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NOTE ON CAPITALIZATION STYLE

In writing this work I became acutely conscious of the intricacies of organizational nomenclature. The section heading to "Religious Names and Terms" in the thirteenth edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* notes: In few areas is an author more tempted to overcapitalize or an editor more loath to urge a lowercase style than in that of religion. [This] is probably due to unanalyzed acceptance of the pious customs of an earlier age,. . .or to fear of offending religious persons. . . .

Seeking to avoid value judgments on the validity of Mormonism's competing truth-claims, the following capitalization policy will be followed in my thesis. Each convention is identified by a *Chicago Manual of Style* section citation and/or prose explanation.

— "Mormons" and "Mormonism" will be capitalized as cultural designations derived from a proper name. (7.66, 7.79)

— "Mormon Diaspora" will be capitalized as a distinctive historical period. (7.61)

— "Mormon church" will not be capitalized because it is not properly the name of any of the sects claiming authority from Joseph Smith. (7.81) The reader should understand that the term was assigned derisively early in its history and after about 1860 was directed most narrowly at the followers of Brigham Young in Utah.

— "The Church" will be capitalized because of vernacular usage referring to the larger body of Mormons before the death of Joseph Smith and to the larger scope of Mormon tradition. This differs somewhat from the *Manual* because of cultural convention. It

---

is not intended as a slight to other denominations, it is simply a short title or, if you will, a "personal" pronoun. While it is common for any believers to refer to their denomination as "the Church," the historian faces a problem when dealing with conflicting claims: to capitalize is to suggest the legitimacy of a particular claim, creating a value judgment on the part of the writer. When "Church" is capitalized it will refer to the pre-1845 church organization and to the larger culture of Mormonism following Smith's death and the division of his following, not to a particular succession group. The problem of identity is compounded following the division of the Church after Smith's death in 1844. Some claimants gave their followings new titles; many kept the formal name of the Church, creating a multiplicity of organizations with the same name and competing claims; and some assumed earlier organizational names. To those unfamiliar with the intricacies of Mormon history this hodge-podge of titles may appear nit-picking and confusing. Rightly so, but semantics make a world of difference, for one may be confusing two entirely different groups, related only by a distant claimed heritage. Consistent with the Manual will be the lowercasing of the use of "church" to refer to particular sects within Mormonism. (7.82)

— "The Restoration" or "the Restored Gospel," as it refers to the concept in Mormonism of a reissuing of divine truth, will be capitalized. (7.81)

— Priesthood offices, except when used as titles, will not be capitalized (7.20).

— Consistent with the accepted citation of Bible and scriptural references, in all save formal citations the names of Mormon scriptures will not be italicized and abbreviations will be used for the individual subordinate books (7.85, 14.34).

— Joseph Smith's designation as "the Prophet" will be capitalized consistent with the appellation of revered persons (7.78), except when the term "prophet" is used generically (7.20). I have used interchangeably terms and names by which Joseph
Smith, prophet-leader of the Mormons, was known to his people during his lifetime. He was to those who knew him, the Prophet Joseph Smith, Brother Joseph, the Prophet, and simply, Joseph.
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Francis Gladden Bishop joined the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1832, served widely as a missionary, and was excommunicated in 1842 for heresy. Following Joseph Smith's death in 1844, Bishop proclaimed his prophetic call to the scattered Mormon groups around the United States. This biography examines the experiences, particularly divine communications, that shaped his beliefs. Looking in detail at his experiences and claims to divine authority, the study examines the dynamics of dissent in an authoritarian religion. More specifically, it provides a case study of the tensions in Mormonism as the movement sought to create a unified social and cultural tradition. It also examines Bishop's leadership and his followers' role as a schism sect during the Mormon Diaspora (1844–1865), relating particularly to mid-nineteenth century Mormon Utah.

(280 pages)
INTRODUCTION

In the closing years of the Depression, the early 1940s, the Utah Section of the Works Progress Administration published a nearly comprehensive calendar listing of church records for Utah denominations. Pains were taken to survey the records from every known non-Mormon religious group that might have generated records during its tenure of existence.¹ One group listed in the record was a small band with the odd name of the Gladdenites. No church records were located, and of this small religious group the record reads: "More a general movement than an organized church."² Four decades earlier in a historical discussion of groups with Mormon heritage, one who had known the sect's leader personally had to admit that of him "we have no authentic account . . ., so we can safely give him but a casual mention as the leader of one of the many movements of the time."³ It is true that the small band of believers probably generated no church records, at least none that have survived in Utah. In light of their brief tenure in Utah, it is only less true—though no less important—that they existed as more than "a general movement." Their shepherd, who to Joseph Smith, son of the nineteenth-century Mormon prophet, was a little-known Mormon schismatic who spent nearly his entire adult laboring vainly to convince the scattered Mormons in the U.S. of his divine call.

Francis Gladden Bishop lived a life full of contradictions. Attested as they are by the above quotes, Bishop accomplished nothing notable--or of record--in his lifetime, yet he had an impact on the faith he subscribed to. His thoughts were confusing and changed with the circumstance in which he found himself, yet they contributed to the development of a new religion's social and ecclesiastical culture and
personified many of the tensions in the Mormon tradition. He was a faithful, if heretical, Church member living on the fringes of the religious society. Taken in retrospect it may be suggested that the life and labors of Francis Bishop are perhaps an example of the whole being less significant than the separate values of the parts.

Given such a statement, why devote time to the study of such a character? Perhaps the best reason to examine the life of Francis Bishop is that he lived. He was alive, he breathed, he was a part of our historical world that we seldom examine in detail—the nameless, human gravel fill supporting the foundations of the higher levels of the American political and economic system. No one questions the study of the Illinois rail-splitter; should we give attention to the cultural questions and contextualize the answers raised in the study of a nearly forgotten visionary? Actually, yes, we should. If we do not, then the tragedy and ecstasy experienced by yesterday's millions and today's billions of humans become worthless, carved free from the larger social context and relegated to the status of vignettes. Microhistory—particularly biography—while it is a focused look at a sliver of society, must also reflect the values and issues of the larger culture into which that sliver fits. To provide this broader context is one goal of those doing microhistory.

I have tried in this thesis to not only resurrect the life and culture of a dead man but to do so with few substantial source materials. Frankly, I am pleased with the outcome. There are (to my knowledge) no surviving diaries or autobiographies and few letters though he corresponded widely. Much of the surviving first-hand knowledge of Bishop comes from his published writings, which, like rejoinders from within the Church, must be carefully weighed for validity. I may be faulted for often regarding Bishop's precise wording as a near-actual measure of intent. Bishop was a literalist. In a letter to Brigham Young, Bishop detailed his reasons why a dream of Orson Hyde's, related in a negative article in the Frontier Guardian, could not possibly
be referring to himself. His argument was that the collation of a pamphlet he had published, the Address, did not match the number of pages mentioned in Hyde's dream. Bishop's literalistic interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, which he dearly loved, are additional demonstrations of his mindset. Dale Morgan, a truly great bibliographer and historian, was once chastised for the same interpretive stance that I take with Bishop's writings. If I am held to account for too strict of an interpretive position, at least I am in good company.

Bishop's claims and statements may often be compared against information gleaned from dozens of references in official church records, governmental records, sermons, correspondence, personal narratives, and newspaper accounts. Those that are historically provable have generally proven accurate. In weighing the information in each source, I have asked several questions. What is this? Who wrote it? Why was it written, and under what circumstances? For example, how and when did Bishop get to North Carolina to write this letter, what was he doing there, what were the implications this letter carried? Who was Bishop addressing in this publication? How does he tell this story? For what purpose does he tell it, and what does he leave out? In the absence of a deluge of information, my writing is composed of historical context, gleaned from the sources. The study of history is the pursuit of context. The "what" revealed in writing is often less important than the "why." The unwritten context of a document is as important as the information contained therein. My research is written as such, relying heavily upon interpretation to supplement the source's narrative.

With these historical raw materials and with the handtools of historical method I will examine and illustrate from a biographical perspective 1) an example of the religious climate and background from which followers of Mormonism emerged; 2) the tensions regarding authority in Mormonism as it sought to create a unified social
and religious tradition and establish cultural order; 3) a context for the Mormon Diaspora, using my subject to address cultural Mormonism outside of the followers of the apostolic quorum after the death of Joseph Smith by focusing on one of the dozens of schismatic groups; 4) an illustration of the functions and dynamics of heresy and apostasy in an authoritative body and the way authoritarian religious groups cope with dissent. Additionally, Chapters 4, 7, 11, and 12 attempt to place Bishop into a niche in nineteenth-century Mormonism. It is impossible to comprehend dissension without understanding what in the parent society was misinterpreted, contributed to the cause, or was revolted against. In essence, I will look at the Mormon religious experience, particularly the Diaspora, from the bottom up.

May I state at the outset of this work that my perspective in addressing Mormonism is clearly that of a cultural insider. The intent has not been to create a hagiography of Bishop or the institution of Mormonism, nor to be condemnatory toward either's perceived weaknesses. I have rather attempted to make an unreal man real. It has not been an easy task. My impression of Francis G. Bishop is essentially, I admit, in the end a bit condescending. The man must have possessed a substantial ego to support for so long the course he pursued. His actions and choices do not leave the reader convinced of his balance. He was zealous but not focused, dedicated but not careful, bright but not wise. In many ways he reminds me of a contemporary utopian, Robert Owen. For all his visionary zeal and personal faults, given careful supervision F.G. Bishop may never have left—or rather, have been expelled—from the Latter-day Saints.

As a historian I cannot make a similar judgment on the validity of his doctrines and beliefs. Neither I nor anyone can clearly say precisely what he witnessed. I do not believe the man was crazy. I do believe that he was consumed with an interest in himself, a self-interest translated and expressed—cloaked to the point of disguise—in religious opinion.
PART I
CHAPTER I

A FARMER'S SON

Next to nothing is known of the parentage and family history of the Bishops. Family records do reveal that Francis' grandfather gave to his son his own name, Isaac. Isaac Gates Bishop was born during the American Revolution to Isaac and Anna Hudson Bishop in Lebanon, New York, at the end of July, 1779. When the time came for the younger Isaac to name his eldest son, he bestowed upon the infant the name he had himself inherited.

Even less is known of Francis' maternal ancestry. The only information about Francis' mother, Mary Hyde, is her name and birthdate—8 JUN 1786. She, however, left a matronymic legacy in the Bishop family, naming her eldest surviving daughter Anna Maria, a combination and slight expansion on her own and her mother-in-law's names. Mary remains otherwise in obscurity.

Between 1800 and 1803 Isaac Bishop and Mary Hyde were united in marriage, presumably marrying in western New York or moving there early in their marriage. Here they began their family with the birth of a son in 1804, Isaac Hyde, who was given a patronym and his mother's maiden name. The next child, a daughter born a year later, preceded four more sons but died soon after birth. Francis Gladden was the second of these four boys; neither of the two who followed him lived long past infancy, though more children would come.

Francis Gladden Bishop, Mary and Isaac's third son, entered the world as inauspiciously as did his four older siblings. Francis was born on the 19th of January,
1809, in Livonia, New York, in Ontario County.  

A year later the enroller for the Third U.S. Census knocked on the Bishops’ door. Francis, as the baby of the family, was enumerated with his surviving brothers in the column for males in the household under ten years of age.

Of Francis' early life few details are known factually. Other than a fleeting mention of the Bishops in public records, the brief memoir dictated by his sister Anna Maria in Salt Lake City remains virtually the sole source of family information outside Francis' own writings. Written more than half a century later, Anna Maria focused on relating the memories of her early life for the benefit of her children and grandchildren. Francis' motivation for recording his history was different. His memories were published, revealing tidbits of his history intended to sway potential converts by demonstrating the actions of the Lord's hand in his behalf. Thus, what little he did write was to illustrate and support his standing as divinity's herald. Still, supplemented with gleanings from public records, the two accounts make it possible to trace major events in the lives of the Bishop family in upstate New York.

The Bishop family remained in the Livonia area long enough to give Francis at least a start on his schooling. His adult writings and surviving letters reveal that in later life he was capable of producing written communication on a fairly sophisticated level for one raised and educated rurally—though to his death his writing would suffer with a superabundance of commas. Francis also began to read the periodical literature of his day. He later claimed to have been offered a college education for continuing his study of classical Greek and Hebrew.

An important part of Francis' informal education was the family study of the Holy Scriptures. With parents belonging to the Methodist church, both he and his sister later remembered that reading in the scriptures had been an important part of familial education. Isaac and Mary raised their children in Methodist sternness with
the strictures of moral behavior expected of believing parentage.

Isaac Bishop continued to farm in Livonia for about a decade after Francis was born; but sensing an opportunity for improvement, he moved the family about 150 miles to the north, near the shore of Lake Ontario. The fall in prices and land values reversed the temporary boom in western New York that had been boosted by the commodity demands of the War of 1812. This deflationary spiral had made currency more expensive, and those who had invested in property and improvements were by 1819 prepared to sell land piecemeal at a par with their initial investment or at a slight loss rather than to lose their entire holdings. For those who chose to hold land in hope of a future rise in prices, tenancy was also an option—if tenants could be found. The value of tenant improvements might offset the fall in general land prices.

Isaac located a home and farm site on unoccupied land about six miles west of the growing Lake Ontario port town of Rochester. In Greece, New York, he immediately began to put down roots. Prosperity, if the Bishops were to enjoy it, would have to come from hard work. Despite their labor and any gains they might have realized in Greece, in 1824 circumstances forced the Bishops to mortgage thirty-four acres they still owned in Livonia.

Isaac built a respectable farm with the help of his three sons over the next decade. In that time Mary bore four more children, and by 1829 Isaac had a family of nine to support.

Francis spent his teen years in Greece, working on his father’s farm. There he experienced much the same style of life as others around him: spring ploughing and planting, clearing land and fence construction, candle and sugar making, butchering, and perhaps home production of small saleable items. It is also likely that he found the opportunity to continue formal learning to some degree, while his parents saw to his scriptural education.
At this time, especially in the rural reaches of the United States, religion was laced with mystical experiences. Visions, healings, speaking in tongues, and other manifestations of the Spirit in Calvinist tradition served as a symbolic bridge from damned humanity into saving belief and marked divine favor. Calvinism was not the only religious tradition to rely on demonstrable faith. Arminian denominations adopted these practices widely (which began the Second Great Awakening) from New England Congregationalism, as the latter sought to arrest the post-Revolution decline of churches. Membership in Methodist or especially Baptist church structures was often conditional upon demonstration of the workings of the Spirit in a person. Conversely, demonstrable faith, while an important part of folk belief, had become excessive in the zealous West and was at the same time discountenanced by the recognized clergy as superstition.¹⁸

The Second Great Awakening had begun at the turn of the nineteenth century and by Francis' youth had worked its ferment well into the New York countryside. Recurring rounds of revivals kept the populace focused on the state of their moral damnation and the necessity of salvation. Francis, too, felt drawn to religion and by age sixteen (1825) had become sufficiently concerned about his salvation to make a public profession of Christian faith.¹⁹ Though he was young, Francis' early experience with religion was not superficial; religion became a life-long avocation. Part of his spiritual focus stemmed from experiences that followed closely on the heels of his acceptance of religious discipline. Like another boy only a hundred miles away, Francis was the recipient of a vision. While he failed to immediately understand its significance, the manifestation—more importantly, his understanding of it—was to play a key role in determining the direction of his later life, much as did the first vision of Joseph Smith, Jr. in determining his.²⁰

Four months after his seventeenth birthday (1826), near his home in Greece,
Francis retired to the forest "and engaged in solemn prayer to God. . . ." Relating the experience three decades later he remembered becoming insensible to the surroundings as he prayed, then of becoming aware of spirits around him in the air, yet "none of these [spirits] seemed plainly visible." Before him appeared a wall, with an open doorway allowing through it a brilliant light. Through this opening three persons passed into view. "I was in a perfect ecstasy while gazing upon the heavenly visitants," he later wrote. The trio looked on the boy and smiled then ascended to the aperture and passed from view.21

Immediately following their departure a different personage appeared. This individual, he reported, came "as a man." Said Francis: "His hair was grey, and hung curled around his shoulders, and his countenance was dignified beyond all I ever conceived of human majesty."22 He, too, smiled on the boy. Soon the vision closed; and, released back into consciousness, Francis' mind engaged in contemplating the meaning of what he had just experienced and the vision's significance. Perhaps, like the visionary Daniel, he could have said that "my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart."23 Francis finally settled on the interpretation that the first three figures had been angels, while "by an impulse of the same character, I saw [the fourth to be] the Ancient of Days, of whom I had read in the Prophecy of Daniel."24 This character, the "Ancient of Days," would become central to Bishop's religious interpretations and later views of contemporary events.

