be transmitted to their descendants as a consequence of blood inheritance. While such a Lamarkian view of nature seems out of place in twentieth-century America, it is not inconsistent with the nineteenth-century tendency to merge culture and biology.

Covenantal relationships within the patriarchal order might likewise be analyzed in terms of the interrelationship between the suborder of divine law and the order of nature. Since all such relationships are established through priesthood ordinances, all are in one way or another based in divine law. As in Puritan covenant organization, the most problematic relationship within the patriarchal order is the parent-child relationship. As in Puritanism, it is the one relationship within the patriarchal order that directly involves the order of nature. The manner in which nature is involved, however, differs between the two systems.
First, unlike Puritanism, the parent-child relationship within the patriarchal order is directly grounded in the order of nature only if the parents were matrimonially sealed by priesthood authority prior to the birth of the child. If this is not the case, the child will subsequently have to be sealed to both parents if the parent-child relationship is to have validity within the context of the patriarchal order. Since this sealing ceremony is essentially an adoption ritual and is identical whether or not the parents and child share biological substance, the ensuing relationship appears to be unambiguously grounded exclusively within the order of law.

And second, in cases where the parents were matrimonially sealed prior to the birth of the child, the father-child relationship appears to be more within the order of law and the mother-child relationship more within the order of nature. In the body of the dissertation this situation was analyzed through the examination of two different types of data. First, various examples were given to illustrate the point that for a child to be born in the covenant, it is essential that it share biological substance with its mother but not with its father. And second, statements by various general authorities were presented indicating that in Mormonism motherhood is primarily conceptualized in terms of procreation and nurturing and fatherhood in terms of priesthood authority and governance.

Mormon blood categories are formally similar to the Puritan concepts of natural depravity and federal holiness in that all are biologically transferable and basically consistent with Weber's notion of hereditary charisma. Unlike Puritanism, manifestation of appropriate hereditary charisma was never regarded as a prerequisite for membership in the Mormon church. It was, however, for inclusion within the patriarchal order. Hence, because of their putative descent from Cain, Negroes could be baptized into the Church but not participate in the rituals that would allow them to establish relationships within the patriarchal order.

At a formal level, receiving one's second anointing within the Mormon church has some similarity to being declared a visible Saint within New England Puritanism. In both cases one has his "election" secured and thus becomes part of an inner Church of the redeemed. The
condition associated with having one's second anointing, however, is more akin to Weber's conception of office charisma than it is of personal charisma; and unlike real holiness, is an aspect of the order of law rather than of the order of nature.

The Mormon group bears even less similarity to Weber's depiction of the sect than does the Puritan church group. While there are various charismatic-like categories within the group, none can be unambiguously identified as personal charisma. With its emphasis on distinctive blood, personal attributes manifest in a preexistent state, and the infusion of divine powers through priesthood ordinances, however, charisma plays a decisive role in Mormon group identity and solidarity. The Mormon group is a charismatic group in the general sense of that term. The distinctive manner in which charisma is distributed within the group, however, militates against facile comparisons with other charismatic organizations.

The Church's covenant system provides the basis for a localized pattern of deference

The ordering of relationships

In this dissertation deference within both Puritan and Mormon covenant organization has primarily been discussed in terms of the formal ordering of covenantal relationships. The ordering of such relationships has been analyzed in terms of the principles of hierarchy and affirmative opposition. As indicated in chapter 2, both principles were previously identified by other investigators as basic to Puritan social structure. One contribution of this dissertation has been the demonstration that the same principles are fundamental to Mormon covenant organization.

The concept of hierarchy in Puritan covenant organization has been traced to medieval scholasticism. Among the various consequences that such a concept might potentially have for covenantal relationships, this dissertation has focused only on one: superordination versus subordination. The principle of hierarchy has thus been assumed to be present in cases where, when two individuals are covenantally linked, one is formally superordinate to the other.
The Puritan emphasis on affirmative opposition appears to be derived from the esteem with which they held the logic of Petrus Ramus. According to Ramus, two "relates" are in affirmative opposition if each derives its meaning and significance in terms of its relationship to the other. What makes such a concept more than just the relic of an antiquated system in logic is Ramus's insistence that there is an existential connection among relates. Since Puritans regarded most covenantal relationships as relates, their reliance on Ramus generated the logical necessity that each individual within the system effect actual ties based on the principle of affirmative opposition with other individuals. There were thus theoretically no citizens at large within Puritan Massachusetts; the social condition of each was defined in terms of his relationship to other members of the society to whom he stood in affirmative opposition.

Despite the lack of any obvious historical connection with Petrus Ramus, essentially the same conception underlies Mormon covenant organization. For an individual to be a fully qualified member of the Mormon group, it is not sufficient for him to be a baptized member of the Church. He must also be linked by sealing ties to particular individuals to whom he is related according to a conception similar to Ramus's depiction of affirmative opposition.

_Puritanism._ Puritan covenant organization is characterized by a large number of relationships. These may be grouped into three covenantal subsystems: the household, the church, and the state. A comprehensive analysis of all Puritan covenant relationships was not attempted in the body of the dissertation. Based on the evidence at hand, however, the church covenant relationship, linking visible saints within the local congregation, appears to be the only important explicit covenant tie not characterized by the principles of hierarchy and affirmative opposition. Covenant church members are thus conjoined on the basis of equality; and without some form of status differentiation, affirmative opposition appears to be a logical impossibility. With this one exception, essentially all explicit Puritan covenantal relationships are analyzable in terms of these principles.
The dissertation paid most attention to relationships within the household. There are basically three such relationships: husband-wife; parent-child; and master-servant. Each is characterized by hierarchy. Thus the husband is formally superordinate to the wife; the parent to the child; and the master to the servant. While not all Puritan households had all these relationships, the existential aspect of affirmative opposition was certainly operative in the construction of Puritan households. Theoretically all citizens of Massachusetts Bay Colony were expected to be part of a household and by virtue of this fact were defined in terms of their relationship to other individuals within the unit.

The dissertation was less concerned with the ordering of relationships within the church and state. Mention, however, was made of the relationship between congregation and minister and between citizen and magistrate. Both were discussed in terms of the principles of hierarchy and affirmative opposition. Data presented indicated that the minister was regarded as formally subordinate to the congregation and the magistrate to the citizenry, while neither minister, magistrate, congregation nor citizenry could validly exist independent of an actual entity to which each stood in affirmative opposition.

Mormonism. Although there are a number of covenantal rituals within the Mormon church, all explicit covenantal relationships within the patriarchal order are based upon four forms of domestic association: husband-wife, father-child, mother-child, and master-servant. Among these, the master-servant relationship is largely irrelevant to existent Mormon covenant organization; there is only one known instance of such a relationship having been established in the entire history of the Church. As a result there are only three basic relationships within Mormon covenant organization.

In terms of hierarchy and affirmative opposition these three relationships are ordered in essentially the same manner as their counterparts in the Puritan household. The husband is superordinate to the wife, the father to the child, and the mother to the child. Within the Mormon covenantal order no individual can occupy one of
these covenant positions without having established an explicit
covenantal tie with a particular individual that occupies a position
in relationship to which his own position is defined. Within the
context of the patriarchal order there is thus no such thing as an
unattached husband, wife, father, mother, or child. And thus there
are no participants at large.

All three relationships are established through sealing
rituals. The various sealing rituals in which an individual has been
involved defines his position within the patriarchal order. To be a
fully qualified member of the order an individual must be sealed as a
child to both a father and a mother and as a spouse to a husband or
wife. And anyone who does not also have children sealed to him or her
is regarded in some sense as marginal. In nineteenth-century
Mormonism a man's prestige within the Mormon group was to a degree
dependent upon the number of wives and children with whom he had
established sealing ties.

Localized deference

When operating in consort, the principles of hierarchy and
affirmative opposition affect deference behavior in two important
ways: first, they define a pattern of social inequality; and second,
they assign individuals specific positions within a group in terms of
that pattern. The result is a structure of organic solidarity in
terms of which each participant is defined by virtue of his actual
relationships to other members of the group.

Puritanism. A feature of both Puritanism and Mormonism is
that this system of deference is centered upon the localized group as
opposed to the national society. In Puritanism this is best seen in
terms of church organization. A church member's position within the
ecclesiastical organization was thus defined in terms of his
membership in the local congregation vis-a-vis the local minister.
There was no recognized church organization independent of the local
congregation.
Mormonism. In Mormonism the same point is best brought out through the recognition that while sealing relationships assume a domestic pattern, they confer particularistic status within the Mormon group and as such have no necessary connection to the domestic matrix in which one is involved as a consequence of his participation in general American society. A convert to Mormonism might thus have all essential domestic relationships in place as husband, father, and child. If such relationships have not been sealed by proper priesthood authority, however, they are of no avail within the context of the patriarchal order. Conversely, it is possible for an individual to establish valid sealing ties that have no correspondence to domestic or kinship relationships as recognized in general American society. This was demonstrated in the body of the dissertation by various examples of women being matrimonially sealed to deceased men and of children being born in the covenant to fathers with whom their mothers had never had sexual intercourse. Perhaps the best examples of this sort, however, are those of women who in the early days of the Church were simultaneously civilly married to one husband and matrimonially sealed to another.

The Church's covenant system establishes a mechanism in terms of which Mormons can relate themselves to the Mormon church in contrast to the national society in which they also participate.

Each of the various aspects of covenant organization already discussed contributes to the attachment of participants to the localized center of the group as opposed to the national center. Fundamental to this condition, however, are the interrelated elements of power distribution and encompassment. As defined in the Introduction, power in this dissertation has been regarded as the ability to establish and regulate covenantal relationships. The distribution of power is thus the manner in which this ability is ordered within the group. Encompassment, on the other hand, has
reference to the process by which one system is subsumed by another. It is through encompassment that integration within the total covenantal system is achieved.

Puritanism

The distribution of power. As already indicated, Puritanism is devoid of any concept that man can possess power to effect binding covenants between mortals and Deity. Rituals associated with such relationships are rather regarded as manifestations that these ties have already been established by God.

Power to establish covenant ties among mortals is believed to be derived from the civil authority of the state on the one hand, and the religious authority of the local congregation on the other. The state thus has authority to establish the marital relationship as well as all other civil ties. The local religious group, in contrast, can found a religious congregation by ascribing to a church covenant, establish the admittance procedures by which others may join the covenant group through being declared visible saints, and effect or dissolve the tie between the congregation and a particular minister.

Power to manage covenantal relationships is distributed among the household, the church congregation, and the state. The household head thus has authority to manage domestic relationships within his own domestic unit, the minister and visible saints those within the local congregation, and the state those within the colony as a whole.

But while power is thus broadly distributed, the state clearly has ultimate authority in the covenantal system. Within the domestic sphere it formulates the grounds upon which a marriage can be established, the legal relationships among household members, and the conditions under which a given unit may be dissolved through divorce. And within the church sphere it has power to determine what is orthodox, and to punish or banish from the colony those regarded as religious radicals and heretics. While religion was certainly a motivating force in the establishment and management of Massachusetts Bay Colony, the recognition of civil authority as the ultimate
governing power disqualifies it as a theocracy in the technical sense of the term.

**Encompassment.** Although civil authority was recognized as the most all-inclusive power within the covenant system, the process of encompassment was achieved through an essentially religious conception. As already indicated, there were three basic subsystems within Puritan covenant organization: the household, the church congregation, and the state. What integrated them within the context of a unitary system was the concept of holiness. Within the household, federal holiness was transmitted cross-generationally through the natural parent-child relationship. It was this same concept of holiness that enabled one to be a baptized member of a church congregation and to have the potential eventually to be declared a visible saint. In this way the household was encompassed by the church congregation. The church congregation in turn was encompassed by the state through the regulation that all freemen had to be visible saints and that all male visible saints could qualify as freemen. The church congregation was thus subsumed under the state in essentially the same way as the household was subsumed under the church congregation.

It was this same concept of holiness that ultimately provided the grounds upon which the members of the covenant system related themselves to the localized colonial order as opposed to national British society. Although civil authority was the ultimate power within both, from the Puritan point of view it was qualitatively different within Massachusetts Bay Colony than within Britain. This difference stemmed from the fact that the colony was a holy commonwealth. Its affairs were administered by holy men who were visible saints within church congregations primarily made up of families who had the ability to transmit federal holiness from generation to generation. Except during the years of the protectorate, the governmental system and societal order in the mother country in no way fulfilled such specifications. Thus while the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay Colony continued to be a part of general
British society, they were at the same time a people apart--bound together through their common possession of distinctive holiness.

Mormonism

The distribution of power. As has been repeatedly pointed out, one of the distinctive features of Mormonism is the belief in priesthood, a charismatic quality believed to be possessed exclusively by properly ordained Mormon males. All Mormon covenantal relationships are established through the enactment of priesthood ordinances; and consistent with the belief that priesthood is completely independent of civil authority, no civilly established ties are recognized within the context of the patriarchal order. In contrast to Puritan belief, Mormon ideology accepts the notion that through the enactment of proper priesthood ordinances, binding covenant relationships can be established between God and mortals as well as among mortals themselves.

Through the concept of delegated keys, Mormons view priesthood as being distributed among Mormon men in an orderly and well-managed fashion. The manner in which such authority is delegated within the context of the patriarchal order becomes more intelligible if it is assumed that it has two centers or loci: one theoretical and the other pragmatic.

Theoretical power centers in Adam and the priesthood keys that he monopolizes as the presiding patriarch of the human family. When the patriarchal order is established in its perfection in the celestial kingdom, Mormons believe that this power will pass by patriarchal succession from Adam to his righteous male descendants. By virtue of this delegated patriarchal authority, each will be empowered to govern the wives and children under his jurisdiction.

Pragmatic power, on the other hand, centers in the living president of the Church and the priesthood keys that he monopolizes as the temporary presiding high priest of the visible Mormon kingdom. This priesthood, as distributed among Mormon males through the differential delegation of priesthood keys, generates the Church's hierocracy. It is only by virtue of the power monopolized by the
president of the Church that sealing relationships can be established and dissolved. And it is through the portion of this power that has been delegated to Mormon males that they are regarded by the Church as religiously qualified to preside over the wives and children that have been sealed to them.

**Encompassment.** It is through the process of encompassment that the pattern of domestic inequality within the individual Mormon household becomes basic to the general system of deference within the Mormon group as a whole. Encompassment within the Mormon covenant system primarily involves the relationship between the family and the hierocracy. While the Church was attempting to establish the New Jerusalem, this process was primarily achieved through the consecration and stewardship covenant. On the basis of a formal document, a covenantal relationship was established between the bishop, as representative of the hierocracy, and the head of the household. By virtue of this covenant, the household head became dependent upon the hierocracy both for continued rights to the stewardship that he had received at the time he consecrated his real property to the Church and for his family's position within the Church's covenantal order. Since the covenant was a transaction only between himself and the bishop, the household head was the link between the hierocracy and the rest of the family. His wife and children had no rights in the system independent of the covenant that he as household head had entered into.