How and why did a seventeen-year-old boy identify an angelic ministrant precisely as an obscure prophetic character from the Old Testament? Unfortunately Francis never recorded explicitly his reasons for assigning this particular identity to the heavenly visitor. The accounts that survive imply that little time passed before Francis had established, in his own mind, identities for his visitants and for the fourth
in particular. In doing so Francis demonstrates a detailed knowledge of the Bible, a familiarity sufficient to allow him to isolate a distinct prophecy from the middle of the Old Testament that seemed to provide an identification for his visitant. Conversely, Francis may have matched his figure with an identity only after a period of purposeful study (days, weeks, even perhaps as long as a year or two). In either case, Bishop at a young age had gained or was gaining an intimate knowledge of the Bible and at a sophisticated level of detail.

This application of scriptural knowledge is the earliest disclosure of the intellectual process that shaped his later life. Francis Bishop's primary source of understanding and knowledge in relation to contemporary events and the foundation of his world view was in his reading and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. At a young age he had been steeped in the prophecy and narrative of the Bible. This volume he accepted as absolutely authoritative and literal truth. It almost seems as if he considered the stories and prophecies, down to the very words, to be divine dictation. Bishop sought his enlightenment from what was written as scripture, increasingly, as his life progressed, seemingly without regard to context. His was a very personal interpretation of Holy Writ. He sought from its pages answers—the answers—to any and all situations that were to face him in mortality. Too, the type of scripture he most often drew from, apocalyptic visions of the future, prejudiced his view of the present, a position or outlook more fully demonstrated in his later life.

Elements of Francis' 1826 vision parallel the first vision experience of Joseph Smith, dated as having occurred six years earlier. But despite surface similarities of age, background, and experience, there were deeper differences. Joseph recorded that he was introduced to and instructed by those who had appeared to him. He would later teach that when an angel or righteous spirit appears he brings knowledge to the recipient. The wealth of instruction Joseph received from his visitors left little open
to rationalization, imagination, or interpretation. What Joseph's vision provided that Francis' did not was a direction in which the recipient should point himself.

If Francis received instructions from his visitors he left no record of it; indeed, he recorded no communication. The impression is given that he had been shown a vision but gained nothing more than the experience itself. Rather than having a clear understanding of why or even what had happened, Francis was left to interpret value and significance from not much more than memory and his belief in the vision's actuality. Certainly the vision carried profound religious meaning, but it appears as if the meaning of the vision was not communicated to Francis. It was not until after an indeterminate "later" that the vision's significance was even comprehended. Still, contrasting the two experiences should not imply that one was more or less real than the other. The historicity of the visions is inapproachable, but the issue of what either witnessed is not as important as what Francis Bishop and Joseph Smith believed they had seen and experienced. In both cases future actions were rooted deeply in this first experiential belief. But there is significant difference between the experiences, that is, the instruction reported by one boy and the lack of it by the other.²⁶

The actions and attitudes of each following their first experiences with the Divine also show a divergence. Joseph, following instructions from his visitants, kept aloof from churches around him that clamored for membership. Francis, on the other hand, without instructions in affirmation or to the contrary, involved himself with the religious culture that surrounded him. While Joseph withdrew into personal study and meditation and away from prejudicial sectarian conflicts, Francis shortly joined "a society of people, who I believed were Christians."²⁷

Bishop's experience as a member of this unnamed religious body was short-lived and was given only a passing mention in his autobiographical writings. He left the group after no longer than two years, motivated by another vision and the forced
move of the family. The former would mark the next focal point in Bishop's early religious career. In the meantime there were more temporal needs to be assuaged.

Francis turned twenty in 1829. His father, Isaac, and family were still paying off the money owed on their land, but they had converted timbered land into a home that sister Anna Maria remembered possessed "a good, commodious house, a very large framed barn, cow sheds, sheep sheds, . . . a large meadow, large cow pasture and all the plow land [Isaac] wanted," as well as "a fine young orchard and beautiful garden." Isaac had much in which to take pride. It was not to last, however.

In the spring of 1829 a newcomer to the area looked over the improvements and tried to induce Isaac to sell his hard-won farm. Isaac did not want to be bought out for very obvious reasons. Not only did he have a pleasant home and farm of his own creation, but by 1829 he had begun to lose his oldest sons to marriage and families of their own. The eldest, Isaac H., was gone already, and two others were within a year of legal age. Now, with concerns of their own, the senior Isaac's sons could not be relied on to provide the intensive labor needed to start life over again. Behind these three was only one son, a toddler; the rest of the family being female, and the oldest daughter only nine. Beginning another homestead would have been difficult and impractical, even with partial improvements to the land. Additionally, Isaac in 1829 turned fifty. In a day before Social Security was dreamed of, it was the time to start consolidating one's assets to provide dowries and farmsteads for the children and secure subsistence for rapidly approaching old age.

Isaac flatly refused the offer, and the prospective buyer went away disgruntled.

In days to come the "Scotchman," as Isaac's daughter called the would-be buyer, discovered a convenient weakness in Isaac's wall of security. Isaac had not completed payment for the land from which he and his family had carved their homestead. With economic conditions in a state of depression, it was a small matter
to convince the mortgage or title holder to sell the bond. The unscrupulous man simply paid the balance due, thereby legally acquiring rights to the property together with the range of improvements won by a decade of another man's labor. The Joseph Smith, Sr. family, a hundred miles east, were living as tenants on the Palmyra farm which they had lost under similar circumstances. The ploy almost certainly was not limited to these two instances. Isaac was confronted with the demand for payment in full or loss of his property. His inability to complete payment on demand without warning and the range of coveted improvements on the land only served to make the new creditor's base demand inflexible. Of this time it is remembered that Isaac aged "wonderfully" in a short time and rarely smiled.  

Henry and Francis, the oldest sons still at home, helped move the now-impoverished family two hundred miles south into Allegheny County. Once in southern New York Isaac probably rented a farm to support the family. It was while the family was in Allegheny County that Francis experienced another "trance or vision." This time he pictured himself solemnly preaching atop a mountain, surrounded by a multitude. Upon regaining his faculties Bishop was left with a powerful impression that he needed to preach. The earlier of the two accounts documenting this vision and its aftermath is more humble than the latter. It simply states that he felt himself called to the ministry or to the witnessing of "the Saviour of sinners." The longer of the two was written in 1854 when Francis had just organized a church and was enjoying, albeit briefly, a sizable following. His optimism leaked into the words of his third-person account as he remembered resounding success as an independent preacher in New York. "[I]n every direction multitudes flocked to hear him, and many were converted to receive Jesus as their Savior," while petitions were received "to visit and pray for the sick, which seemed to inspire many with almost unlimited confidence in him as a man of God."
In retelling this experience his rose-colored memory served him well, but his self-aggrandizement is deflated somewhat by the reality that he had barely turned twenty. Still, the cult of personality or charisma ideal, born in his earliest preaching experience, would become increasingly important to Bishop, and he relied on it heavily in later years.

Bishop was able to attract a following of some sixty or so individuals, who petitioned him to forego his independent preaching and to formally associate with an established church. Accordingly, some time before 1831 a certificate was drawn up and presented by him to the Freewill Baptists, who formally recognized him as a minister of the gospel.

The Baptists placed a heavy value on scriptural knowledge while eschewing formal theological training. This emphasis on non-education could be carried to an extreme in the zealous West and was the root of problems in the western Baptist community. Preachers and exhorters often disagreed vehemently over the interpretations of scriptures they could barely read. Some, concluded one church official, "were as afraid of a dictionary as they were of a [Presbyterian] missionary." The status of the educated among Baptists may have served as the deciding factor against Bishop's pursuit of educational refinement as an adult.

While Francis continued his career with the Baptists, his parents surrendered their farming efforts in Allegheny County and moved the family north. The rented farm had been a failure. Frost heaves disrupted the fields, heavy snows and cold weather in 1830 and 1831 combined to make conditions impossible to grow fall wheat. After two unsuccessful years, the family, without Francis, moved to Lima, four miles north of Francis' birthplace, to stay with Isaac H.'s family. When they arrived in Lima, the younger Isaac welcomed his parents and persuaded his father to stay the winter and to try in the spring to locate a farm in the area.
By arriving when they did the Bishop's missed Samuel Smith's earlier missionary visit to the Livonia/Lima area. Smith, a younger brother to the proprietor of the Book of Mormon, Joseph Smith, had brought copies of the newly published book with him on a trip to the Livonia area in 1830. He returned with Orson Hyde and other missionaries from the "Mormon" church (officially named the Church of Christ at its organization in 1830) in the spring of 1832, only a year before Bishops' arrival. In 1833, after hearing the gospel of the Restoration preached by other Mormon elders, both Isaacs and their wives accepted baptism and joined the fledgling Church of Christ. As soon as amiable weather dried the roads from spring mud into summer dirt, both families loaded up and moved to Kirtland, Ohio, where the saints were gathering. They reached Kirtland on the day in early June that Hyrum Smith and others laid out the ground for the House of the Lord, the Kirtland Temple.

Kirtland had been a stopping place for the Church's first organized missionary effort, the Indian Mission, in late 1830. The town was also the former home of one of the missionaries, apostle-to-be Parley Pratt, and remained the residence of his friend and former pastor, Sidney Rigdon. The missionaries had chosen to remain in the Kirtland area about three weeks before pressing on to Missouri. Preaching their message of restoration and new revelation, they found a warm reception among Rigdon's communal Christians, who with their leader had broken with Alexander Campbell and the Disciples of Christ over the issue of common property. After careful study, Rigdon became convinced that the Book of Mormon was of divine origin and accepted baptism into the new religion. Others of his sect followed.

With a group of believers organized in Ohio, the beleaguered saints in New York were able to find a haven from the persecution which was mounting there. As important to this move west was the doctrine of gathering, which counseled believers to assemble in divinely appointed locations. Though several hundred passed on to
Mormon settlements in western Missouri, Kirtland by 1833 was home to 150 saints. Nearly all of the new arrivals were in need of subsistence, and all needed housing.43

While his parents' and brother's families were moving to Kirtland, Francis pursued his responsibilities among the Baptists in southern New York. While he was engaged in preaching at a church in Belfast, Bishop was seized by an illness that continued long enough to leave him nearly helpless for a period.44 Upon recovery he interpreted the ailment as a divine rebuke for the course he was pursuing. Francis finally decided to formally dissociate himself from the Freewill Baptists and return to his labors as an independent exhorter. Having done so he prepared himself to wait on the Lord to see what course of action would be the Lord's inspired will.

In the spring of 1832 a party of four Mormon families under the leadership of Alpheus Gifford stopped in Olean Point to construct a flatboat on their way to Missouri. Still recovering from the effects of his illness and looking for the Lord's will, it was most likely from this group that Bishop became aware of the church his parents were considering independently, known derisively as the "Mormonites." After satisfying himself that the claims and doctrines of the church were valid, Francis joined the Church by immersive baptism July 2, 1832, in Olean Point (now Olean), New York, at the hands of an unnamed priesthood holder.45

Francis Gladden Bishop was now a member of the organization that he would never leave, or at least leave alone, within or without formal membership.
CHAPTER II
A BUDDING BRANCH

Two characteristics that Francis Gladden Bishop consistently displayed in life were zeal in a cause and an absolute trust in himself. Both character traits were manifest in his youth but not as developed as they would eventually become. In later life his perception of "himself" broadened to include not only his individual identity and physical capabilities but also his impressions and reasoning, revelations, and his position as God's chosen, "the Branch" referred to in Zechariah. Francis' zeal found its earliest expression in the functions of religion, laboring for the Baptists and as an independent exhorter. When his allegiance changed—at least overtly—as he picked up the Mormon banner, so did the vehicle of his zeal and the social context of his expression. Yet as events would soon prove, his allegiance to the Restored Gospel was crowded aside by the self-importance of his own experiences with Divinity. He was first a missionary of his own call. Francis demonstrated both his zeal and self-confidence in reacting to events that followed his baptism into the Church of Christ (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints). These reactions also lay at the heart of his ecclesiastical difficulties in coming years.

Francis was twenty-three at his baptism into the Mormon church in the midsummer of 1832. Soon after he was ordained to the Melchizedek priesthood and given the office of elder. Ordination to a priesthood office usually did not occur
unless the recipient were to preside over a congregation or to travel as a missionary himself. Francis' experience as an exhorter may have qualified him for proselyting responsibility in his newfound faith. In any case the ordination was made, and, by his own account, Francis began to preach the gospel of the Restoration locally.  

Within a few weeks of his ordination a man by the name of Walton presented himself to the branch of the church to which Bishop belonged in Olean Point, New York. Walton claimed he had been sent by Joseph Smith to preside over local congregations. His credentials consisted of an ordination as a "High Priest after the order of Melchesedec [sic]". Unfortunately for the body of believers, Walton was an unskilled and overbearing leader. Beyond this problem lay the matter of influence. Bishop had enjoyed leading a following by force of personality, both as an exhorter for the Baptists and independently. In the local church body he presently occupied some position of visibility; another leader, skilled or unskilled, threatened to displace Bishop from a position and status he enjoyed. Walton's ordination superseded what official importance Bishop held in the congregation to the point that "the Branch was very nearly destroyed." Francis was upset.

In the real or imagined strife caused by Walton's leadership, Francis perceived an opportunity. Bishop settled on solving the problems at hand by seeking an ordination to the office of high priest for himself. This would place him on an authoritative par with Walton and perhaps provide the chance for securing local leadership permanently. Unfortunately this solution necessitated a 200-mile trip to the church's headquarters in Kirtland, Ohio.
During late summer or fall Bishop made the trip west. Once in Kirtland he petitioned church authorities (probably the Presidency of the High Priesthood: Joseph Smith, Jr., Sidney Rigdon, and Frederick G. Williams) for an ordination to the office of high priest. To request an ordination was not an unknown practice in the Church; however, in Bishop's case the advancement was refused. The petition was denied not because the request was brash, but because Bishop was judged to be unfit for the office. It was the opinion of the council that "he wanted a high station without meriting it, or without being called by the Spirit of God to that work." Francis' personality or priority agenda revealed too much of an anxious or aspiring attitude. Mormon theology equates priesthood with the power to act with God's authority—aspiration does not gain advancement. This appearance before a church council gave church leaders their first glimpse of Bishop's aspirations and self-importance. Dismissed from the council, Francis retained the office to which he had been ordained, that of elder, and returned to the Olean Point area, still seeking to prove himself as able as he was willing to carry the office and calling of high priest.

The ordination he had counted on had been withheld, his intended solution was counted a failure, and the strife in the Olean congregation was still stirring. Once at home Bishop sought alternative solutions. Intent on securing the ordination that in his mind would solve the problem, he had hamstrung possible ecclesiastical intervention with Walton by omitting mention of the conflict while before the church authorities in Kirtland. No official church action would be taken in the situation. Civil authorities could not be involved since this was an ecclesiastical matter. But, since Bishop
considered himself "an inspired man of God" and his prayers to be of great faith, there yet remained in his mind a way through the apparent impasse. In petitioning the Divine, Francis took it.

Francis addressed his concerns—or made his claim—regarding the priesthood and the church to which he belonged to "the throne of grace." He asked for divine inspiration concerning two questions: a sign concerning the truth of his newly found faith (which, he says, he had begun to doubt); and, more importantly, he asked for understanding concerning the office of high priest, which Walton boasted that he possessed and Bishop himself so desired.

Before addressing the results of this query it is important to put Bishop's above-stated questions into context. They reveal his mental position in relation to the Restoration gospel and the place of personal ideas and idio-cultural baggage from the past that had been brought into his new faith. The stated intents of his queries and their underlying motivations are in fact contradictory. Taken together, the questions suggest that Bishop had mentally created a complex disguise for what he was actually concerned about. The first point in question, "concerning the truth of his late faith," i.e., the veracity of the Mormon claim, could have stood independently. If Bishop became satisfied that the Mormons had no authority and were not what they claimed to be, then the second question, concerning "the character of the High Priesthood," was moot.

Simply posing the second question about the character of the High Priesthood implied that even before he asked, he had become satisfied of the validity of the
Mormon claim. He in fact wrote of himself in third person as "a man of great faith before God, [therefore] he could not believe himself deceived in this late faith." He had apparently become a believer in Mormonism. By his statement the first query appears to have been a disguise concealing the motivation of the second.

The way in which his questions were expressed brushed aside the Olean congregation's concerns over Walton's actions and focused on Bishop himself and his position. He had focused his interest and attention in an ordination as high priest. He had also been refused by the Church. Unable to secure an ordination to the office, he turned to the Lord. Asking for a demonstration of the validity of the Mormon cause and the guise provided by the second inquiry softened his outright asking God to provide an ordination that could not be had otherwise. Francis did not seem as concerned about the status of his chosen faith in the face of Divinity as he was about the "nature of the High Priesthood," i.e., how is this office given—or gained—and what can one do with it? The undercurrent of what Bishop seemed to be asking was that he saw in the office of high priest an opportunity for the advancement of personal status. Since ordination has been refused, how might the ecclesiastical order be circumvented? His questions and their motivation imply that Bishop was in fact seeking only a specific answer, one that would raise his personal status and solve only incidentally the conflicts in the local congregation. The response he received to his two questions satisfied the most personally important matter and served as the foundation of Bishop's career as a schismatic leader in Mormonism.

While praying late one night a messenger appeared, standing at his bedside.
Without introduction the being approached Bishop, placed his hands on the supplicant's head, and said solemnly "I ordain you a High Priest." Having thus spoken, the visitant disappeared, and Francis was caught away in a vision. He found himself seated on a throne with a crown on his head and a sword in his right hand. He was informed by his visitor that "This," meaning the throne, crown, and sword, "is the power of the High Priesthood!" This action, he later explained, was to teach him the character of the ordination he had just received, which he examined exhaustively in his later writings. At the same time Francis was also told that Joseph Smith had fallen as a prophet and was rejected, and that he (Francis) would lead the Church.

Bishop wrote years later of being innocently unaware of the visit's grand significance. Actually, his writings suggest he had little or no idea of the meaning behind what had transpired. To fill the void Bishop again turned to his understandings and interpretations of the scriptures as a catalyst for inspiration, searching the prophetic passages of the Old Testament, filtering his experience through scriptural prophecy, and fitting them to himself and his experiences. Soon he arrived at the vision's significance. In coming days, in the same fashion as he began to understand his 1826 vision, Bishop discovered the meaning and interpretation of his experience. "[T]he prophecies," he later wrote, "regarding the man, called the Branch, and also Elijah the prophet to come, and restore all things, were unfolded to me by Divine revelation..." Besides the obvious significance of the ordination, Francis interpreted the vision and ordination to be a divine call. For the first time he claimed to be "the Branch" spoken of in the Old Testament book of Zechariah. Scripturally,
this prophetic character is easily seen to possess a large degree of power and responsibility. It was, incidentally, a station considered by Biblical scholars even in Bishop's day to refer to Messiah, Jesus Christ.\(^6^3\)

Francis had received a vision in 1826 that he did not clearly understand. He came to assume that from the benevolent smiles of his visitors he was to enjoy divine aegis and responsibility. Later, in a trance or vision, he had pictured himself preaching a well-attended sermon and had met some success preaching both independently and for the Freewill Baptists. Drawing his ordination into line with the self-appointed significance of previous visions, Bishop appears to have begun constructing a *Weltanschauung* in which he was not only a part but one wherein he was moving rapidly towards the center.

This experience calls for a contextualizing of spiritual experiences in early Mormonism. Reports of personal visitations from angels and spirits were common in Mormonism's earliest days. In a notable and oft-cited example, during an absence of the Prophet Joseph Smith in Missouri the saints in Kirtland had allowed "a spirit" to creep into their meetings and had reverted to revival-camp displays in expressing their belief. Upon his return Joseph perceived the force motivating the displays was not of God, and he dictated a revelation about testing the spirits. The Prophet explained that evil spirits (unembodied) were just as actively trying to thwart the work of God as were angels and righteous spirits seeking to advance it. The former would seek to confuse or counterfeit true experiences with the Holy Spirit. The saints needed to be able to distinguish between the two sources of inspiration. For, said the revelation,
"there are many . . . false spirits, which have gone forth in the earth, deceiving the world." The problem in the church at this date was that any spiritual manifestation was accepted, without consideration of the source. Bishop, it may be seen, was to be found in similar circumstances. Not that his visions were demonically inspired, but discerning the spiritual source for his visitation was apparently not a concern for Bishop. He simply accepted this and later experiences as divine and as signs of favor. Smith and other leaders were more skeptical of the source.

Francis had been told by his night visitor that Joseph Smith had fallen from his call and that Bishop was destined to lead the Church. The message that Joseph had fallen from divine grace—hence, losing divine authority—touched a theme common to dissent in Restoration history and was occasionally featured in revelations to other individuals when calling them forward to leadership. In response to his own petition concerning religious authority as a boy, Joseph Smith reported that he had been visited by two beings surrounded by a brilliant light. He was told by one to join no church, for they were all wrong, and that all their creeds were an abomination in the sight of the Lord. These instructions in his interview with God and his Son made the first cut in severing Mormon tradition from the weight of Christianity, a move which made possible the erection of a new divine order. Though this vision was not common knowledge until the Nauvoo period, it set the standard for conflicting claims and visions that intended to rechannel divine authority. This divine investiture was claimed by Joseph and companion Oliver Cowdery by virtue of ordinations under the hands of Jesus' ancient apostles, the resurrected Peter, James, and John. The church
organized on 6 April 1830 was therefore a reestablishment or restoration of the same authority that existed in the primitive Church and functioned under the same divine commission. Mormons still speak of the "Restoration" when speaking of Church history.

With this authority returned to earth in the eyes of Joseph's followers, those who sought to "lead the Church aright" in coming years had to circumvent or make a break with the authority or truth claim of the parent organization. Before 1860 this was usually done by claiming higher authority or special dispensation and/or that Joseph had fallen as a prophet. Francis Bishop's 1832 vision of the "Ancient of Days" made the vital break with authority, though it would not be openly apparent for ten years. Circumstances would keep him in the Church for another decade, while his theological conception of the calling developed enough to be utilized openly later.

Once Bishop received this ordination and began to generate an understanding of its significance he wasted no time in relating the vision to those around him, and the news found a willing ear among Olean Point's neophyte Church members. The event was seen as a better option than what was transpiring in the local branch because of Walton's domination. Word of the vision and its new authority soon got around to other branches and out to neighbors who were not members of the church. In the excitement Bishop regained a charismatic draw and began to be viewed as someone more than a simple elder in an unpopular religion. Bishop caused quite a stir. Once word of this visitation and the excitement caused by it reached the authorities in Kirtland, Bishop was summoned forthwith.
By the time Bishop arrived in Kirtland for the second time it was late in the winter of 1832-33. At the Church's headquarters, he appeared before the School of the Prophets, an assembly of priesthood holders meeting in the upper story of Newell Whitney's store. Francis was asked by the assembled body to explain his claim and the circumstances of this ordination. He was examined closely by the Prophet and reportedly crossed his story several times in retelling it. Though Bishop forever after hotly denied the error of his course and maintained the reality of his visionary experience, Orson Hyde, who was present at the hearing, said of the accused that "[he] became confused, and blushed with shame and guilt - he fell down upon his knees and confessed that he has lied in the name of the Lord—begged to be forgiven and cried aloud for mercy." Upon this demonstration of repentance Bishop was readmitted to membership in the priesthood and retained standing in the church.

Joseph Smith took occasion to address the topic of ordination and said that Francis' claims involved a false principle. Since the priesthood had been restored to the earth and living men held it as validly as in Christ's day, "no heavenly messenger will ever come to interfere with that power by ordaining any more." An angel might come to bring information and to minister, but no more would there be a need for a man to be ordained by one.

Apostle Orson Hyde's recollection of this event, published in the *Millennial Star*, must be judged as coming from a fourteen-year-old memory tinted with prejudicial bias, but it is in substance probably more accurate than Bishop's account. Bishop's version of this trial was published in a pamphlet intended to convince those
who were or had been members of the Church of his divine call. Francis tended to overlook experiences that injured his influence with his current following, and he interpreted words and events very loosely to give support to his doctrinal ideas. Acknowledging questionable actions on his part (such as lying) was not conducive to collecting adherents. Hyde claimed in his recollection that others who were at the trial, both in the Church and who had left the Mormons, would substantiate the events as he related them. Bishop, on the other hand, flatly denied that he had ever confessed to an error and until the last year of his life considered and acted upon his vision as a reality and an authoritative one.

It is at this early date that the foundations of Bishop's claim of authority and the counter by the Church began to take shape. Francis Bishop claimed that the Restoration was in fact a Preparation, begun to pave the way for his own labors. It centered on the idea that God reveals authority as necessary to his chosen instruments. The Church's counter to this claim as expressed by Joseph at the trial was, with a notable exception, nearly identical to Bishop's claim itself: that is, that God reveals authority as necessary to his chosen instruments but through an orderly and recognized process. This idea (which became policy) was clearly stated by Joseph Smith at Bishop's hearing.

The circumstances surrounding Francis Bishop's supermortal ordination and hearing before the School of the Prophets also stands as an early manifestation of the underlying tensions between divine authority and human agency in the budding social culture of Mormonism. This tension may be most easily revealed by a set of rhetorical
questions and answers, questions that in Nauvoo and beyond became more than rhetorical. What role can dissent play in a social order that is centered on divine revelation? Does enlisting in the Church mean surrendering theological free agency; then again, if Divinity is guiding the church, how can conflict or dissent be countenanced? How far may disagreement be carried before it becomes heresy, and how much further before it is apostasy? Finally, how does an authoritarian religious system fit into a larger socio-religious culture that is founded on the tolerance of disagreement, a constitutionally established "agreement to disagree"? The histories of Francis G. Bishop and the Mormon Diaspora of which he became a part lay in the answering of these questions.
CHAPTER III
MISSIONARY, HERETIC

At the conclusion of his trial before the School of the Prophets, twenty-three-year-old elder Francis G. Bishop had been drawn back into orthodox faith. The rapprochement overtly consummated, he was dispatched to the area of the Church's earliest missionary effort, inland New England and upper New York. Francis apparently did not return to the Olean Point, New York, congregation of which he had been a member and had stirred with reports of his angelic ordination.

Before departing Kirtland, Francis found occasion to relate to Joseph Smith and a council of elders his 1826 dream or vision of the Ancient of Days. Joseph, now with nearly a decade of prophetic experience, acknowledged his vision was probably divinely motivated. Francis was told that "it was a matter of importance, and . . . I should yet understand it, as it regarded myself," but Joseph did not attempt to give an interpretation of it. None was needed. Although to the council the young man's experience was another of the many dreams and visions common in the young church, for Francis the vision was not common. It was part of a sacred appointment that set him apart from his peers. It must have been gratifying to have the leader of the church acknowledge the validity of his vision, but regardless of the official position of church leaders, Francis had settled on his own interpretation and had already preached of his divine calling. Only months into his decade-long career within the Mormon church, the path into the future was marked for the young elder. He would wait for the Lord's call to further action, but Francis Bishop's mindset within the culture and beliefs of Mormonism had become fixed and would change little in the next decade. Though he
remained a partaker in the Mormon cultural experience, in coming years his mental priorities and doctrinal values would not appear to be much influenced by official teachings. Mormonism, while it provided an environment, did not really become a part of him. Rather, he selectively assimilated its values and ideals as his own.

Francis left Kirtland in the spring of 1833 to preach of the Restoration. On three prior occasions Joseph had dictated revelations instructing elders to travel "two by two" preaching the gospel and bearing testimony. If Francis travelled with a companion he did not record it. During the early nineteenth century it was common to encounter itinerant clergy and laymen travelling a circuit of congregations or functioning as lay exhorters through the countryside. As the Mormons began dispatching their version of this breed into the ministry, they joined a large number of sectarian counterparts in canvassing the religious and irreligious of America. Mormon missionaries travelled about the country, quite often relying on the generosity of those they encountered for food, clothing, and shelter. They commonly travelled afoot and continued a day's journey until finding a family or individual who would give a place to preach or shelter and food for the night. Travelling all night might be required if the weather were cold or if people were few or unfriendly. If money were available elders might stay in taverns.

Meetings were usually held in private homes, a nearby schoolhouse, or occasionally a local church. The missionary or his host would circulate notice of a meeting's appointment and extend invitations to attend. A typical meeting might consist of a hymn and a prayer, then an address by the missionaries. Though discussion could become argumentatively warm or listeners might be powerfully moved by the Spirit, meetings held by Mormons typically avoided emotionalistic displays. At the end of the meeting an invitation for baptism might be offered by the missionaries (if they held the office of priest in the Aaronic priesthood or elder or high
priest in the Melchizedek priesthood), usually to be performed in a nearby stream the next day.  

If a sufficient number of converts were made in one place, a branch (a local congregation, often temporary) might be organized until the new members had enough time to settle their affairs and "gather" to one of the church centers in Ohio or Missouri. The doctrine of gathering the faithful was central to Mormonism throughout the nineteenth and into the early twentieth centuries.

Francis' experiences on a circuit for the Freewill Baptists prepared him for the roving life of a Mormon missionary. During the decade between 1832 and 1842 he would travel sporadically as a missionary for the Latter-day Saints, traversing the area between Ohio, Maine, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

The respite in a missionary's duties came when a conference was appointed by church leaders. Conferences assembled the missionaries from an area for two or three days of meetings where local church business would be transacted, ordinations might occur, instructions would be given, and assignments made. Reports and minutes would be directed back to Kirtland for the First Presidency (Presidency of the High Priesthood). These conferences were under the direction of a popularly elected chairman and recorded by a clerk or secretary. The summary reports were often published in the Church periodicals such as the *Messenger and Advocate* (Kirtland) or later the *Times and Seasons* (Nauvoo).

On the 23rd of July, 1833, Francis was elected by the other attending missionaries as chair of the Westfield Conference, held in the New York town of the same name. In addition to the conference's regular business, Elder James Higbee was tried for an unrecorded offense. As chair, Francis would have presided over the trial and tendered final judgment in the case. Witnesses questioned in the case substantiated the charge against Higbee and his license to preach was demanded.
When it was not surrendered, Francis, acting as chairman, moved to take formal action. By a vote of the assembly, Higbee was excommunicated from the Church.\textsuperscript{83}

Such action taken by a conference was binding but always subject to appeal before a higher council. When the "Church of Christ" was first organized there were no ecclesiastical councils. As membership grew and the organizational needs changed, two important bodies were created, the high council in 1834 and the travelling high council, or twelve apostles, the following year. The latter body having been newly commissioned at the time Bishop was being tried, the precise relationship between the two councils' responsibilities was unclear.\textsuperscript{84} In 1835 the Church officially became known as "The Church of the Latter Day Saints." In 1833 appeal would have been directly to the First Presidency; following the organization of the high councils of Zion in Missouri and Kirtland, Ohio in 1834, to one of those bodies. After 1835 the Twelve Travelling Councilors—the Quorum of Twelve Apostles—also were involved with judging cases.\textsuperscript{85} The distinction between the jurisdictions of these several groups was not firm, especially between the high council and the apostolic quorum, until a clarification was made by the Prophet, generated by a question in a yet-future trial for heresy—Francis G. Bishop's.