After the patriarchal order was established in the early 1840s, the husband/father continued to be the critical link between the hierocracy and the individual Mormon family. This link, however, was now not established by formal covenant between the husband/father and a representative of the hierocracy, but by virtue of his own position within the hierocracy. In order to become a patriarch by having wives and children sealed to him, it was essential that he be ordained an elder within the Melchizedek Priesthood and thus become at least a nominal member of the hierocracy. The manner in which his family unit was encompassed by the hierocracy was in part a function
of the priesthood keys that were delegated to him from the president of the Church.

In the Nauvoo period the family patriarch was ultimately equated with the priest and king, who by virtue of having received his second anointing had theoretically become a nearly autonomous center of salvation for those who were linked to him through sealing ties. At this point the relationship was the most tenuous that it would ever be between the individual patriarchal family and the hierocracy as an organized body.

During the ensuing years the patriarchal family was to increasingly lose its independence and consequently became more under the direction of the hierocracy as an organized body. This was achieved through three processes: (1) regularizing prerequisites by which one could establish or enter a patriarchal family; (2) placing limits on the size of the individual patriarchal family; and (3) downplaying and eventually virtually doing away with the status of priest and king. The end result was a grouping of nuclear families who were directly dependent upon the hierocracy for their creation and continuance.

While the complexities of how these various processes were worked out through time are too complicated to be reiterated here, the most important element was that the family unit in varying degrees remained dependent upon the hierocracy for its creation and continued existence. Since the sealing power by which the family was established as an eternal unit was monopolized by the hierocracy and was absent from civil society, belief in its efficacy resulted in the family being oriented to the localized Mormon group as opposed to the national system. In as much as the principles of social differentiation within the patriarchal order were the same as those within the individual family, there was thus no clear demarcation where domestic ordering terminated and religious group ordering began: the individual family unit was an integral part of the Mormon group as a whole.
Assumption 3

Modifications which have occurred in the covenant system might be characterized as adjustments necessitated by the Mormon group's changing relationship to secular society.

Both Puritan and Mormon covenant organization changed through time. In each case many of the most important of these changes occurred essentially at the same time as did crucial modifications in the respective group's relationship to the larger society to which it was at least nominally attached. Because of the temporal proximity of these two types of changes, it is possible to analyze the first as a consequence of the second. In other words, modifications in covenant organization might be regarded as pragmatic adjustments to the particular religious group's changing relationship to general British or American society.

During the course of the historical spans that have been considered in the body of the dissertation, Puritanism and Mormonism evidence similar stages in their relationship to the larger societies in which they originated. In both instances three basic phases are discernible: first, a period of persecution as a minority religion; second, a period of local dominance in a relatively isolated geographic region; and third, a period of rapid integration with the larger society.

Despite these covert similarities, there were marked dissimilarities between the development of Puritanism and Mormonism. At least part of these differences can be explained in terms of the relationship between church and state in the parent societies. Early seventeenth-century England approximated a condition referred to by Weber (1968:1160-63) as caesaropapism: religious practices and ecclesiastical affairs were regulated by secular administrators. Such functionaries had ultimate power to determine the nature of the state religion and the rules of conformity to which English subjects were to comply. Nineteenth-century America, on the other hand, was characterized by a formal separation of church and state. Amid the foment of voluntaristic pluralism each religious system was theoretically free to develop independent of state regulation and sponsorship.
This basic difference in the relationship between church and state dictated the distinctive conditions that each religious group had to meet if it was to persist through time. Puritanism had to develop an intervening mechanism that would isolate it from the religious prescriptions and proscriptions of the English state. Mormonism, on the other hand, had to establish a condition that would enable it to maintain cohesion despite the centrifugal tendencies to which it was heir as a movement that had arisen amid the religious competition of the Second Great Awakening.

Covenant organization was basic to the survival strategy that each religious system worked out. While the two forms of covenant organization were similar in various respects, they emerged in very different social contexts and were consequently modified in response to dissimilar pressures from the larger society.

**Puritanism**

Although there is some overlap in developments, Puritan history discussed in chapter 2 of this dissertation might conveniently be divided into four general phases: (1) English inception, from the mid-sixteenth century to the establishment of Massachusetts Bay Colony; (2) early colonial, from the establishment of Massachusetts Bay Colony to shortly before the instigation of the half-way covenant; (3) mature colonial, from the instigation of the half-way covenant to the revocation of the first Massachusetts Bay Colony; and (4) integration and decline, following the revocation of the first charter. While a fundamental concern throughout the entire period is the isolation of Puritan institutions from the regulatory power of British government, each phase is characterized both by a different relationship to secular society and by important changes in covenant organization.

**English inception**

Early English Puritanism is diverse and complex. In general terms it might be regarded as a movement in opposition to the religious procedures of the state. From the perspective of the form
of Puritanism that was later to be established in Massachusetts, three developments within early English Puritanism were of particular importance: (1) the acceptance of Calvinism; (2) the desire to organize gathered churches consisting exclusively of the religiously qualified; and (3) the instigation of the church covenant as a means to organize local religious congregations.

From the perspective of the group's relationship to the state, the church covenant was perhaps the most consequential; it provided the mechanism in terms of which those who accepted Calvinism and opposed the established church polity might regard themselves as having been gathered out of the world and united as an integrated body of believers. As discussed in chapter 2, the employment of church covenants antedates the general Puritan movement, and as early as the time of Queen Mary they were used to organize religious groupings independent of the established church. It is well suited for a religious grouping that is attempting to exist in opposition to a condition of caesaropapism. Through the employment of a church covenant, such a group can maintain that the authority to organize a church resides not with the state but with the local congregation. The church covenant provides the charter for the local group, states its dogma and code of conduct, and establishes the boundary separating the participants from the rest of the world. In short, it provides the basis for religious autonomy.

Early colonial

In the period immediately following the establishment of Massachusetts Bay Colony the most important modifications in Puritan covenant organization centered upon the establishment of three policies: (1) that only those who could give evidence of having received the covenant of grace would be permitted to enter a church covenant group; (2) that freemanship was to be extended to all male members of church covenant groups; and (3) that no one who was not a member of a church covenant group could obtain the status of freeman. When considered in concert, these three policies can be understood as as an extension of the process of insulation from the
caesaropapism of the English state that had earlier begun with the instigation of the church covenant. The granting of the charter, coupled with the fact that the Acts of Uniformity did not extend beyond England and Wales, created the condition that Puritanism in Massachusetts could be established and maintained through local political processes. This, however, was possible only if local political processes were monopolized by those who were sympathetic with Puritanism. The three policies worked together to ensure this outcome. By establishing nonbehavioral requirements for the granting of church covenant status, hardline Puritans were given much more discretion regarding who could or could not belong to this elite group. It was not sufficient that one behave a certain way or profess certain beliefs; one had to demonstrate that he was truly a Puritan. By restricting freemanship to individuals with church covenant status, insurance was given that the political processes of the colony would be monopolized by the type of individual who could pass the rigid religious qualifications that had been linked to the granting of this position. Finally, additional security was given by broadening freemanship to include all male visible saints; if for some unforeseen reason an individual with political authority was acting against the interests of the Puritan community, the orthodox visible saints qua freemen were empowered to remove him from office.