After the conference Francis continued to travel throughout the summer and into the fall of 1833. As the leaves changed color, the days shortened, and cooler nights came more frequently, Francis decided to return to Kirtland. He arrived in late autumn nearly destitute. His parents, Isaac and Mary Bishop, also newly arrived with the rest of the family, were no doubt happy to see their missionary son appear at the door but not in this condition. Francis arrived as one of several hundred newcomers to Kirtland. The town had become one focal point for converts to the new religion and was home to the leadership of the Church. It also served as a temporary haven for those planning to press on to Mormon settlements in western Missouri. The influx of
new arrivals strained tighter and tighter the housing and resources available in the community. Many of the saints arriving and already in Kirtland had abandoned unsold farms elsewhere to make the trip and were in serious need of help for basic subsistence. With winter coming on, the number of those unable to fully support themselves constituted a threat to the community's economic balance.

In the U.S. during the first half of the nineteenth century, what welfare systems existed were shouldered by individual towns and townships. To reduce the number of poor who had to be sustained by public means, it was the prerogative of the township's Overseers of the Poor to warrant the sheriff to "warn out" those who were judged to need public support. If a family or individual did not depart willingly, the town sheriff was authorized to forcibly evict and return the poor to the county of prior residence. Those who were truly destitute might be shuffled about the country. These were hard times for every family. In Kirtland, not too far removed from the subsistence economics of frontier life, a family must have been absolutely without hope to be thus addressed. 86

On a Thursday morning, the 21st of October, Kirtland's constable knocked at the door of "F.G. Bishop and family" to deliver a formal warning for removal. 87 It is possible that twenty-four-year-old Francis had returned to Kirtland with a wife or had come home to wed a local girl he had become acquainted with the year before. It is more likely that Francis was mistaken for the head of the house. The same day Francis' father and brother, Isaac Hyde, were similarly warned. The Bishops, however, were not the only ones thus served. Other undesirables, such as Joseph Smith, Jr. and Sidney Rigdon (councilor in the First Presidency and a former pastor of the United Brethren in nearby Mentor), were similarly warned. 88 In Bishop's case the cause for the warning may have justifiably been poverty. In some cases the motivation behind the warning may have been the desire to rid the town of increasing
Mormon influence.

Francis perceived in the warning a fortuitous opportunity to leave on another mission. By the middle of November he had travelled overland from Kirtland and had arrived in Norfolk, Connecticut. Here he preached several times to a receptive audience. Leaving Norfolk he kept to the road, passing through Canaan into southern Massachusetts. In the spring of 1834 Francis made his way back to Norfolk and baptized ten people who had heard him preach the previous winter. The following December he addressed to Kirtland a letter reporting his activities and successes in the summer of 1834. It is a good summary of the range over which a missionary might travel in a year. After attending a June missionary conference in Maine, Francis travelled south to Boston and then back up the coast to Dover, New Hampshire. Dover did not prove to be a profitable place for preaching and Francis soon left, moving to Bradford, Maine, and then back to Dighton, Massachusetts. Leaving Dighton he travelled to Wendell then on to Salisbury, Connecticut. From here he addressed his letter to the editor of the *Messenger and Advocate*. On his return trip he again passed through Canaan, Connecticut, and stayed long enough to ordain a convert from the previous winter a priest. 

Many Mormon missionaries have reported experiences of miraculous protection or divine intervention. Francis shared in this protection at least once, though he may have been unaware of the occurrence. After the turn of the New Year, 1835, on a preaching tour through the rural areas of Connecticut, Bishop found occasion to preach at a meeting in Oxford, New Haven County. A local gentleman, Ashahel Mead, disagreed with the doctrines presented by the Mormon elder and became incensed at Bishop's intent to return. After the missionary had quit town, pursuing his journey, Mead vociferously pronounced his disapproval of the Mormon elder and the doctrines he taught. Since Bishop was to return for a second
appointment in two weeks, Mr. Mead agitated among the townsfolk for a mob to be
raised, which he volunteered to head, to drive the Mormon permanently from town.
"So confident did he seem to be that he was right, and Mr. B[ishop] wrong," wrote a
witness later, "that he repeated his request to be taken out of the way if Mr. B[ishop]
was right. He emphatically requested the whole company to remember what he
said."94

Shortly after this bold display Mead became ill, deranged, and for a week
vacillated between sanity and madness. Before the missionary to whom he had taken
offense arrived in town, his battle was over. "[T]he very day he proposed to head a
mob, he headed a funeral procession."95 Elder Bishop again preached in Oxford
unopposed.

Like the husbandman in Christ's parable of the sower, between 1833 and 1835
Bishop broadcast the seeds of new faith in the rocky soils and stony hearts of New
England Yankees. Though he labored for the Restored Gospel, circumstances would
soon demonstrate that he still insisted on preaching his own versions of its doctrine
and had not surrendered fully to the central authority of a prophet.

The 1835 Massachusetts Conference had been appointed for August in
Bradford; "All the Elders within reasonable bounds of these conferences are requested
to attend them, and it will be their duty so to do," read the conference notices in the
March Messenger and Advocate.96 The following month's issue contained a terse
notice printed for the information of the saints and congregations abroad stating that
Elder Francis G. Bishop was suspended from further preaching until his case could be
tried before the travelling high council or twelve apostles.97 Bishop's doctrine had
cought up with him.

In early April, elder Gibson Smith had addressed a letter to the Kirtland
authorities concerning the conduct and teaching of his fellow missionary. The
accusatory information in the letter prompted high council clerks Orson Hyde and William McLellin to post notice in the April Advocate concerning the wayward elder. Convert Julian Moses hinted in his autobiography that Smith and Bishop had been travelling companions when in the Canaan, Connecticut, area. Moses had been baptized by Smith and was the priest ordained by Bishop in 1834. Smith had addressed his letter to Kirtland from Norfolk, Connecticut, a town where Bishop had preached on at least two previous occasions. Bishop yet harbored the love of concentrating on the "mysteries of the Kingdom" and a very literal interpretation of scripture. Smith or other missionaries had occasioned to hear Bishop preach and didn't recognize some of his teachings. The charges proffered by Smith against Bishop are not fully known but, surmised from the record, concerned Bishop's speculation, scriptural interpretations, and doctrines not central to Mormon theology. A charge specifically mentioned in the suspension notice was Bishop's stated view on one of his favorite subjects, the identities of the "two witnesses" in Chapter 11 of the Revelation of St. John. As prophesied in the Apocalypse, these two prophets were to preach in the streets of Jerusalem for three years immediately before the return of the Lord. Francis had stated while speaking with "a brother" that these two might be himself and the man with whom he was speaking.

Prohibited from active proselyting, Bishop was left with the option to stay where he was (New Haven, Connecticut) until the Massachusetts Conference convened or of returning to Kirtland for a direct appeal. To save time and travel expenses he opted to stay in Connecticut. During the four-month wait without a valid ministerial license, Francis may have improved on his time and begun to accumulate the skills of watch repair and silversmithing that he later claimed as his trade on census reports and other documents.
In later years Bishop complained of the hurried inconvenience of attending the Bradford Conference for his trial. His complaint of a bothersome surprise is unconvincing. He would have seen the conference notification in the *Advocate* since it was from the pages of this source that he acknowledged receiving notice of his suspension. As a missionary, suspended or not, he should have been planning to attend the conference, as attendance was expected of all missionaries in the area—and he was given four months notice.

Bishop's case was the first of five ecclesiastical actions conducted as part of the conference chaired by apostle Brigham Young. On presentation of Bishop's case before the conference, it was discovered that the accuser, Gibson Smith, had failed to arrive. With no witness to substantiate Smith's charge, the action against Bishop was discharged without consideration. Despite the lack of evidence and an accuser, Bishop was not cleared nor permitted to resume preaching. Before dismissing his case, a second, separate charge of false prophecy was presented before the conference, which was substantiated by an unrecorded accuser. Francis' suspension was upheld. For appeal his case was remanded to Kirtland and the church officials there. Bishop, if he were to continue as a missionary for the Church—indeed, if he desired to retain church membership—was under the necessity of presenting himself in Kirtland to appeal his case before the authorities there.

With summer coming to an end, Bishop made the long trip overland from Massachusetts to the Church's headquarters. The overland trip from central Massachusetts to Kirtland, Ohio, would have taken about two weeks. Bishop probably lingered in the east to settle his affairs, departing late enough to arrive in Kirtland after the middle of September. On Monday the 28th he presented his case before the high council.

Oliver Cowdery, Joseph Smith's older brother Hyrum, and John Whitmer
presided over the council meeting of high priests, which included the twelve regular members of the high council. Members of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles, who had proffered the charge for which Bishop was called into account and who would serve as witnesses, were also present at the council meeting. The charges brought before the council were those on which the defendant had been suspended initially, that of "advancing heretical doctrines which were derogatory to the character of the Church." The given testimony revealed that Bishop was persisting in his personal interpretation of scripture and Church doctrines.

The case was opened for examination. William Smith, an apostle and younger brother of the Prophet, testified that Bishop had claimed when speaking with another church member that the "two witnesses" might be his hearer and himself, an accusation confirmed by Luke Johnson, another apostle. A second charge brought against Bishop concerned a failed (therefore false) prophecy. Bishop had been heard to prophesy the night a broadside was tacked up advertising the "Mormon prophet" for sale, that whoever had done so would die (perhaps given in hope of a repetition of circumstances that had felled Mr. Mead the year before). This, however, was not the end of the accusations. Other witnesses complicated the issue, stating that the accused was indolent and that he believed women "felt his spirit" and often fell in love with him. Finally, in defense of the elder, Brigham Young and Heber Kimball said they believed Bishop to be capable of magnifying his calling if he so chose.

After opinion and testimony had been received both in accusation and in defense, the humbled recusant rose and acknowledged his error. His confession made, Francis asked for the forgiveness of the council. Upon this demonstration of humility Francis was restored to full fellowship and priesthood responsibility. Following an afternoon recess, the council reconvened, and Bishop was reordained an elder.

Besides reclaiming a doctrinally wayward missionary, Bishop's trial before the
council provided an important organizational decision. During the hearing an 
unmentioned individual or party, perhaps Bishop himself, questioned the authority and 
decisions of the apostles in relation to those of the high council. It was suggested that 
the decisions of the more recently organized body (the Twelve) should be suborned to 
those of the council.\textsuperscript{108}

The minutes of the high council's organizational meeting in February 1834, 
which became a section in the Doctrine and Covenants, said nothing of a superior body when originally written. As the first edition of the D&C was being readied for publication, the Prophet added verse 13 to the text.\textsuperscript{109} This brief addition stated the relationship between the two bodies. Of the decisions of the high council and the travelling high council, or twelve apostles, the new verse stated: "From the decision of the former there can be an appeal, but from the decision of the latter there cannot. The latter can only be called in question by the general authorities of the church. . . ."\textsuperscript{110} This would seem to be a clear answer to the point in question, save that with the exceptions of Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery, and the compiling committee, no other Church members had yet seen the book. The volume of revelations had been approved by a council in August, but by Bishop's hearing date the sheets had only recently been sent to the bindery, and the finished volumes were not expected until November. The decision of the Prophet in Bishop's appeal thus became the first public distinction made regarding the separate responsibilities and hierarchical relationship of the two councils.

Examining the contextual implications in the accusations made against Bishop shows how deeply he was involved with his personal doctrines and interpretations of scripture relating to his calling given by the "Ancient of Days." Although he remained in the Church, Bishop had severed himself mentally from the core of Mormonism in
favor of his own call. Complaints brought before the Massachusetts Conference and high council were for more than personal quirks and not for merely heretical doctrines. The three charges all point to the idea that Bishop considered himself (perhaps unconsciously) unique among his fellow believers. The idea that he was possessed of an unusual ambiance, karma, aura, or charisma he believed to be strong enough to be discerned by others is hinted at in his opinion that women and others were able to sense "his spirit." It was something that "set him apart." At the same time, though it was caught slipping from his shoulders, Bishop began to try on the prophetic mantle. Francis had assumed an unsanctioned prophetic role in his teaching. Prophecy serves in Mormonism as a symbol of divine guidance and could not be ignored as a sign of station. Those appointed as Bishop had been needed to demonstrate prophetic ability.

This point relates to the charge of heresy, or more precisely, of advancing doctrines and ideas upon which nothing had yet been revealed. Bishop harbored a life-long love for the mysterious passages of scripture and avidly read them. In this situation Bishop had infused his private study into his public teaching and had been preaching personal interpretations of apocalyptic scripture along with the basic doctrines of the Church: faith in Jesus Christ, repentance, baptism by immersion for the remission of sin, and the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. It was not that Francis' preaching was inappropriate—the elders had been commissioned specifically to gather the righteous out from the world before the Apocalyptic day of burning—but rather that Bishop was teaching his own views and versions of scriptures and doctrines. His expressed views were, in this case, not in harmony with what had (or had not) been revealed and accepted as doctrine. He had transcended or superseded what then existed in the accepted body of truth. To use a colloquial phrase, he was "out on a limb" instead of close to the trunk.
Francis Bishop had not nor would he ever completely subordinate personal scriptural interpretations to Latter-day Saint doctrine because his opinions were founded in the call he felt was his by virtue of his earliest visions. After the Church finally broke with him in 1842, everything he would teach centered around his visions of 1826 and 1832, both involving a character he identified as the prophet Daniel's "Ancient of Days," supplemented by visions then yet to come in Nauvoo.

Neither had nor would Francis Bishop exclude his personal beliefs regarding his early visions from influencing his interpretations of Mormon doctrine. From his visions he was committed to the idea that he fit high into the divine plan—somehow. But in 1835 the visionary calling he had received three years earlier had still not coalesced into a clear destiny. Bishop was thus caught trying on prophetic stations (the "two witnesses"), seeking by trial and error the one into which he was destined to fit. Throughout his entire life, his early vision/visitation experiences were to give primary shape to his world view. He clung steadfastly to his vision-sanctioned realities and used them like a sculptor uses an armature—as a foundation, a primary point of reference and direction—in determining his interpretation of scriptural "reality." These he fleshed out with the clay of Restoration doctrines, but the design was his own. What he taught as a missionary was Mormonism on the surface, but under that veneer lay a core of Bishop's own values.

Properly identified, Francis G. Bishop was a heretic, not an apostate. Heretics rarely reject the social and emotional values of the parent group. Rather, values or beliefs may be changed or reinterpreted, restructured or reordered to coincide with personal beliefs and priorities. For Bishop this was the issue of authority, the authority of his visions particularly. For a true apostate the break may be made similarly but leads to a rejection of the group's social, emotional, and other values. The appellation "apostate" has been broadly and incorrectly used in all branches of
Mormonism to tar unregenerate dissenters with the onus of their dissent.

Even while serving as a missionary, defending and spreading the gospel, by 1835 Bishop had taken his third step towards a definite rift with the orthodox Mormon faith. His adolescent background taught a literal acceptance of scriptural tradition, learned in a Methodist upbringing and in Baptist service. Blended with Bishop's personality it would provide a foundation in scriptural familiarity that assured that what Bishop read in the scriptures he believed literally. His first step away from orthodoxy was his dissatisfaction over his appointed station as an elder in the Church, desire for the office of high priest, and the visitation and vision that rectified his concerns. The significance of these visions dominated his thinking and identity for the next three decades.

The second step was his preaching of this call in Olean Point and the appearance before the School of the Prophets. Here, in light of his subsequent actions, it appears as if he silently refused to accept the Church's decision that his 1832 ordination by the "Ancient of Days" was invalid. At the time he was also reassured that his 1826 vision had been and was "of importance."

Between 1833 and the 1835 trials (the print of the third step) Francis Bishop had begun to test his call, feeling about for the niche that he believed the Lord had prepared for him. One step remained, to be taken in Kirtland the following year, before the final one put him over the brink in Nauvoo.

Though he had been received back into communion, by this time (1835) Bishop had inwardly set himself on the path of a personal religion, which for a time would run in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints but because of its nature would inevitably part from it.
CHAPTER IV
SPIRITUAL FIRE

Francis had left on a mission to the New England states from Kirtland, Ohio, in
the spring of 1833. At the time he had been recently restored to fellowship in the
Church following a trial for heretical preaching. He returned from that mission in the
fall of 1835 to account for—and be cleared from—another charge of heresy.

Having again been restored to priesthood fellowship, Bishop chose to remain
in Kirtland for the winter. The enticement of economic opportunity that the town
offered may have been the deciding factor. In his missionary absence the town had
been transformed. The Kirtland he returned to in the fall of 1835 was not the same
Kirtland that he had left. The numbers of new arrivals meant an upswing in the
numbers of houses and businesses needed to supply the populace. There were new
opportunities to be taken, if nothing else, as a laborer for the buildings that were being
constructed on easily obtained credit.

By the time Bishop returned, Kirtland had grown from a tiny village into a
bustling town boasting high prices and gripped with speculative growth. Homes and
businesses were being constructed, the LDS temple was nearly completed, stores were
liberally spreading goods about town on the hope-filled promises of their patrons.
Francis was also to be caught by the spirit of pursuing material wealth, and he partook
in a small way of the general spirit of speculation that ran nearly rampant in the town.

Kirtland's inhabitants, Mormon and non-Mormon, held a bright hope for the future.
For the Mormons, rapid economic success, rising above the bitter expulsion from the
cluster of Jackson County, Missouri, settlements, could be interpreted as a sign of
Economic growth had been stimulated in part by the Mormons' construction of the Kirtland Temple. The temple project was disseminating into the local economy the offerings of the saints abroad, creating a cash surplus that artificially financed the town's economic growth. Construction of this edifice called for every available resource the Church possessed—and some that weren't available but still were needed. The ground had been laid out in 1833 and construction began in 1834, lagging during the westward march of Zion's Camp. Nearly every able-bodied man in Kirtland worked on the temple some time during its building. Francis, too, may have assisted in the temple's construction beside his father and brother.

The building of the temple contributed to the Mormons' optimism in another, intangible way. The saints had been commanded in 1832 to construct a "house of prayer, a house of fasting, a house of faith, a house of learning, a house of glory, a house of order, a house of God." By 1836 the building was nearing completion, and the dedication was greatly anticipated. To inform and prepare the priesthood leadership for the long-awaited dedication and to underscore the purpose for a house of the Lord, Joseph Smith began a series of instructional meetings for a select group in responsible church positions. Though these meetings predated the actual dedication and involved few of Kirtland's inhabitants, the experiences gained in this setting became crucial to the success of the dedication—and to our understanding the historical significance of the larger event.

Beginning in January, 1836, Joseph gathered members of the high council, the twelve apostles, the bishopric, and others, first in homes and later in the attic of the unfinished temple, to receive instruction in prayer meetings. The fifteen weeks, between January and April of 1836 became the most intense outpouring of divine approval.
ministration in the Church's history. Historian Milton Backman has counted ten separate meetings during the spring of 1836 in which the participants cited heavenly visitors. Nearly every meeting recorded spiritual manifestations: the attendance of angels, speaking in tongues, and visions. In five of the meetings for which records survive, the Savior made an appearance. As well, discord was occasionally manifested that interrupted or stopped the bestowal of divine gifts.\textsuperscript{115}

The handful of select attendants gained experience in cultivating the spiritual under the direct tutelage of the Prophet Joseph Smith in an environment more intimate, orderly, and controlled than the general meetings held later. Held until the dedication, these meetings provided many church leaders and those who would fill leadership positions in coming years their first experiences with manifestations of the divine.\textsuperscript{116} These private meetings were essentially "practice sessions," teaching the men how to purify and prepare the heart and mind, to focus concentration and prayer, and to "be one" so that inspiration, revelation, and the Spirit of the Lord might be received. Such meetings provided a context for "proper" spiritual experiences: Though the Spirit would come to a spiritually prepared individual, it did not come simply because a person considered himself to be so.

While these meetings were being held privately, efforts were made to fill the quorums of the priesthood to have as many priesthood holders as possible present for the dedication of the temple.\textsuperscript{117} At the beginning of March, a business conference of elders met and in the course of the meeting voted to issue a new license to the recently restored missionary, Francis G. Bishop.\textsuperscript{118} With a new lease on authority Francis felt he was ready to begin another mission and made preparations to leave. Before he had an opportunity to depart Kirtland, Joseph Smith instructed those planning on leaving for extended missions to wait until after the temple had been dedicated and recalled
those currently serving missions.\footnote{119}

To kill time before the dedication of the temple and the opportunity to receive his "enduement," Francis crossed from Kirtland over into Ontario, Canada, to preach briefly.\footnote{120} He could have been in Canada no more than three weeks, for he returned to be present for the dedication of the Kirtland Temple on Sunday, the 27th of March, 1836, and the solemn assembly meeting where the endowment was given three days later.\footnote{121}

The reason for the delay in dispersing missionaries was to allow as many as possible to receive the initial rites of the developing endowment. In Mormon theology, the endowment is a series of ceremonies that endow the recipient with knowledge of the purposes and plans of God for man; it brings with this knowledge an endowment of spiritual power.\footnote{122} The purpose of the endowment was to enable those who received it worthily to become brothers in the gospel, to seal their testimony in the hearts of their hearers, to withstand the powers of Satan.\footnote{123}

It was in Kirtland that Joseph Smith began to reveal the initial ordinances of the endowment ceremonies to the priesthood-holding Church membership. In later years, as the temple in Nauvoo was being readied, the Prophet expanded and deepened the scope of these ordinances; the endowment gained significant additional meaning and women were admitted with their husbands into the circle of initiates. During his lifetime Joseph bestowed the endowment fully to only the apostles and a select few in the upper room of his Nauvoo, Illinois, store.\footnote{124} It remained for the apostles, under the direction of Brigham Young, to administer this ordinance to 5500 saints, male and female, in the attic ordinance rooms of the dedicated—but unfinished—Nauvoo Temple.\footnote{125} However, as first explained and given in Kirtland, the purpose of the ordinance was limited.
The dedication day of the Kirtland Temple was a solemn occasion, long awaited by the saints who had spent, at a conservative estimate, sixty thousand dollars in materials and donated labor on an edifice to their God. Several hundred people were waiting at the doors of the temple before they opened at 8 A.M. Before 9:00 nearly a thousand people had crowded into the pews, and about a hundred who could not get in had gone to hold a meeting in the nearby schoolhouse. While it may not be positively stated that Bishop attended services in the temple, because he was a priesthood holder it is very likely that he indeed did.

The dedication service itself began promptly at 9:00 and lasted well into the afternoon. During the service Sidney Rigdon spoke at length, half a dozen hymns were sung, a lengthy dedicatory prayer was read by Joseph Smith, and the quorums of the Church were sustained by vote of the congregation. Before concluding the meeting several leaders testified of the truthfulness of the latter-day work; some addressed the congregation speaking in tongues. The crowd was dismissed a little after 4:00 that afternoon; however, the day was not over. Pentecost—the sign of God's acceptance—yet awaited.

That same evening the general priesthood quorums of the church reconvened to receive instructions from the Prophet relative to the solemn assembly, appointed for the coming Wednesday. It was to this gathering of priesthood that the sign of God's acceptance was given with Pentecostal force. Because he received his endowment later at the solemn assembly, it may be safely assumed Francis was in attendance at this meeting and was a witness to the workings of the Spirit.

Joseph began by instructing the assembled men about the ordinance they would attend to in the coming week and its solemnity. Having done so the Prophet began to counsel and instruct the priesthood bearers in relation to the Spirit of
Prophecy. If he had had an attentive audience, they were at once doubly so. In the high priests' pulpit Joseph stood and called for the congregation to speak and to prophesy. "Do not quench the Spirit;" the words were delivered forcefully as a command and a challenge, "for the first one that opens his mouth shall receive the Spirit of prophecy." Nineteen-year-old George A. Smith rose and began to speak and at once to prophesy. As he spoke out his voice was joined by a sound like that of a strong, rushing wind, filling the house with its sound. Just as no one could see the source of the audible but unfelt gale, no one could discern the source of the impulse that also moved the entire multitude to rise upon their feet at its coming. Once on their feet men began to prophesy and to speak in tongues, adding mortal voices to heaven's power; the heavens were opened and some beheld the visions of eternity. Joseph declared from the pulpit that the hall was filled with angels. Those who did not participate in visions and prophetic glossolalia at the least felt the power of the Spirit of God and heard and witnessed the words spoken by men in rapture.

Neighbors wrote of hearing an unusual sound in the house, of running outdoors and looking out of windows to behold the stone edifice illuminated from within by candles and lamps and from without by "a bright light like a pillar of fire resting upon the Temple." The Tabernacle in the wilderness in Moses' day had received the shekinah, the brightness of Divine Presence, described as "a pillar of fire by night and a vapor of smoke by day." A more permanent structure now enjoyed a similar outpouring and presence.

Into the night the heavenly display continued unabated. Finally, as the sustaining power ebbed away, the visions closed, the tongues fell still, and the congregation was seated. Their Pentecost had lasted until nearly the hour of dismissal—11 P.M. No doubt those who in their beds soon fell asleep did so with
echoes of hosannas ringing in their ears, and those who laid awake pondered the experience they had witnessed.

Of the next day the Prophet recorded anticlimactically in his history simply that he "Attended school. Nothing worthy of note transpired." While he and others studied Greek and Hebrew in the attic of the temple, Francis Bishop picked his way through the mud of Kirtland's thawing roads to the home of his father, where he received under the elder Bishop's hand a patriarchal blessing. In it Isaac promised his son great outpourings of the Holy Spirit if he remained faithful.

Thou shalt be a mighty man and travel throughout the earth from land to land, and from sea to sea, and be a messenger even to the end of the earth, and be one to spread forth the Kingdom abroad, and bring thousands unto it; thou shall lead thy thousands to Zion, even a great army. . . . Thy name shall be known afar off, and sounded from land to land, and from sea to sea, to earth's remotest bounds.

This is thy blessing.

The pronouncement was recorded longhand by a scribe and confirmed later by the official Church patriarch, Joseph Smith, Sr. The elder Smith would not have reread the blessing's text but simply confirmed that the blessing previously received was of force as a patriarchal blessing. This blessing in later years came close to attaining the status that Bishop placed on his recorded visions.

On the morning of Wednesday, the 30th of March, Francis knocked the spring mud from his feet and entered the cool confines of the temple to attend the long-promised solemn assembly. Admittance was by invitation only, and Francis seated
himself amongst the other three hundred priesthood holders in attendance. Presently the assembly was called to order and the thirty-one-year-old Prophet ascended the stairs to the pulpit.

Joseph began, after calling the meeting to order, by commenting on the trials of the Church. He then introduced and explained to the assembly the ordinance of washing of feet that was to take place among them that day. He, with Sidney Rigdon and Frederick Williams, washed the feet of the newly chosen twelve apostles, who in turn repeated the performance for the presidents of the quorums present. As they proceeded, these brethren began to prophesy in behalf of each other. The ordinances for the others in attendance and prophetic pronouncements continued throughout the day and into the evening.

When it had been completed, Joseph again addressed the congregation as the sacrament of the Lord's supper was distributed. At about candle light the Prophet retired, leaving those assembled to enjoy the companionship of the Spirit. Francis stayed all night in the temple with the others to receive his endowment at the hands of the apostles. The Pentecostal outpouring that had accepted the building three days before at the dedication was reconfirmed at this gathering.\textsuperscript{133}

The experiences of these days had an impact on those who participated in the spiritual outpouring. But there is a context against which the marvelous power and events of the meetings must be arrayed. Importantly, the majority of priesthood holders who attended both the post-dedication meeting and the solemn assembly were not those who had been in the earlier gatherings where similar heavenly manifestations were received. While about a score of Church members could claim over six years of church activity, those participating in the post-dedication meetings were drawn from the general membership of the church and had comparatively little
depth in Restoration experience. This was not the only hedge; these general quorum members had not been prepared for the experience to the extent that council and bishopric members, those in the earlier meetings, had been. Many in attendance saw visions, were visited by angels, heard choirs, and some recorded seeing the Savior himself. Given the diversity of the congregation and the depths of Restoration experience, it may be stated with certainty that not all in attendance shared equally in the manifestations of the Spirit. Still, those who did not receive the gift of tongues, of prophecy, or revelations, saw their neighbors in rapture, heard the tongues, and may have shared in the visions as the recipients related what they were seeing. Regardless of the statistical distribution of the experiences, something spectacular was happening.

The significance of the events witnessed at these times was probably not fully comprehended by the majority of those who received them. Without an adequate understanding of the marvelous manifestations they received or witnessed or their purpose and meaning, the door was left open to personal rationalization in an effort to understand the reasons for bestowal. The experience in the temple would in time become the past, to be remembered through the veil of time and at the mercy of the conscious present. The Kirtland Temple dedication experience would thus gain significance in the minds of the attendants as temporal distance increased.

Many who were in attendance at this meeting stayed with the core of the Latter-day Saints, moved to Utah, and regarded their experience in Kirtland as a divine testimony regarding the work in which they were engaged. But not all who received visions or were present to experience the outpouring of the Holy Spirit stayed "faithful." Some followed or became leaders in the divisive years of factionalization in the Church after the death of Joseph Smith. For some disaffected and schismatics the experiences at the solemn assembly in Kirtland became keys to identifying what
"used to be" and a mark of what seemed to be lacking in the Nauvoo experience. The roots of the Mormon division after 1844 might thus be seen as originating in this significant event, the rich spiritual soil of the Kirtland Temple dedication and the priesthood's endowment at the solemn assembly. So it was that while the Kirtland Temple experience was an exercise in community-building, it also laid the groundwork of differing interpretations that would ultimately divide that community.

These two meetings served to overtly mark with a literal "blaze of glory" the conclusion of the first phase of Joseph Smith's public prophetic experience that, for lack of another term, may be labeled his Revelatory phase. This is not to imply that revelation to the young prophet would cease but rather that the genre of the Prophet's expression was to change in the years following troubles in Kirtland and those already brewing in northern Missouri. The Prophet was maturing in knowledge and experience, and the preoccupation with survival in the face of mobs in Missouri and the very real issue of betrayal were two other reasons for the revelatory lack. In Missouri many of those who had been with the Prophet in the earliest days of the Church left disenchanted or were excommunicated.

The change in the accustomed revelatory practice that began in Missouri continued in Nauvoo. Joseph was faced with enormous growth in converts, consequently a diminishing percentage of the membership of the church that could claim even five years with the Restoration. Neophytes needed basic gospel instruction to enable them to build a framework of understanding on their foundation of faith. Nauvoo would see the Prophet publicly becoming more an instructor than an orator, explaining the doctrines that had already been received. Here in Nauvoo he began concentrating on preparing the saints to receive enlightenment for themselves and eventually open revelation and inspiration. Spiritual milk was given freely,
while meat was revealed to a select few who had proved themselves willing to keep the intelligence they had received. Revelation had not ceased; such works as the "Book of Abraham" and the 1843 revelation on celestial marriage were still to come. What changed was the circumstances in which these revelations were received and presented to the Church in general. Revelation and prophecy did not cease, they simply became private, and publicly Joseph became a tutor or preceptor. A good example of this is the King Follet Discourse. Joseph presented the doctrine of the corporality of Diety and the eternal progression of Man without dictating the concepts as revelation. He spake as a prophet, but it was from his own knowledge and with what he had himself received.