Mature colonial

The most important modifications in the second generation of Massachusetts Puritanism were (1) the virtual restriction of church membership to the descendants of visible saints; (2) the increased restriction on the number of church members who could qualify for church covenant status; and (3) the instigation of the half-way covenant. These developments might be characterized as attempts by orthodox Puritans to maintain power as the group's relationship to secular society was changing. As such they were logical extensions of the policies that had been established in the early years of the colony's existence.
Despite the formulation that the colony was a holy commonwealth, it was attracting large numbers of individuals who were unsympathetic to the Puritan cause. Even among Puritans there was considerable dispute concerning such issues as the proper structure that the church polity should assume, the proper rules of discipline, and the content of orthodox religion. Although Puritan traditionalists thus far had been able to monopolize religious and political processes, their somber jeremiads give every indication that they felt themselves under siege.

Restricting church membership to the descendants of visible saints was one way to guarantee that political power would remain a monopoly of those families who at least at one time had possessed a correct understanding of what the structure of the holy commonwealth should be like. These individuals would be most likely to preserve the correct traditions. The concept of federal holiness provided a religious justification for such restriction. Sharply curtailing the number of children of visible saints who were granted church covenant status was but another aspect of the same process. Not even all the children of the orthodox could be entrusted with preserving the proper traditions. Such restrictions on full religious participation heightened the dilemma of how to maintain the loyalty and support of those denied full religious participation. The half-way covenant was at least a partial solution. If the noncovenant children of visible saints agreed to maintain proper church discipline, their children could become baptized members of the Church. Such a formulation, of course, didn’t even begin to address the issue of what to do with the large numbers of people who, because they lacked the proper descent qualifications, were not even permitted to be baptized.

Integration and decline

While the Puritan solutions for the preservation of the integrity of their group resulted in increasing numbers of people being denied full religious and political participation, it continued to operate in an essentially orderly manner until the closing years of the seventeenth century. Religious and political affairs continued to
be regulated by freemen; only visible saints qualified as freemen; and essentially only those who accepted the religious and political concepts of the colony's founders qualified as visible saints.

This order was not disrupted until action by the larger society destroyed the basis for political autonomy. When the first Massachusetts Charter was annulled in 1684, the local Puritan elite lost their ability to determine the qualifications for freemanship and political office. With this development the manner in which they had sought to politically insulate themselves from general British society was disrupted, and the colony to a large extent was politically reintegrated into general British society.

This did not mean, as it might have done fifty years before, that the central government now took measures to crush Puritanism in the colony. Rather, the colony was forced to accept the principle of religious tolerance and with it the condition of voluntaristic pluralism. Lacking its political infrastructure, the general principle unifying the system of Puritan covenant organization was disrupted, and the movement eventually split into a number of disparate and often competing sects.

Basic to the Puritan order were mechanisms to isolate it from a caesaropapistic state attempting to enforce religious conformity. When the state's regulations changed from conformity to that of tolerance, many of these mechanisms lost their relevance and the nature of Massachusetts Puritanism was radically transformed.

Mormonism

Seven basic phases of Mormon history have been examined in this dissertation: (1) from the organization of the Church until the expulsion from Missouri; (2) from the settlement of Nauvoo until the death of Joseph Smith; (3) from the death of Joseph Smith until the exodus from Nauvoo; (4) from the exodus from Nauvoo until Brigham Young's 1848 arrival in the Salt Lake Valley; (5) from Brigham Young's 1848 arrival in the Salt Lake Valley until the coming of the railroad in 1869; (6) from the coming of the railroad until the 1894 revelation on lineal sealing; (7) and finally the period following the 1894
revelation. Each of these periods may be described in terms of both shifts in the relationship between the Mormon group and general American society and in modifications in the covenant organization of the Church. The body of the dissertation has provided a detailed analysis of the logical relationships between these types of changes. In the following paragraphs only a few of the more salient features of these relationships will be summarized.

Pre-Nauvoo period

External conditions. Mormonism emerged during the early Jacksonian phase of American history. This period has been characterized as a time of rapid change. Many Americans were experiencing geographic and economic displacement. Political policies and procedures were dominated by the concepts of states's rights and nongovernmental interference. Voluntaristic pluralism, sectarian conflict, and rivivalism were basic features of American religious life.

Internal conditions. At the time of its inception, Mormonism's greatest challenge was to produce a religious system that would appear more attractive than its competitors to a sizable number of people. Its response was in part the creation of a system that in important respects appeared to be the antithesis of the socioreligious milieu in which it emerged. Thus great emphasis was placed on order, regulation, geographic and economic stability, and the restoration of the one true and universal church.

Covenantal response. A fundamental feature of this emphasis on stability was the rapid development of a complex covenantal system in terms of which relationships among members were ordered and regulated. Among its more important features were the following: (1) the existence of an exclusive priesthood with its officiants integrated in terms of an hierarchically ordered hierocracy; (2) a covenantal structure in terms of which individual Mormon families were encompassed by the hierocracy; (3) Mormon identity expressed in terms
of putative Abrahamic descent; and (4) the employment of territoriality and economic control for the establishment of group cohesion. All but the last of these features was to persist as basic to Mormon covenant organization.

Among these four features, priesthood was perhaps most crucial for the subsequent development of Mormonism. It provided a basis for group cohesion that was particularly suited to American voluntaristic pluralism.

To understand why this is so, it is useful to compare Mormon priesthood with the Puritan church covenant. Both provide a basis for church organization independent of the state. But while the church covenant is well suited for the development of a minority religion in a society dominated by a caesaropapistic state attempting to maintain religious uniformity, the same is not true in a milieu characterized by voluntaristic pluralism. This is because the church covenant concept presupposes that religious authority is centered in the members of the covenant group and thus makes no provisions for distinguishing between competing religious groups employing church covenants as their organizing charters. This is evidenced by the splintering and disintegration that occurred in Puritanism subsequent to the annulment of the first Massachusetts Bay Charter. In contrast to the church covenant formulation, the Mormon priesthood concept assumes that religious authority is independent of human action and is divinely infused into only one religious group. The acceptance of the Mormon claim to priesthood authority presupposes that no competing group can be right. The priesthood concept did not prevent the development of schisms within Mormonism. The basic issue in such contests, however, was the question of who had the keys of the priesthood. And the line of Mormonism that has been examined in this dissertation was able to justify its claims in such a way that it continued to grow and expand.

The encompassment of the Mormon family by the hierocracy has been only slightly less important for the development of Mormonism than has the priesthood concept. As has already been discussed, Puritan households were encompassed by church congregations. These in turn were encompassed by the state through the monopolization of
political processes by visible saints. There was no mechanism linking the Puritan household directly to the Puritan group as a whole. When the political mechanism uniting the church congregations was destroyed, the individual household was integrated only into the local congregation.

Economic and territorial control were perhaps the most impractical aspects of early Mormon covenant organization. They appear to have departed too radically from the individualistic aspects of Jacksonian social life. Attempts to implement them resulted in both dissension within the Mormon group and persecution from without.

Early Nauvoo period

External conditions. After the expulsion of the Mormon group from Missouri, they had been welcomed in Illinois. And the legislature had granted the City of Nauvoo a charter with provisions for a high degree of local self-government. Mormon interpretations of the charter coupled with a lack of sympathy with various of their beliefs and practices, however, resulted in a renewal in the Mormon-Gentile conflict.