It was precisely this shift that many who sought to lead and reform the Church after Smith's death tried to reverse, seeking to return to primitive Mormonism and the days of open prophecy, public revelation, and divine manifestations. Remembering the successes of earlier years, many of the later schismatic leaders chose Kirtland, Ohio, in which to "reawaken" the spirit of the Church.

No record of Bishop's personal participation at the Kirtland Temple's dedicatory events is presently known to exist. We can only speculate at what he experienced. It is probable that he was not one of the company who was wrapped in visions, for he makes no mention of such in any of his later writings or remembrances. Bishop's demonstrated propensity to inflate an experience for his own good makes it difficult to believe that he would not have reported supramortal experience in the Kirtland Temple had there been anything to report. Had he been a participant in the rapture of visions he certainly would have regarded this experience as he did his earlier visions—through the rose-colored glasses of idio-doctrines, belief in divine favor, and personal self-importance.
CHAPTER V
THE LATER MISSIONS

By early summer of 1836 Francis had been immersed in the optimistic spirit of Kirtland for six months or more. Francis had returned to Kirtland the September previous, suspended from missionary service. He was now restored and endowed "with power," ready to depart for another missionary endeavor. In this and the following year he would fill two brief missions to the eastern states, the first around Washington, D.C., and the following spring through Pennsylvania and Maryland in the company of an Elder James.¹⁴⁴

Before leaving Kirtland for Washington, Francis secured the elder's license that had been promised the month before. This paper identified him as a faithful member of the Church and recognized his status as a "minister of the Gospel."¹⁴⁵ To Bishop this certificate represented a final vindication in his recent ecclesiastical suspension. Signed by Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon, it served as a tie to the Church's priesthood leadership and a symbol of his good standing in the eyes of the Restoration. He kept this paper with him for more than twenty years.¹⁴⁶ What he didn't seem to realize was that all missionaries were issued identical certificates and that his was not a special dispensation.¹⁴⁷ Nearly two hundred-fifty elder's licenses were issued before the first of June the same year.¹⁴⁸

As the summer came in Kirtland, the blaze of spiritual events surrounding the temple dedication subsided. With the house of the Lord complete, those who had labored in its construction were free to concentrate on improving their financial standings. Many returned their attention to their small farms.¹⁴⁹ As they did so the
money that had been sent to Kirtland to support the temple's construction ceased to circulate in the local economy. The offerings of the saints abroad had supported the cash-poor town's economy and had now been removed as a prop. In place of the dedication's fire, another spark was struck, kindling an economic blaze that eventually consumed Kirtland.

Kirtland's continued growth was tethered by a lack of capital circulation. In an effort to convert substantial land wealth into hard capital, a plan was laid by Church leaders to create a local bank. A bank would help give Kirtland the security and stability that the volatile speculative market which had built the town had not. Kirtland still had happy people, giddy with the rapid pace of economic development and confident of the future. The organization of a bank, in light of the country's economic circumstances, was a manifestation of their optimism.

At a meeting on the second of November, 1836, articles were drawn up preparatory to petitioning the Ohio legislature for a formal bank charter. It was not an unusual request that the Kirtland Mormons submitted. The group of signatories were confident of obtaining an operational charter and went naively ahead with plans to operate as though one had been granted. Oliver Cowdery, commissioned to secure the banknote plates, was instructed to have the name of "The Kirtland Safety Society Bank" engraved thereon. Cowdery embarked for Philadelphia as Orson Hyde was dispatched to petition the legislature for a charter.

With the two emissaries on their journeys, Society shares were subscribed on a percentage margin, at fractions of face value. Some investors paid next to nothing for huge amounts of stock, others purchased small amounts for more realistic prices. In the midst of the plans, as fall came and winter began to creep inland, Francis returned from his brief summer mission to Washington, D.C. Newly returned, he decided to
buy into the new bank. He bought twenty fifty-dollar shares of the venture and paid in fifty-three cents per share, or $10.62, probably the largest amount of cash he could raise readily.\textsuperscript{150} Isaac, Francis' brother, purchased an even hundred shares for $26.19, five times his brother's shares at a purchase value of half the price per share. With the shares subscribed and partially paid in, Cowdery returned with the banknote plates, his mission successful. Hyde's was not. The legislature had refused to grant the charter.

Scholarly examinations of the condition of Ohio's economy in 1837 reveal that far too many private banks had been commissioned and the economy was unable to support them all. The "Hard-money" Democrats who politically dominated the Ohio legislature realized this and were so successful in blocking the issuance of additional bank charters that no new charters were granted in 1835, and only one of sixteen petitions was honored in 1836.\textsuperscript{151}

This situation put the saints in a bind. The officers were elected, payment was due on the plates and banknotes which had been printed and delivered, and the town was needing circulating currency. The Kirtland Safety Society was now in an operable position but without a legal license. As a stop-gap measure, a bank in Michigan was purchased with the hope that its charter might be extended to cover Kirtland's. Additionally, on January 2, 1837, a formal reorganization of the unchartered Kirtland Safety Society into a private, joint-stock "anti-banking" company took place.\textsuperscript{152} Several hundred men, Francis and brother Isaac included, signed the document as stockholders in the corporation. Notes printed "Kirtland Safety Society Bank" were stamped by hand to read Kirtland Safety Society "anti-Bank-ing Co."

Despite this setback, Francis finally leaped headlong into the town's speculative mood at the end of December, 1836. He purchased a seven-acre tract in town, which cost him $10,000, a good illustration of how inflated prices had
Given such an enormous purchase price, Bishop was probably planning on subdividing and reselling his parcel at a profit. In 1831 Kirtland, a typical half-acre town lot could have been secured for between $10.00 and $50.00. As more and more saints flocked to the headquarters of their church, prices rose, fed not only by the rising numbers of purchasers but also by the grand plans that these people held. Lots were selling at substantially inflated prices. Two years later, after the Safety Society had collapsed and Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon had fled Kirtland at night, land prices became more realistic. But for now the buying and selling was heavy, supported by the popular desires and apparent opportunities to become wealthy.

December also held another opportunity for the twenty-seven-year-old elder. At the beginning of the year (1836) growth in the church had pressed Joseph Smith to ask Alva Beaman, president of the Kirtland elders' quorum, to submit a list of names for a second Quorum of Seventy Elders. Within a few weeks, the list, which included the name of Francis Gladden Bishop, was readied and given to the Prophet, but the temple dedication and other business had so occupied the Prophet during the year that action towards organization was postponed. Finally, on the 31st of December, the list was approved by a general vote and the men formally called to become members of the new quorum. This calling brought Francis within shouting distance of the Church's central leadership bodies. Though it was not a call to actual leadership, it gave Francis, as a member of a priesthood quorum, opportunities to be more closely involved with men such as Wilford Woodruff and John E. Page, friends of Joseph Smith's, and with others who would later occupy leadership positions.

In the spring Bishop again left on a mission to the east. Returning to Kirtland in the fall, having been to Maryland and again to Washington, D.C., Francis passed through Rochester, New York. There on October 28th he was voted secretary of the
Rochester Conference to record and forward the proceedings of the conference to Kirtland.\textsuperscript{157} Since he was travelling that direction, hand-carrying the report instead of forwarding it through the mails would have been as rapid.

While in the Rochester area he may have passed the old Greece, New York, homestead where he had spent his boyhood and where his father had been swindled out of his farm, to see how ten years had changed the land and neighbors. He would have found a different town. Greece by this time was a suburb of Rochester, a major lake-port city on the trade routes into Canada and south and east through New York itself.

In November, 1837, almost immediately upon arrival in Kirtland, Francis sold the seven acres he had secured the year before. He was luckier than most who owned land in town. The buyer, one Ebeneezer Jennings, paid Bishop $10,000 for the property. By closing the deal at the price that he had originally paid for the parcel, Francis avoided financial ruin.\textsuperscript{158}

While Bishop had been travelling in the East and as he arrived in town, the reorganized Kirtland Anti-banking Society collapsed in a tumult of accusation and corruption. The enterprise had rapidly paid out its specie assets, and Society officers were charged for circulating unauthorized bank notes. To compound matters, Warren Parrish, the bank's president, was accused of counterfeiting and embezzling funds to finance his own speculative ventures. Joseph Smith resigned as cashier as the extent of Parrish's actions became known. Discounts for Kirtland notes became greater and greater till they were worth next to nothing. At the same time the Church experienced widespread apostasies, including some within the leadership. Joseph and Sidney Rigdon eventually fled Kirtland in the middle of a January night "to escape mob violence."\textsuperscript{159}
Bishop left Kirtland also by early spring, probably planning on embarking on another mission or travelling to the Church's new headquarters in Caldwell County, Missouri. Before leaving Ohio he secured, in addition to his ministerial certificate from the Church, a license to perform marriages.¹⁶⁰ If he had been planning to go to Missouri he decided against doing so and redirected his attention to the labors of a missionary.

Francis disappears from record during the summer of 1838, but by fall he had made his way east and south, where he suddenly appeared in Patrick County, Virginia, along the North Carolina border. While laboring in this area he was contacted by a branch in North Carolina that had been left without an elder to preside over the local congregation.¹⁶¹ In response to the solicitation, Francis discontinued his proselyting and went to preside over a group that needed priesthood leadership. However, in answering the request, Bishop flung himself into the teeth of another member of the Seventy Elders and one of Mormonism's growing legends--Jedediah M. Grant. At the end of November he addressed a letter to Sidney Rigdon from this area--Webbs, in Stokes County, North Carolina--telling briefly of his recent activities but not mentioning the circumstances of his arrival in Webbs.¹⁶² Bishop's letter, which naively reported his success and travels, only served to fuel an accusation against him that would result in his being disfellowshipped yet again.

Jedediah Grant was well known and widely respected in the areas where he had labored as a missionary. Even thirty years after his departure, another Mormon missionary in the Webbs area could report that Jedediah Grant's name and works were "household words, in North Carolina and Virginia, where he labored and organized branches of the Church."¹⁶³ Grant, a firebrand who would in the 1850s fan the consuming fires of Reformation in the Utah branch of the Church, had departed Stokes
County, North Carolina, only weeks before Francis arrived.

Hearing unsettling rumors flying about concerning the events in Missouri, Grant had left North Carolina in October of 1838, arriving in Missouri just in time to assist his parents and family in the Mormon retreat from that state. Governor Lilburn Boggs had issued his infamous executive "Extermination Order," which permitted the hastily mobilized non-Mormons, as the state militia, to have the Mormons "exterminated or driven from the state... [italics in original]." This gave legal license to one side of the depredations that had been happening in Missouri's northern counties for months. Bringham Young, newly returned from the British Mission and the senior church leader who was not dead, in jail, or apostatized from the church, was directing the retreat.

Francis' letter to Sidney Rigdon was written in November of 1838. In it Bishop asked for letters of introduction and character; he was not well received on his ministerial certificate alone, though he reported locating some patrons in well-born families of the area. There had been enough converts baptized (by his predecessor, he failed to add) that Francis felt a conference could be convened and suggested that Joseph and Sidney should consider coming. His letter demonstrates how little Bishop was aware of what was happening in Missouri. Joseph and Hyrum Smith, with Sidney Rigdon and others, were incarcerated illegally in Liberty, Missouri; and with the issuance of Boggs' order tensions were exploding on both sides, focusing the Mormons' immediate attention on the issue of survival in the face of armed mobs and a hostile state government. Pleasant letters of reference occupied a low point on the priority list.

While the letter to Rigdon was on its way, anti-Mormon sentiment was being stirred up in North Carolina. Francis learned of at least one mob attempt that was
Frustrated for lack of a leader. Faced with condemnatory rumors about his church, Francis Bishop and his cause were in need of some positive attention. Alarmed at the actions in Missouri and with problems beginning to surface in his area of labor, Francis put hope in the adage that the pen is mightier than the sword. In the early weeks of 1839 he sat down and penned a manuscript touching lightly on rise of the Church and trying to particularly address the persecutions in Missouri from the Mormon perspective. The bulk of the work was a broad defense of the principles of American religious liberty, more suited to his talents at writing than at history. Lacking details of recent events, he reviewed the mobbing of Joseph and Sidney Rigdon at Hiram, Ohio, in 1832 and wrote of the persecutions five years previous in Jackson County, Missouri, mentioning only briefly the recent Haun's Mill Massacre and the election riot at Gallatin.

With this draft in hand Francis travelled south to Salem, North Carolina, where it was set in type and published under the title of *A Brief History of the Church of the Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints*. With the publication of this short work Bishop added his name to the list of the earliest pamphleteer defenders of Mormondom. Bishop's *Brief History* was one of the first published non-doctrinal defenses of the young church and also probably the first non-periodical published history. The last page carried a notice that the author also desired to publish a selection of hymns and "A Scriptural Illustration of the Peculiarities of the Religious Faith of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." In light of his propensity to teach his own ideas, the scriptural work would have been fascinating. Apparently neither was ever published.

Once his treatise was published Francis mailed copies to political leaders in Washington, D.C. and distributed copies about the area he was laboring. Bishop
credits his pamphlet with softening local public opinion towards the Mormons. He also believed that his pamphlet defense of the Church's position prepared the way for Joseph Smith's trip to Washington a year later (1840) to petition for Congressional redress in behalf of damages sustained by the Saints in Missouri.  

By the time the Brief History had been readied for distribution, Francis' letter to Sidney Rigdon had arrived in Missouri. Its intended recipient had been released from a Missouri dungeon for health reasons and was in 1839 either in Quincy, Illinois (a temporary refuge for those fleeing Missouri), or in a minute, swampy townsite called Commerce, forty miles north of Quincy on the Mississippi River, where the Church would soon establish its new headquarters. Since the letter was from Jedediah Grant's former missionary area Rigdon might have shown it to Grant. Grant was independently apprised of the situation in a separate letter from the saints in the South and asked in June to return to North Carolina.  

By late that August, 1839, probably by letter (since no Latter-day Saint periodicals were printed at the time), Bishop was notified by Brigham Young that he was suspended from preaching yet again and was summoned to appear in defense of his actions in North Carolina. Ironically, Grant had petitioned for additional missionaries in the spring of 1838 and had received a tacit promise of help from apostle Thomas B. Marsh.  

Francis was shocked that such an innocuous act as crossing a state boundary would engender such a response from authorities. He was certainly aware of the stated responsibilities of a missionary, though he may not have been aware of a circular recently published in the first number of the Nauvoo Times and Seasons. This epistle, signed by six of the twelve apostles, contained admonition and reassurance for the scattered saints and a few words to the elders laboring abroad. "We would also
warn the elders," the epistle read, "according to previous counsel not to go on to another's ground without invitation to interfere with another's privilege, for your mission is to the world and not to the churches."\textsuperscript{177} Another important clause followed this word of warning. "We would also remark, that no man has a right to usurp authority or power over any church, nor has any man power to preside over any church, unless he is solicited and received by the voice of that church to preside."\textsuperscript{178}

Despite Bishop's later claim that he had been asked to preside by the North Carolina branch, he failed to remember that he was moving into another elder's area and for the purpose of presiding over a congregation. Not only was he flying in the face of both instructions, but Francis was also a Seventy, a priesthood office that is called specifically to preach and not to preside.\textsuperscript{179} The temptation for position and recognition had been too great for better judgment.

The suspension letter he received was vague in relation to the charge brought against him but from the administrative end was motivated by his actions in another's area.\textsuperscript{180} To allay suspicions of misconduct that his actions might have caused in his superiors, Francis began to gather character references from people in North Carolina and Virginia, where he was laboring.\textsuperscript{181}

With these in hand he began the overland trek to the new Church headquarters. Instead of travelling up the coast and taking the Erie Canal or Ohio River west, Francis travelled a more direct route across the Allegheny Mountains. Once on the western side of the mountains he took the occasion to preach in several Kentucky towns.\textsuperscript{182}

Elder Francis G. Bishop made an unheralded entrance into the "City of Joseph," Nauvoo, Illinois, around the turn of the 1840 New Year. He had no family in the city this time, as had been the case in Kirtland. Francis' parents' family had
travelled west with the Kirtland or Poor Camp in 1837, when the Mormons essentially evacuated Kirtland, and had settled where they were in Jacksonville, Illinois, when word was received of the saints' expulsion from Missouri. Francis' parents and brother, Isaac, had settled in the Illinois state capitol at Springfield. His sister and her family soon moved nearer Nauvoo, to Macedonia.

By arriving in the city when he did, Bishop missed a discourse by Joseph Smith that might (or might not) have been key in the prevention of Bishop's future career as a schismatic leader in post-martyrdom Mormonism. After his first vision years before, Francis had decided that his extra-mortal visitor was the "Ancient of Days." In coming years Bishop would name this important person as John the Revelator. In the summer of 1839 the Prophet Joseph Smith spoke concerning the mission and identity of the Ancient of Days, and he identified the prophet Daniel's figure as Adam, the father of the human family. Bishop's actions and experiences demonstrate that he was much more concerned with his interpretation and understanding than he was in others', regardless of their station. He still regarded what he had been told by the "Ancient of Days" in 1832 as truth: that he had been ordained to the "High Priesthood" and would one day lead the Church. He would wait for the Lord to prepare the way. But even eight years after his vision of the Ancient of Days, he had not surrendered his desires for a recognized ordination to the office of high priest. He still believed himself called to greater things than that with which he was now involved. Had Bishop been present to hear Joseph's discourse it would likely have had little effect on his personal views.

Francis probably arrived in Nauvoo in late December, 1839, or in January of 1840. By then winter's cold had killed off the malaria-carrying mosquitos that had spread epidemic through the weakened refugees the previous summer and fall.
townsite had been secured and plans were being laid on a grand scale for Mormonism's new haven. However, before partaking of the city's newborn opportunities, there remained for Francis the matter of his most recent suspension.

Francis was not long in the city when his case was pled before Hyrum Smith and the city's new high council. No official record remains of the hearing, but to substantiate or dismiss such actions would have required, as in previous cases, an official hearing before church authorities. In Bishop's own sketchy recounting of the proceedings (the only remaining source), he claims that he was notified of the specific complaint against him only after arriving at Nauvoo. The certificates Francis had secured were certainly produced before the tribunal for their consideration. Bishop explained that he had crossed the district boundaries at the behest of the leaderless North Carolina branch. In light of subsequent council actions, Bishop also probably related an expurgated version of his experience of being ordained a high priest by his night visitor in 1832, avoiding mention of the precise circumstance of the claimed ordination, carefully trying to justify and soften the edge to the question of his actions in moving to preside over a branch without the recognized ordination and authority. Bishop's account states that the council decided Young had acted against the instructions of Joseph and Hyrum Smith as presidents of the Church. After consideration by the council Bishop was cleared of the charges levelled against him.

Once Bishop was restored to fellowship, Hyrum Smith formally introduced Francis to another brother of the Prophet, president of the Nauvoo High Priest's Quorum, Don Carlos Smith. Francis was accepted by "a previous ordination" as a member in that quorum. In the face of later actions this "ordination" was most likely the visionary one of 1832 by which Bishop claimed later authority, not one
performed at the hands of a recognized priesthood holder. \(^{193}\)

With his aspirations now formally recognized by the Church, Bishop was given a ministerial certificate from the Nauvoo High Priests Quorum and was "sent out to regulate the branches of the Church abroad in the United States." \(^{194}\) On February 4th, 1840, what became Bishop's last missionary report was published in the *Times and Seasons*, the Church's new periodical. \(^{195}\) His proselyting activity as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints had come-- unknowingly, as yet--to an end.
CHAPTER VI
THE NAUVOO APOSTATE

Today, as it was a century and more ago, the town of Nauvoo is a beautiful place. Before the Keokuk Dam raised the level of the Mississippi River, a rift of submerged limestone churned the usually calm blood of the Father of Waters, creating the Des Moines Rapids. The head of these rapids lies at the foot of a sizable westward bend in the river. This bend creates a beautiful level plain on the eastern bank, the only place for miles where the bluffs do not drop into the river, commanded by a gentle bluff backed by miles of black-soiled Illinois prairie.

When the Mormons first arrived in 1839, months after fleeing Missouri, the plain was the site of a grimy, minute speculation town hopefully named Commerce. The plain backing the town was an unhealthy tangle of stagnant pools and overgrown trees that taunted settlers. It was to this jungle that the Prophet Joseph Smith led his followers and laid out his city. By the time Francis Bishop arrived in fledgling Nauvoo in the first month of 1840, the swamp had been largely drained by a ditch along the foot of the bluff, diverting the springs at its base, and houses were being erected. Temporary log dwellings gave way to frame and later to brick homes as the city continued to grow with saints and converts emigrating to the new Zion.

His recent trial had concluded with a vindication of wrongdoing in North Carolina and Francis' introduction into the high priests' quorum. The spring of 1840 found Francis G. Bishop functioning as a high priest, sent out, as his nemesis Walton had claimed in Olean Point, New York, eight years ago, to "regulate the branches of the Church abroad." How long he occupied this calling and where he went remains
an unknown.

He did not enjoy his calling as a high priest for long. The unusual manner in which Francis had been admitted to membership in the high priests' quorum raised eyebrows and questions within priesthood circles. Within four months the issue became of sufficient concern to be addressed formally for explanation. At the opening meeting of the Church's annual general conference (coincidentally the tenth anniversary of the Church's founding, 6 APR 1840), a letter from the seven presidents of the Seventies quorum was read seeking clarification on a point of priesthood responsibility. The letter asked if those who held the priesthood office of Seventy in the church had a right to also claim the office of high priest. The case in point was the action taken in behalf of F.G. Bishop. The presidents wondered if others who had received similar ordinations had a claim to the quorum and priesthood responsibility that Francis Bishop now enjoyed. The topic was opened to the conference for discussion, and after opinions were delivered on the subject by several individuals (presumably church authorities) Joseph Smith laid the matter to rest. The Prophet stated that though a Seventy may have received an ordination to the office (that of a Seventy), the responsibility was by nature that of an elder in the church and not of a high priest, which is administrative. With this explanation Smith stated that brother Francis Bishop had no claim to the office or calling of high priest. By a vote of the congregation it was resolved that he (Bishop) be replaced in the Seventy.

In elaborating this distinction between responsibilities Joseph did not imply that Bishop could not have been ordained, only that he needed a separate ordination to be received into the high priests' quorum and attendant responsibility. This clarification finalized the division between priesthood offices and has been the policy of the church ever since. Despite the Prophet's repeated explanations of the call, occasionally questions were raised. This was the final time that a question was
advanced on this priesthood issue during Smith's lifetime.

This event is an insight to the inner workings of the Mormon church that sits in contrast to accusations of despotism made against the Mormons. Especially toward the end of Joseph Smith's life, accusations were made that he ruled the saints despotically and that they feared or refused to move without his permission. To be sure, Smith held and wielded enormous influence in his stations as prophet, lieutenant general of the militia, city recorder, and later as mayor of Nauvoo. But in this circumstance involving Bishop, such assumed trepidity in his followers does not appear to be grounded, which in turn reveals two things about the time period. First, even in the important matters of doctrine and priesthood there appears to have been room for interpretation. Hyrum, who was the Prophet's older brother and Associate President of the Church, was able to place Bishop in the high priest's quorum without Joseph's sanction or knowledge. Even though the decision was ultimately reversed by the younger Smith, Hyrum still exercised the latitude to make such an important decision. Once action had been taken, Joseph only advanced a point of clarification, not a condemnation concerning the action's validity. The Latter-day Saint structure in Nauvoo was perhaps not as autocratic as many have believed. Second, even into the Nauvoo period, in matters of priesthood and church governance the organizational structure was still developing.

With this decision rendered by the Prophet, Francis' hopes to "rise" in the priesthood were truncated for a time. Evidently the church leadership still did not feel that he had served sufficiently well to merit a priesthood advancement. In another case it may have been that the individual would have simply been ordained and left in the high priest's quorum. This decision from the president of the church no doubt stung Bishop. He had for years sought an opportunity to claim this priesthood office and on at least one occasion had asked outright for an ordination. Nevertheless, in
Nauvoo, as he had in times past, Francis stopped complaints in his throat, closed his mouth, and accepted the decision of the Church. Within two weeks of the general conference Francis was issued a new elder's license.\textsuperscript{204}

Nauvoo's situation in 1840 was similar to that in Kirtland, Ohio, five years before. The main business in town centered on its construction. By early summer 250 houses, mostly cabins of hewn timbers with a sprinkling of framed ones here and there, were counted in the new city.\textsuperscript{205} Hundreds more were needed by the 5,000 saints who had fled Missouri and by converts who were beginning to arrive in the city from the eastern states and Europe. As had been the case in Kirtland, labor was at a premium, and those who would work could easily find employment.

Rather than stay in the city, Francis might have returned as an elder to the life of a missionary. By mid-August thirty-one-year-old Elder Francis G. Bishop was in southern Indiana. Whether he was new to the area or as a functioning high priest had presided over a branch there remains a mystery. He had evidently spent enough time in the vicinity of Salem to become enamored with a local girl, Irena Overton, a daughter of Dandridge and Dorcas Overton. Since she was not of age (Irena was two months away from turning twenty-one) her father's consent was indicated when the couple registered their intent to marry at the county courthouse on the 15th of August, 1840. The following day William Strain witnessed that the marriage between Francis and Irena had by him been solemnized according to the law.\textsuperscript{206}

Francis G. Bishop was settling down to domestic responsibility, but he was still very much interested in becoming a recognized high priest. And he was still silently convinced that his nocturnal visitor in New York had been acting under the direction of the Most High when he came to deliver to him as a "young elder" divine favor and a call to the "High Priesthood."\textsuperscript{207}

Before the end of 1841 Bishop had arrived in Nauvoo with his bride of a year
and was able to purchase or trade for a pair of prime city lots on the bluffs overlooking town.\textsuperscript{208} Lots in the eighty-acre tract offered for sale by non-Mormon resident Daniel H. Wells were selling as dearly as $1,000 in 1840.\textsuperscript{209} It is unlikely that Bishop was in a position to pay cash for his properties, but in an economy as cash-poor as Nauvoo's there were alternate ways of securing a building lot. The Church held in trust the majority of properties in and near the city and was willing to settle a member on a lot for a reasonably small price. Neighbor George Lyman secured a lot north of the temple site from church trustees for $100 paid in labor.\textsuperscript{210}

Francis also had responsibility abroad that is probably indicative of continued missionary activity. A notice in the fourth number of volume two of the Nauvoo Times and Seasons stated that "The travelling and presiding Elders of the church . . . are authorized and solicited to act as Agents for the Times and Seasons."\textsuperscript{211} The prospectus published in the next number carried the notice: "No person will be considered an accredited agent, . . . whose name does not appear on the published list [at the end of the issue.]"\textsuperscript{212} The name of "F.G. Bishop" appeared on the last page of this and subsequent issues in the list of travelling agents. He maintained a commission as a travelling agent for the paper from January through at least August of 1841.\textsuperscript{213}

Before two years had passed from his arrival in Nauvoo and despite his continued activity outside the city, Bishop had secured himself financially and set himself up in business as a silversmith.\textsuperscript{214} The county tax records for 1842 show Bishop with a taxable personal property value of a respectable $220.\textsuperscript{215} From the same records it appears that in addition to silversmithing he was engaged in watch and clock sales and/or repair, for the taxable value of his timepieces in comparison to others in town was unusually large.

Francis and Irena lived in a house constructed on the best situated of his pair of
lots. Their home stood on the west half of lot 4, in block 9 of the Wells Addition to Nauvoo.\textsuperscript{216} This situation was in many respects ideal. Located nearly at the crest of the bluff overlooking town, it was part of a number of homes and businesses that, to the chagrin of the Prophet, were being built away from Nauvoo proper, which was on the plain in the bend of the Mississippi River. Bishop's home lot was also immediately north of block 20 of the Wells Addition, which had been purchased by the Church and set aside for the building of the second of Joseph Smith's houses of the Lord, the Nauvoo Temple.\textsuperscript{217} It was here that Francis set himself up in the silversmithing and/or watch and clock repair business.

Francis kept abreast of the opportunities to advance socially and ecclesiastically. Such an opportunity for social advancement presented itself at the end of 1841. On December 30th the name of "Francis G. Bishop, silversmith" was listed among the large number of applicants who petitioned the city's new Masonic lodge for admission to "Nauvoo Lodge, under Dispensation."\textsuperscript{218} On the third of February next, three weeks past his thirty-third birthday, Francis' name was among those cleared for membership.\textsuperscript{219} Yet the following month, when the body of applicants was entered on March 15th, Bishop's name was not among them; consequently, he was never accepted as a Mason. Whether he withdrew his own name or was rejected for an unknown reason is not apparent. He had been cleared; there had to be a reason why he was not accepted as an entered apprentice. Perhaps he remembered the anti-Masonic furor that had consumed New York when he was a boy-or perhaps the issue was not Masonic at all.

At the beginning of March of 1842, a member of the temple committee, responsible for overseeing the building plans and construction, happened to be at the temple site. Reynolds Cahoon had also been a member of the temple committee of the Kirtland Temple and might have been acquainted with the elder Bishop (Isaac G.)
while he worked on that edifice. This winter evening Cahoon called at the Bishop home and chanced upon Francis reading to his neighbors. After a moment's attention to the text, his attention was captured, and he listened to what Bishop was saying.

Francis was reading "something which he himself had written, illustrative of his Patriarchal blessing, and his Divine calling as the Branch, as sustained by the [scriptures]." To Francis his work represented a harmless personal attempt to comprehend his blessing. To an outside observer it appears that he was trying to square Holy Writ to his call and divine appointment. It demonstrates that Bishop had not, even after a decade in the Church, surrendered his belief in the authority of his early visions, regarding them superior to the prophetic declarations of the prophet he claimed to follow. Though they had been labeled as false by that prophet, to Bishop they were still valid and yet marked a call to greatness. When previously confronted about these odd beliefs Bishop himself had admitted a number of times, vocally at least, that he had been in error. Upon these confessions he had been reaccepted into the church. Evidently such acknowledgements were short lived, a more certain assurance of truth being given to Bishop by the memory of his own experiences. Too, it is possible that Bishop had continued to receive periodic visitations or revelations.

Cahoon lodged a charge against Bishop before the high council. Though there is no record of the specific content of Bishop's text, the charges brought by Cahoon suggest that Francis was representing his work as revelation or doctrine and had placed it on an authoritative par with the pronouncements of Joseph Smith acting as the prophet of the Lord and president of the Church.

The 11th of March, a Friday, was a pleasant early spring day. The Nauvoo Legion, the city's militia, had been on parade about the town, and the air of festivity common to a martial display was evident. The Legion was dismissed from the day's activities by Lieutenant-General Joseph Smith at the parade ground below the
temple, and after supper the Nauvoo high council convened at the office of Hyrum Smith. After a brief initial meeting the council adjourned to the Joseph Smith home for the business at hand. In addition to the Nauvoo stake presidency and the high council, several of the twelve apostles were in attendance. When the individual arrived in whose behalf the meeting had been called there were presumably twenty people present. The trial of Francis Gladden Bishop before this ecclesiastical court was curiously flavored with the exercise of civil power and illustrates how closely the two were tied together in Nauvoo at the time.