Internal conditions. Two conditions appear to have dominated Mormon internal affairs during the early Nauvoo period. First, covenant organization was in disarray as the result of the loss of territoriality and economic control as unifying mechanisms. Second, a Mormon siege mentality had developed as a consequence of the persecutions that they had experienced. With the renewal of hostilities, there was the growing expectation that they would again be expelled and perhaps be "broken up" as a people.

Covenantal response. Mormon covenantal development during this period might be interpreted as a response to these various developments. There were marked changes in the nature of covenantal relationships and extensive elaborations in covenantal myth, ideology, and ritual. Baptism for the dead, the endowment, celestial marriage, polygamy, the second anointing, the eternal nature of familial
association, the essential equivalence of God and man, the concept of a Mother in Heaven, the premortal grand council in heaven, and the concept of the Adamic patriarchal order were all either introduced or greatly elaborated during this period.

But while Mormon covenant organization appears to have undergone radical change during this period, there were relatively few modifications in the basic covenantal structure of the Mormon group. The most important of these was that sealing replaced economics and territoriality as the basis for covenantal ties. This change, however, was crucial for the subsequent development of the Mormon group. Since sealing was grounded in marriage and kinship, it did away with the types of covenantal interaction that were required when the basic raison d'être of the Mormon group had been the establishment of the New Jerusalem and the instigation of the law of consecration and stewardship. Mormon group cohesion was now freed from territorial and economic constraints.

Although it is difficult to comprehend completely the type of covenantal order that Joseph Smith was attempting to construct during the closing years of his life, it appears to have been devised to ensure the continued existence of the Mormon group despite the possible dispersion of the Saints and the loss of contact among the members of the hierocracy. The two key elements in this scheme were the status of priest and king and the ordinance of sealing. A man who had become a priest and king through receiving his second anointing could thus serve as a center of salvation to all who in some sense were linked to him through sealing ties.

Late Nauvoo

External conditions. The late Nauvoo period was characterized by increasing hostility leading to the repeal of the Nauvoo Charter and the imperative that the Mormons abandon the City of Nauvoo.

Internal conditions. Two basic internal conditions in the later Nauvoo period were of particular importance. First the succession crisis that followed the murder of Joseph Smith tended to
fragment the Mormon group to the extent the Brigham Young and the
apostles were apprehensive about the possibility of deep schisms
within the Church. And second, faced with the need to leave Nauvoo,
Church leaders came to be believe that the only salvation for the
Mormon group lay in leaving the United States as an organized body.

Covenantal response. Covenantal organization provided ways to
cope with these conditions. Brigham Young and the apostles in part
validated their claim as the true successors to Joseph Smith by
maintaining that they had received from him the authority to perform
temple rituals. They marshaled the support of the Mormon people
through the construction of the temple. And they helped prevent
factionalism by insisting that only those who were supportive of their
leadership would receive the covenantal ordinances once the temple was
complete.

Shortly before the start of the exodus, covenantal ordinances
were instigated in the attic of the temple. For the first time the
rank and file membership of the Church participated in the endowment,
sealing, and second anointing ceremonies. Mass participation in these
rituals helped cement the loyalty of the LDS people to the apostles,
markedly increased their cohesion as a people, and enhanced the
separation that they felt from American society. They now felt
themselves ready to "flee into the wilderness."

As far as can be determined, adoptive sealings were first
performed during the closing days that the Nauvoo Temple was in
operation. This ritual greatly expanded the organizing possibilities
of the sealing network that had previously been based essentially only
in celestial marriage. Although adoptive sealing was only performed
to a limited extent in the Nauvoo Temple, its operation was fully
consistent with the attempt then being made to employ temple rituals
as a way to increase group solidarity.

Plains period

External conditions. As the Mormon group was in the process
of attempting to leave the political jurisdiction of the United
States, there was a tendency toward a near political separation between themselves and the rest of American society. This condition to a degree was militated against by the calling of the Mormon Battalion in the summer of 1846.

Internal conditions. The overriding concern of the LDS leadership during this period was the preservation of group solidarity and the successful migration of the Mormon people to the new gathering place in the West. The achievement of both of these goals was complicated by the centrifugal forces associated with the difficulty of the trek and the lack of territorial focus.

Covenantal response. Forms of covenantal organization were devised to deal with many of the difficulties. The family was designated as the basic unit of subsistence and production. Because of the manner in which the family had come to be encompassed by the hierocracy, however, basic group cohesion was preserved. The concept of adoptive sealing was employed to merge smaller family units into larger and more effective units. And adoptive sealing was employed in ideology formulations that envisioned the entire Mormon group as a kinship polity conjoined through a unitary sealing network.

Early Utah period

External conditions. With the colonization of the Great Salt Lake Valley, the Mormon people for the first time in their history felt themselves to be freed from a persecuting and hostile Gentile society. The treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo gave the United States government nominal jurisdiction over the areas where the Mormons were settling, but they were hundreds of miles from any sizable Gentile population. And by means of the Utah territorial system of government, they were able to enjoy a greater measure of self-rule than they had been able to achieve under the Nauvoo Charter.

Internal conditions. At least temporarily removed from any external threat and having established a permanent location for
settlement, Mormon needs for group cohesion were now markedly changed. The Church desired to occupy as large a geographic area as possible and establish an essentially self-sufficient economy based on agricultural production. Given the environmental restraints of the Great Basin, the best way to achieve these goals was by means of a highly mobile work force of essentially independent farmers. With the consequent geographic separation, economic independence, and residential mobility, it was essential that the structural relationship between the individual members of the Church and the group as a whole be clearly articulated and readily intelligent in order that Mormon cohesion be preserved.

Covenantal response. As had previously been the case, the Mormon covenantal system underwent modifications that made it more adaptive to the current circumstances in which the LDS people were placed. First, the practice of adoptive sealing was suspended. This resulted in the effective size of the patriarchal family being limited to that of a man, his wives, and his unmarried children. Such units were much more adaptive to the geographic and economic conditions of the Great Basin than were the larger patriarchal units that had developed during the plains period. Second, the second anointing ordinance was now not performed. This eliminated the existence of semi-independent power sources associated with the status of priest and king. As a result, heads of patriarchal family units became much more directly dependent upon the hierocracy as an organized body. There would thus be less chance of schismatic groups developing in areas geographically isolated from Church headquarters at Salt Lake City. Third, rules governing sealing relationships became more routinized and centralized. And forth, the concept of the properly established patriarchal family as an integral aspect of the Mormon church was emphasized. These last two developments had the tendency to increase the structural cohesion between the group as a whole and the individual family despite the centrifugal tendencies associated with geographic dispersion.
Late Utah

External conditions. Utah history after the end of the civil war and especially after the coming of the railroad in 1869 was marked with increasing hostility between Mormons and Gentiles. Mining and commercial interests in Utah were principally developed by Gentiles. The railroad eliminated much of the geographic isolation that the Mormons had enjoyed in the 1850s. National crusades were organized against the "Mormon Menace." And in its attempt to eliminate the practice of polygamy, the federal government passed legislation that by the late 1880s had resulted in the property of the Mormon church being escheated, its membership effectively disenfranchised, and most of its leading hierocratics either in prison or on the underground.

Internal conditions. Throughout the period the Mormon group continued to lose ground in the conflict. Its attempts to mobilize its membership against outside economic interests were only partially successful. Lobbying efforts in Washington did not prevent the enactment of harmful legislation, and the Church's attempts to have the Supreme Court declare such laws unconstitutional were in vain. Finally in 1890 the president of the Church declared his intention to comply with federal antipolygamy laws. This action signaled a reorientation of many aspects of Mormon institutions as the Mormon group attempted to become successfully integrated with general American society while still preserving its distinctive identity.

Covenantal response. During the early stages of the conflict the Church was involved with the establishment of two different covenantal systems that might have provided potential solutions to the crisis. The first involved the reinstigation in the mid-1870s of practices earlier associated with the law of consecration and stewardship. The general acceptance of such practices would have resulted in the economic separation of the Mormon group from general American society. Such a course was consistent with the desire of some Mormons to become as isolated from mainstream America as possible. The second centered upon the covenantal practices
associated with temple rituals. Late in 1865 second anointings began
to be once more performed, and after the 1877 dedication of the St.
George Temple the ordinance of adoptive sealings was reinstigated.
Temple rituals had no necessary association with the integration of
the Mormon church with mainstream America, but neither did they imply
increased isolation.

For a time virtually all previously existing covenantal
aspects of Mormon group life were simultaneously in operation.
Shortly after the death of Brigham Young in July of 1877, however,
most of the practices associated with the attempt to reinstate the
law of consecration and stewardship were abandoned. The Mormon
covenant order was to remain grounded in temple rituals rather than
economic cooperation.

The 1890 Manifesto resulted in the elimination of polygamy as
an operative feature of Mormon covenantal organization. While Mormon
hierocratics had long taught that plural marriage was a fundamental
tenet of Mormonism, its elimination as an active practice had little
effect upon the actual structural relationships within the patriarchal
order. While the potential size of the patriarchal family was
reduced, the husband/father remained the point of articulation between
family members and the hierocracy.

The covenantal system, however, did respond in important ways
to the general rapprochement that was occurring between the Mormon
group and general American society. The most significant event was the
1894 revelation on adoptive sealing. By having sealing ties forged
between living family heads and dead ancestors rather than between
living family heads and living hierocratics, individual Mormon
families were freed to become individually entwined in the political
and economic fabric of American society while still conceptually being
embedded in the patriarchal order. Existent relationships within the
order did not differ radically from those of the early Utah period.
Sealing ties with dead ancestors, however, created a pattern of
conceptual separation and cohesion that was not essential in the
geographic isolation of the 1850s and 1860s.
Contemporary Mormonism

External conditions. The twentieth century has been characterized by an increasing acceptance of the Mormon group by general American society. Although there are currently occasional displays of anti-Mormon sentiment, these are innocuous when compared with the situation in the last century. During the later part of the twentieth century, the greatest change in the external situation in which the Church has found itself has been the diversity of societies in which its membership have permanently resided.

Internal conditions. In most contexts, contemporary American Mormons resemble the general population. They tend to be politically conservative and opposed to trends that they regard as permissive. They have not, however, modified the stand that their religious system is the only true church upon the face of the earth. They continue to proselyte vigorously and to send their missionary force to almost any country that they are allowed to enter. Especially since the Second World War their proselytizing efforts have met with great success, and outside of the United States much of their growth is occurring in Latin America and the Orient.

Covenantal response. The Church's covenantal system has continued to respond to changing circumstances. The rapprochement that occurred between the Mormon church and American society might best be represented by the Church requirement that all married members of the Church be civilly wedded while also being encouraged to be married celestially in one of the Church's temples. Thus celestial marriage is now superimposed upon civil marriage, and a couple thus joined are regarded as properly united both in secular society and in the Church's covenantal system.

Most of the other modifications in the Church's covenantal system have had the tendency to break down any internal status differentiation except that resulting from husband-wife and parent-child relationships and to make its ordinances accessible to all members who are qualified to receive them. After the mid-1920s,
the giving of second anointings was sharply curtailed, and those who received this ordinance were expected to not make that fact known to others. This effectively eliminated the possibility of any inner covenant community within that established through endowment and sealing rituals. Second, beginning in the 1950s effort was made to have temples constructed at locations outside the areas where Mormons had colonized. This effort was intensified in the 1970s and 1980s, and today there are Mormon temples throughout the world. This signaled the increasing role that temple ordinances were coming to play in Mormon group cohesion as the solidarity that might be derived from population concentration dissipated. And third, in 1978 the president of the Church announced that he had received a revelation allowing all worthy male members to be ordained to the priesthood regardless of race. This opened the way for Negro members of the Church to participate in temple rituals and thus to be on an equal footing with other Church members as far as the covenantal system of the Church was concerned.

With the worldwide expansion of the Church has come increased emphasis on the family as the basic unit of the Church. Official Church literature increasingly depicts the Mormon group as a collection of families being directed and regulated by the divinely inspired hierocracy. Mormon covenant organization is well suited to such a conceptualization. By directing the religious life of its membership in terms of issues regarding proper sexual conduct, family life and kinship ties, the Church seeks to avoid conflicts that could arise between it and the societies in which its membership resides if it were to involve itself in economic and political issues.

As in the past, stresses and strains persist because of various inconsistencies between formal Mormon covenant organization and the life situation of individual Latter-day Saints. Among the most important of these are the following: (1) discontent on the part of some Mormon women because of their subordinate position within the covenant system; and (2) the large numbers of Mormons who are not fully integrated into the covenant system because they are unmarried, married to a nonmember spouse, or are the children of nonmember or inactive parents.
Assumption 4

The Church's covenantal system has facilitated the preservation of Mormon group cohesion within a context of flux and change.

In the Introduction to the dissertation, Wolf's concept of "multiple adaptation" was presented as one way to analyze the interrelationship between a peripheral group and the larger society of which it is a part. This formulation will now be returned to as the relationship between covenant organization and group continuity is discussed.

As outlined in the previous section, both Puritan and Mormon covenant organization underwent significant change as each group's relationship to larger society developed through time. And the members of both groups ultimately became integrated into the political and economic systems of the larger society. Given such developments, it is useful in many respects to characterize the development of both groups as a process of "dynamic multiple adaptation." In other words, over time the smaller group became increasingly informed by the larger until it was effectively absorbed by it.

Before such a view can be uncritically accepted, however, it is useful to consider aspects of Puritanism and Mormonism that did not change. Two of the most significant persisting features shared by Puritanism and Mormonism are the following: (1) the intertwining of religious and kinship identity; and (2) the encompassment of the household by a larger religious institution. In terms of both of these features they bear some resemblance to both the East Indians of rural Guyana and the Indians of Guatemala.

First, in all four cases, primordial attachment is an important basis for group identity. In the Guyanese and Guatemalan examples such attachment is expressed in rather conventional terms. Among the East Indians of Guyana, group identity is grounded in the ethnic concept of common national origin. Among the inhabitants of Guatemala's Indian municipios, it is ethnicity combined with territoriality. Primordial attachment among Puritans and Mormons was less conventional. In both cases group identity was in part derived from a belief that religious qualification could to a degree be
biologically transmitted. For the Puritans it was federal holiness that was transmitted; and for Mormons, the qualities associated with Abrahamic descent.

Since (at least during the time spans discussed in this dissertation) neither the Puritan nor Mormon group had been in existence for more than four or five generations, such attachment may appear to some observers to be less authentically primordial than that manifest in the first two groups. At least in the case of the Mormons, however, this form of attachment had important consequences for the preservation of group cohesion. The belief that they were literally the covenant offspring of Abraham established a nonnormative boundary between themselves and those outside the group. As occurs with ethnicity, such a boundary could persist independent both of modifications in the group's internal composition and of its degree of political, economic, and geographic integration with larger society.

And second, in all four cases, the family or household is encompassed by an institutional structure that is basic to the integration of the group as a totality. In the case of the East Indians, this structure is the localized system of deference derived from the participation of male heads in religious rituals. In the municipios of highland Guatemala it is the civil-religious hierocracy. For the Puritans of Massachusetts it is the religious congregation. And for the Mormons it is the hierocracy. By having the household or family encompassed in this manner, familial or household ties become basic structural relationships within the larger group of which the family or household unit is an integral element. As long as the basic process of encompassment persists and the nature of family or household composition is not radically changed, basic structural continuity within the group will persist despite other organizational changes.

Perhaps the East Indians of Guyana and the Mormons are most similar with respect to the process of family encompassment. In both instances the male head occupies the fundamental position between the household and the group as a whole. As demonstrated by the work of Raymond Smith and Chandra Jayawardena in Guyana, this structural arrangement can result in the preservation of important aspects of
group identity and solidarity despite the independent involvement of

group members in the broader deference and status systems of the
national society. Data presented in the body of the dissertation
suggests that this has also occurred within the Mormon group.

In this dissertation, Mormonism has been characterized as an
attempt to establish and maintain a condition of order within an
environment characterized by change and disorder. Covenant
organization has been examined as a basic way in which Mormon order
was established and regulated. As has been demonstrated, the attempt
to establish this covenant order was in part responsible for the
condition of disorder that it was attempting to overcome. Amid the
various upheavals that the Church experienced, however, a basic form
of covenant organization was preserved. This provided an important
basis of continuity for the Mormon group despite the other changes
that they were experiencing. If other aspects of the system were
modified or abandoned, it might be argued that such actions
contributed to the condition of order, which was itself a fundamental
goal of the church as an institution. The end result has been a far
greater integration of the Mormon people with the rest of American
society than was at first anticipated. If, however, the basic
covenant system of the Church has been preserved, and the Mormon
people have found a way simultaneously to participate both within
their own covenant order and within general American society, then it
might be argued that a condition of static adaptation has been
achieved.

Concluding Statement

The dissertation started by identifying Mormon group cohesion
as a problematic issue that warranted additional investigation.

The church-sect typology was then introduced as the most
generally employed method to investigate issues of this sort. Because
of two principal reasons it was rejected as an adequate conceptual
model for the analysis of Mormon group cohesion: first, it had
previously been employed to investigate aspects of Mormon development
and had been found to be defective; and second, it made unwarranted a
priori assumptions both about the *raison d'être* of an incipient religious organization and about the effects that secular society might have on the course of its development.

It was suggested that an alternative approach might prove more adequate. As detailed in the Introduction, this approach was based on Edward Shils's concept of center and periphery and upon various theoretical insights gained through the investigation of societal groupings in the Caribbean and in Mesoamerica. In this model the religious group would be regarded as a peripheral group within a larger society. It would be assumed to possess its own internal system of order based on localized values, institutions, and elite personnel. The analysis would consist first in identifying the basic aspects of the internal system as initially manifest and then in examining how these were modified as the group's relationship with larger society changed through time.

Because of the prominent role of covenant making in Mormon belief and practice, there was good reason to suppose that it was basic to Mormon group identity and solidarity. It was decided that rather than attempting to identify and analyze all aspects of the Mormon internal system, that only covenantal relationships would be dealt with. The basic task of the dissertation therefore became the application of the model for the investigation of the relationship between Mormon covenant organization and Mormon group identity and solidarity.

Due to similarities between Mormon and Puritan covenant organization and because of the possible historical connection between the two groups, it was concluded that the nature of Mormon covenant organization might be better understood if it was compared and contrasted with that found in New England Puritanism. The comparison between the two systems itself, however, was to be only a secondary issue and therefore subordinate to the primary objective of analyzing the relationships between Mormon covenant organization and Mormon group cohesion.

In the Introduction four basic assumptions were put forth regarding the interrelationship among Mormon covenant organization, Mormon group cohesion, and the position of the Mormon group vis-a-vis
general American society. The point was made that if the results of the dissertation analysis could substantiate these assumptions then the methodological approach of the dissertation could to a degree be validated and the relationship between Mormon covenant organization and Mormon group cohesion demonstrated. The second chapter employed the methodological approach described in the Introduction to briefly analyze Puritan covenant organization. The next five chapters employed the same methodology for an extended examination of Mormon covenant organization. The first section of this concluding chapter involved an investigation of the four assumptions in terms of the material that had been analyzed in the body of the dissertation. It is now time to make some general conclusions about the approach that has been employed in the dissertation and the type of insights that it provides.

First, the method does provide one approach to the investigation of social cohesion. Unlike the church-sect typology, religious organization is not considered as a special form of association. The religious group is thus regarded as any other societal grouping and is analyzed with methods similar to those that might be employed for the examination of an ethnic or status group.

Second, it readily identifies a large number of elements that contribute to group cohesion. It is flexible enough to permit the relationship among these elements to be examined in a broad variety of ways.

Third, since the group is regarded as an element in larger society, developments within the group become meaningful in terms of influences exerted on the group by conditions within the more pervasive society. No a priori assumption, however, is made regarding the nature and consequences of these influences. The course of historical process is thus treated as indeterminate.

Fourth, the analysis can readily assume proportions that are impractical. While such an examination suggests the general dimensions of social cohesion within a given group, it does not lend itself to an in-depth analysis of the nature and interrelationship of a reduced number of features that contribute to that cohesion. Because of this, the analysis that has been attempted in this
dissertation might best be regarded as preliminary in nature. It
identifies a large number of elements that contribute to the cohesion
of a particular group and indicates some of the ways in which those
elements are interwoven. Once these general contours have been
established, it is then possible to employ other methodology to
examine some of these elements in greater detail. To attempt to carry
out the second form of analysis without having undertaken the first
could lead to serious distortion.
APPENDIX A

THE WIVES OF HEBER C. KIMBALL

In all, some forty-three women were eventually to be married to Heber C. Kimball during his lifetime. Stanley B. Kimball (1981:307-15) lists these in alphabetical order as follows: (1) Hulda Barnes, born 1 October 1806, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (2) Abigail Buchanan, born 9 January 1802, sealed for eternity 7 February 1846; (3) Charlotte Chase, born 11 May 1825, married 10 October 1844, sealed for eternity 7 February 1846; (4) Clarissa Cutler, born 23 December 1824, married 29 February 1845, sealed for eternity 2 February 1846; (5) Emily Trask Cutler, born 23 February 1828, married during December 1845, sealed for eternity 2 February 1846; (6) Elizabeth Doty (Cravath, Marray, Brown), sealed for time 11 April 1856; (7) Mary Dull (Duell), born 23 November 1807, sealed for eternity 21 May 1848; (8) Mary Fielding (Smith), sealed for time 15 January 1846; (9) Amanda Trimble Gheen, born 18 January 1830, married during December 1845, sealed for eternity 2 February 1846; (10) Ann Alice Gheen, born 20 December 1827, married 10 September 1844, sealed for eternity 2 February 1846; (11) Christeer Golden, born 20 September 1822, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (12) Sophronia Melinda Harmon, born 5 April 1824, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (13) Mary Ellen Harris, born 5 October 1818, married 1 October 1844, sealed for eternity 26 January 1846; (14) Elizabeth Hereford, born July 1789, sealed for eternity 7 February 1846; (15) Mary Houston, born 11 September 1818, sealed for time 3 February 1846; (16) Presendia Lathrop Huntington (Buell, Smith), born 7 September 1810, sealed for time 4 February 1846; (17) Sarah Lawrence (Smith), born 13 May 1826, sealed for time 15 January 1846; (18) Martha McBride (Knight, Smith), born 17 March 1805, married 12 October 1844, sealed for time 15 January 1846; (19) Margaret McMinn, born 7 April 1829, sealed for time...
eternity February 1846 (?); (20) Dorothy Moon, born 9 February 1804, sealed for eternity 14 March 1856; (21) Hannah Moon, born 29 May 1802, sealed for eternity 14 March 1856; (22) Theresa Arathusa Morley, born 18 July 1826, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (23) Vilate Murray, born 1 June 1806, married 22 November 1822, first sealed (probably fall) 1841, sealed for eternity in Nauvoo Temple 7 January 1846; (24) Sarah Peak (Noon), born 3 May 1811, married (probably) 1842, sealed for eternity 15 January 1846; (25) Ruth L. Pierce (Cazier), born 11 February 1818, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (26) Abigail Pitkin, born 17 July 1797, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (27) Laura Pitkin, born 10 September 1790, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (28) Ruth Amelia Reese, born 10 May 1817, sealed for eternity 3 February 1846; (29) Ellen Sanders (nee Aagaat Ysteinsdatter Bakka), born 11 April 1823, married 5 November 1844, sealed for eternity 12 January 1846; (30) Harriet Sanders (nee Helga Ysteinsdatter Bakka), sealed for eternity 26 January 1846; (31) Sarah Schuler (Buckwalter), born 15 May 1801, sealed for time 7 February 1846; (32) Sarah Scott, born 25 October 1817, sealed for time 3 February 1846; (33) Sylvia Porter Sessions (Lyon), born 31 July 1818, sealed for time 15 January 1846; (34) Mary Ann Shefflin, born 31 October 1815, sealed for eternity 4 February 1846; (35) Mary Smithies, born 7 October 1837, sealed for eternity 25 January 1857; (36) Sarah Stiles, born 5 August 1809, sealed for time 3 February 1846; (37) Rebecca Swain (Williams), born 3 August 1798, married 1845, sealed for time 7 February 1846; (38) Frances Jessie Swan, born 20 June 1822, married 30 September 1844, sealed for eternity February 1846; (39) Lucy Walker (Smith), born 30 April 1826, married 8 February 1845, sealed for time 15 January 1846; (40) Ruth Wellington, born 11 March 1809, sealed for eternity 7 February 1846; (41) Sarah Ann Whitney (Smith), born 22 March 1825, married 17 March 1845, sealed for time 12 January 1846; (42) Adelia Almira Wilcox (Hatton, Brown), born 29 March 1828, sealed for eternity 9 October 1856; (43) Nancy Maria Winchester, born 19 August 1828, married 10 October 1844, sealed for time 3 February 1846.

When sealing dates given by Stanley Kimball differ from those that appear in "The Book of Adoptions and Sealings," the date in the second source has been used. All marriage and sealing dates refer to
matrimonial ceremonies linking the women in question to Heber C. Kimball. When such ceremonies occurred before the commencement of sealings in the Nauvoo Temple, they are here referred to as marriages. This is to distinguish them from the sealing ceremonies that were later performed linking the same women to Heber C. Kimball. In Mormon terminology of the period, however, these pre-temple ceremonies would also have been termed sealings. (The one exception is the case of Vilate Murray Kimball. Her first marriage to Kimball would not have been termed a sealing since it, unlike any of the others, was not done by priesthood authority. Unlike the pre-temple ceremonies of women like Sarah Peak Noon, her first priesthood marriage to Kimball is here referred to as a sealing to distinguish it from the earlier civil marriage.) A sealing for time, as opposed to a sealing for eternity, indicates that the woman in question was linked to Kimball as a wife only until death.

For additional information on these women, together with listings of their children, see Carter, Kate B. 1967:7-50; Kimball, Stanley 1981:307-15.
APPENDIX B

THE ADOPTED CHILDREN OF HEBER C. KIMBALL

It is unclear exactly how many people were adopted by Heber and Vilate Kimball in the Nauvoo Temple. In addition to their five biological offspring and daughter-in-law Mary Davenport, "The Book of Adoptions and Sealings" lists thirty-six individuals that were adopted to them as children. Their names are as follows: (1) William Ellis Murray; (2) Mary Murray; (3) James Davenport; (4) Amelia Phelps; (5) William Pitt; (6) Cornelia M. Divine; (7) Harrison Burgness; (8) Sophia Burgess; (9) James Smithies; (10) Nancy Knowles; (11) Charles Wesley Hubbard; (12) Mary Ann Bosworth; (13) Joseph G. Hovey; (14) Martha Ann Webster; (15) William A. King; (16) Hosea Cushing; (17) David Candland; (18) Sarah S. Divine; (19) Mary Ann Candland; (20) George White Pitkin; (21) Amanda Pitkin; (22) Jesse King Nichols; (23) Caroline Nichols; (24) Edward Martin; (25) Alice Martin; (26) Howard Egan; (27) Tamson Egan; (28) John Forsgren; (29) Mary Forsgren; (30) Jesse Harmon; (31) Anna Harmon; (32) Hans Hansen; (33) Abraham Palmer; (34) Patience D. Palmer; (35) Alva L. Tippets; (36) Caroline Tippets. Except for Sarah Divine (whose name is out of order), each woman on the list is apparently the wife of the man whose name immediately precedes her own. All these couples were evidently matrimonially sealed shortly before or after their adoption into the Kimball family.

Stanley Kimball (1981:141, note 1) provides a list of eleven men whom he states were adopted by Heber C. Kimball. These are as follows: (1) Hosea Cushing; (2) William A. King; (3) Howard Egan; (4) Daniel Davis; (5) James Smithies; (6) Jacob Fraizer; (7) George Billings, (8) Charles Hubbard; (9) Hans C. Hansen; (10) Peter O. Hansen; and (11) John Forsgren. Four individuals on this list (Daniel Davis, Jacob Fraizer, George Billings, and Peter O. Hansen, do not appear on the list in "The Book of Adoptions and Sealings."
Davis and Peter Hansen, however, state in their own records that they were adopted to Heber C. Kimball. The other two are prominent in Kimball family affairs during the Winter Quarters period, and there is no reason to suppose that they were not also adopted. Combining Stanley Kimball's list with that from "The Book of Adoptions and Sealings" would bring to forty the number of individuals who were adopted by the Kimballs in the Nauvoo Temple.

Both Sarah M. Kimball (ms a) and Eliza R. Snow (Smith, Eliza R. S., ms a, 2 Apr. 1846) indicate that Sarah M. Kimball was adopted to Heber and Vilate Kimball. These documents, however, do not explicitly state that this was done by a formal sealing ordinance in the Nauvoo Temple. If this was the case, then it is almost certain that Sarah's husband, Hiram, was also adopted at that time.

In addition, there are other individuals, such as George Rhodes and Milo Andrus, who were prominent in Kimball family affairs during the Winter Quarters period but who do not appear on listings of adopted children. It is possible that at least some of them had been adopted by the Kimballs in the Nauvoo Temple.

That approximately forty individuals were adopted to the Kimballs in the Nauvoo Temple is substantiated by Catherine Lewis (1848:19), who writes that shortly before the exodus "Mrs. Kimball told me her husband had then forty adopted children, who are bound to obey their parents in all things."
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