A high council court would have been prosecuted along the lines of the organizational pattern given in 1834, which set the order of the proceedings of the high council. Six of the twelve-member council were to take positions in defense of the accused and were to make certain that he had a fair hearing. The other six members were to take the part of prosecuters and make certain that the Church's interests were represented. Depending on the matters at hand, from one to three of the council from each side, prosecution and defense, were to be assigned to present arguments. The judges of the case were to be the presidency of the stake or the presiding authority, which in this case were William Marks and Joseph Smith, respectively. The council record does not reveal if Marks relinquished his position as judge to the Prophet, but Smith's presence and testimony certainly weighted the outcome of the hearing.

The complaint brought against Bishop before the council addressed Bishop's curious private ideas indirectly. The charge centered on Francis having publicized revelations and doctrines at variance with official teachings of the church. Once before the court it became the responsibility of the accuser, Reynolds Cahoon, to substantiate his charge. Cahoon remained the sole witness in the case (apparently no other witnesses were available). Since the testimony of a single witness was
 unacceptable for action, Cahoon averred that if the papers in question could be
procured and exhibited before the council, the validity of the charge could be proven
from them. Francis had neglected to bring or purposely not brought the writings in
question with him to the trial.

Considering his papers private, Francis refused to produce the documentation.
With Bishop's refusal to supply the needed evidence hindering prosecution of the trial,
Nauvoo Mayor John C. Bennett issued the equivalent of a bench warrant for the
seizure of the papers. Bishop, together with constable Solon Foster, travelled across
town to retrieve them from Bishop's house. The council suspended the proceeding
until the documentation was forthcoming.

Having returned from the cross-town trip with the items in hand, Bishop was
asked to read the same. At the council's insistence, and understandably with some
trepidation, he read parts of his revelations and written reflections on his call as "the
Branch." From these pages he read "that he [Bishop] should yet lead the Church; and
that whosoever opposed him in his divine calling, would be Anathema, Maranatha."
Francis must have been highly offended at the council's response: "the whole mass . .
. appeared to be the extreme of folly, nonsense, absurdity, falsehood and bombastic
egotism--so much so as to keep the Saints laughing, when not overcome by sorrow
and shame."226 It was Brigham Young's opinion that the reasoning was nonsense.227
Even before Francis finished, it was clear that the elder who had once been rebuked
for so eagerly seeking a high priest's office before the School of the Prophets had not
since guided his personal beliefs into line with accepted doctrines. His writings were
testimony of that fact.

Ridiculous and incriminating as Bishop's scriptural interpretations seemed to
the other council members, Bishop's friend and Nauvoo stake president William
Marks moved that the charges be dropped. With this motion on the table Joseph
Smith addressed the council and illustrated the potential problems associated with heresy. Having said this, other members of the council added their feelings and insights. After Hyrum Smith had said some words (possibly concerning the events of himself placing Bishop in the high priest's quorum), the high council voted unanimously that the heretic be removed from membership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The symbols of Bishop's offense, his writings, were committed to the coals of the fireplace; the gathered faces reflected a momentary brightening of flame, and the leaves were consumed. 228

Francis G. Bishop returned home stripped not only of priesthood office but also of official standing in the Church. In the remaining twenty-two years of his life Bishop never regained membership in mainstream Mormonism of whatever stripe. It was not that he didn't try, rather that church leaders would not accept his terms.

Four days after the trial, in the meeting-grove below the temple and within earshot of Bishop's house, Masonic Grand Master Abraham Jonas installed the Nauvoo Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons. Through the coming months those whose names had been cleared were entered into the initial rites of Masonry. Though he had been cleared, Francis Gladden Bishop's name was not listed among those who were raised to membership--at least a dozen of those who in February had sat in judgment against him were. 229

Francis apparently continued to operate his silversmithing business in Nauvoo throughout the spring and summer of 1842. Having been rejected as a prophet and expecting the destruction of Nauvoo, he prepared to leave. Two months after his excommunication, Francis placed an advertisement in the local paper, the Wasp, giving notice of his intent to leave and his desire to sell his two lots and houses. 230 After the sale advertisement appeared, William Marks and Hyrum Smith privately counselled Bishop to remain in the city, expressing confidence that the affair would
blow over and that he could rejoin the Church.\textsuperscript{231} Had he accepted these men's advice he may have rejoined and so remained more anonymous to history. But while he was waiting to close out his business in the city revelations began to come in earnest. This was the call to action for which he had waited so long.

In 1826 Bishop had received in vision three beings whom he identified later as the three Nephite disciples in the Book of Mormon, changed to an immortal state without death, and of a fourth whom he called the "Ancient of Days."\textsuperscript{232} In the spring or early summer of 1842 he was informed by "a promise of the Lord" to expect another visit from one of the three who had visited him years before. Shortly thereafter "an old man of rather low stature, and somewhat thick set, with a bald head and grey hairs, and ordinarily dressed in a suit of light-colored cloth, and carrying two singular appearing canes, called on me, and requested to board with me a few days." Francis declined to do so but invited the man to dinner. The guest talked avidly about the Church and its prophet and after the meal excused himself to go see "Brother Joseph."\textsuperscript{233}

Shortly after, while Francis "was in the Spirit," his odd visitor returned stripped of mortal disguise, this time bringing instructions and information. Bishop's visitor gave his name as Nephi (pronounced with long vowels) and claimed to be the same angel who had delivered to Joseph Smith the gold Book of Mormon plates.\textsuperscript{234} Most of Nephi's instruction dealt with priesthood authority. Bishop was informed that Christ's twelve apostles were elders, not high priests; that "Nephi" and his two brethren had appeared to Joseph and Oliver Cowdery as Peter, James and John in 1829 to appoint them apostles; and that they three, with John the Revelator, were the four angels of Revelation 7:1. John and the other two of the quartet soon appeared. After being instructed by them relative to the Book of Mormon and Francis' impending responsibility in bringing forth the "work of the Father," Nephi returned with an
admonition to fast and prepare to receive seven "Sacred Things." The next afternoon Francis retired alone for prayer and solemnly awaited the promised vision. He was not disappointed. Soon Nephi returned to present before him this series of items. Francis was shown the gold plates from which Joseph Smith had translated the Book of Mormon and, curiously, the initial 116 pages of the Book of Mormon manuscript, which scribe Martin Harris had lost. Also exhibited was a sword taken from a Book of Mormon character named Laban, which represented the justice and wrath of God; the Urim and Thummim, or interpreters (a pair of seer stones), which Joseph used to translate the Book of Mormon; a breastplate belonging to Moroni (the last Book of Mormon prophet and custodian of the plates); a ball-like brass compass, the Liahona or Directors, that had guided Lehi's party through the Arabian desert in the Book of Mormon; and a pair of interlocking crowns Bishop identified as the Crown of Israel and the Crown of Glory. Francis was overwhelmed.

Through the next week Nephi returned repeatedly to display the Sacred Things. All the while Bishop was fasting and purifying himself, though his asceticism was not terrific; he ate a single meal each evening after fasting through the day. At the end of the appointed week Bishop was transported in vision to the throne of the Ancient of Days and there was crowned. Francis Bishop had long since received the authority; he had now received the call to the greater work that for a decade he had been awaiting.

The construction of Mormon Nauvoo and doctrinal developments in the Church progressed oblivious to Bishop and his new authority. Finding himself ignored, Francis proceeded to do what other prophets had done when disregarded—he preached. Bishop followed the prophetic examples of Old Testament figures: Jeremiah, Isaiah, Noah, especially Zechariah, and Book of Mormon prophets Alma
and Samuel the Lamanite. He preached publicly in the city, foretelling the destruction of the temple and the driving of the saints into the wilderness. Destruction had also been a popular theme with his examplars. He was also given a chance to preach formally to the Church but without much success. It was around this time, probably privately, that he for the first time gathered a few believers around him and organized the "Kingdom of God."

The visions he received were inspiring but did not solve the problem of selling his lots in the city. Bishop likely had never received a formal title to his Nauvoo lots. The first county-recorded transfer involving his half of the lot north of the temple site was in July of 1845, when non-Mormon Daniel H. Wells sold to Church trustees "The West half of Lot number four in Block number nine in the Wells addition to Nauvoo" for the sum of one dollar, paid. This was Bishop's lot exactly, no more or less. Bishop may have sold out to Wells, who had originally owned, surveyed, and sold the Addition, and thus escaped mention in the county record; or, Bishop may have been forced to abandon his properties in town, unable to sell, leaving the title to revert to its former owner.

Other events concerning Bishop in Nauvoo are not as well known or documented. A decade later Brigham Young would make a speech about Bishop and his followers from the pulpit of the Old Tabernacle in Salt Lake City. Of Bishop in Nauvoo he said, speaking to the congregation: "Here is sister Vilate Kimball [. B]rother Heber's wife, has borne more from that man than any other woman on earth could bear." Young did not go on to provide a context for this statement. Another curious and perhaps related accusation was made by John A. Widtsoe in his biography of Joseph Smith. In it, Widtsoe listed the names of men involved with polygamy in Nauvoo before the death of Joseph. Two names he included with Brigham Young, William Clayton, Hyrum Smith, Heber C. Kimball, and others, were James J. Strang
and Gladden Bishop. Bishop had been excommunicated in March, at least two months before the first dateable plural marriage, that of Joseph Smith to Louisa Beaman in May of 1842. It is extremely doubtful that at this date he could have been involved with the practice of the Church. On the other hand, "spiritual wifery" (which amounted to adultery) was being practiced by less scrupulous men, including Mayor John Bennett, and it is at least conceivable that Bishop might have also become involved.

By the end of August or first of September Francis had vacated his property interests in Nauvoo and left the city with Irena, his wife. He did not move far, only about thirty miles southeast to Augusta, in the corner of Hancock County. Here lived a former associate, Roger Orton, who was keeping a public house. Here he remained for at least a year.

State elections were held that summer. F.G. Bishop presented himself as a candidate for county representative to the state legislature. The field was large; fifteen other men also drew votes in the balloting for the two representative seats in the Illinois legislature. The pair elected received 1603 and 1459 votes respectively; candidate F.G. Bishop received one.

From Augusta, a year and a half after his excommunication, Francis penned a letter to Joseph Smith asking if he (Bishop) might be readmitted to Church membership. His attitude was ‘I have been a good member of the Church,’ yet he understood that the motivation for the separation lay in his personal ideas. He did not apologize for or compromise his beliefs. Bishop maintained that his doctrines were his own and of no threat to the church he had served. He believed what he taught but supposed that neither his doctrine nor personal beliefs made any difference to the saints. What Bishop ignored was that his was a theology intended to supplant, not supplement. He acknowledged that his "greater things" superseded those revealed
through Joseph. Here in Augusta, "exiled from Zion," he asked to be reinstated as a member of the Church in good standing; if he could not, then Bishop asked that "no one called a Saint oppose me."  

This man was a complicated being, and there is more to his story than odd personal beliefs. Those personal beliefs were the product of a significant religious past, beliefs that instead of being abandoned or exchanged or replaced or updated when their owner joined a new church were packed along with him. Thus Bishop's doctrines are a conglomerate of different religious influences, experiences, and practices. From his earliest childhood came the love and knowledge of the Bible and its importance as a guide to past, present, and future reality. From Methodism under his parents, later as a Baptist circuit-rider, and as a Mormon missionary he experienced theological independence that contributed to his self-importance and provided an opportunity for study and expression. As a circuit rider, Bishop was the \textit{de facto} local authority on scripture and its interpretation for the small groups he visited. As a missionary for the Mormons he travelled as an independent (or at least unchecked) authority for the Restored Gospel and preached this gospel by interpreting scriptures to defend the Mormon position. While filling these several responsibilities there was no routine supervisory force keeping Bishop's doctrines in line with institutional doctrine; he was free to express opinion along with doctrine and, as his trials attest, did so.

To this variety of influences is added Bishop's inner world of reality, his absolute conviction that he had seen visions, and the conviction that he enjoyed divine aegis and responsibility. In actuality, these visions served as the catalyst around which Bishop used his admixture of experience and interpretation to form doctrines. The human capacity for thought creates, in one scholar's words: "a world in which
mental reality does not have to submit to narrow tests of [actuality]. Bishop's supermortal visions are representational of his ultimate reality.

Bishop's missions for the Latter-day Saints served as the opportunity to blend the ideas he refused to abandon along with the doctrines of Mormonism he taught as a missionary. This he added to his basic stock of scriptural knowledge, but prefiltered through a personal screen of interpretive reasoning. The distilled liquor was heady, fraught with prophetic promise, yet was not fully aged until he arrived in Nauvoo. In the years following, the doctrinal mixture gained new interpretations as Bishop reacted to events needing placement in an eternal scheme. But like any wine that has aged too long, by the end of his life it had become less "new wine" than it had vinegar.

For a decade Francis had kept and developed his beliefs silently without effective interference from ecclesiastical authority. Francis had gotten into trouble only when he attempted to present his own opinions as doctrinally authoritative. Regardless of the state or direction of his personal beliefs, as long as the line between heterodoxy and orthodoxy was not breached publicly he remained a "faithful" Church member. It was by stepping beyond this outer limit of appropriate behavior that Bishop invited censure. The ideas of individual members existed as a force outside the gospel, a force that Joseph Smith in his official position might help guide but could never wholly control.

Properly identified, Bishop was a heretic, not an apostate. Crossing the thin line between heterodoxy and heresy identifies the heretic. Heretics rarely reject the social and emotional values of the parent group. Rather, values or beliefs may be reinterpreted, restructured, or reordered to coincide with personal beliefs and priorities. Often a single point of disagreement is isolated and serves as a catalyst, one which may assist in breaking other ties to orthodoxy and around which like-minded individuals may be gathered. Bishop's catalyst was the question of authority of his
visions. For a true apostate the break may be made similarly but leads to a rejection of
the group's social, emotional, and other values. The appellation "apostate" has been
broadly and incorrectly used in all branches of Mormonism to tar unregenerate
dissenters with the onus of their rebellion.

Writing of heretics and apostates in first-century Christianity, the Apostle John
stated: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us,
they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be
made manifest that they were not all of us." Bishop's break in Nauvoo and shift
from faithful church member to dogmatic heretic appears to be sharp, but his past
arraignments before Church councils reveal that Bishop, like those John spoke of, had
never been truly a part of the core of Latter-day Saint faithful. His personal beliefs,
ideas, and interpretations formed the heart of his doctrine and understanding, doctrine
that did not come from the pronouncements of the prophet he claimed to follow. His
ideas were immersed in Mormonism, not rooted in it. His beliefs drew strength from
and were magnified and interpreted through the filter of Mormonism, but they in fact
remained central to Bishop's identity as a Mormon and as a missionary. Francis G.
Bishop did not surrender himself to the ecclesiastical reality that there was but one
prophet for the Church and that prophet's word was to be binding, even when it was at
variance with his own personal revelations, opinions, and scriptural interpretations.

Bishop actually had made his break with the Mormon church in 1832 when he
silently refused to regard his visions and opinions as doctrinally invalid or as
satanically motivated. He remained in the Church for another decade because he
appeared orthodox on the surface. In this respect Bishop may appear nontypical of
dissenters, but if so he serves only as a caricature of dissent. Each dissenter must
sometime acknowledge a point where actions are motivated by, "I can't accept--" or "I
don't believe, because. . . ." For Francis G. Bishop, as with any dissenter,
disagreement, in the form of personal doctrinal interpretations, was at the root of dissent.
PART II
CHAPTER VII
THE MORMON DIASPORA

The year 1844 served as an important cultural, social, and organizational watershed in the history of Mormonism. Perhaps the most appropriate adjective circumscribing and expressing the history of the Mormon American cultural experience is "developmental." The year 1844 marked the apex and conclusion of the first period of Mormon history. During this time the culture had been created and experienced tremendous growth numerically, socially, and doctrinally. The focal event was the assassinations of Joseph and Hyrum Smith in the Hancock County jail in Carthage, Illinois, but there were other significant events that occurred during the year. The development summit came during the spring of 1844. The Council of Fifty, a shadow political body that Joseph taught would become the political Kingdom of God, was organized. The year also saw Joseph place himself on the national ballot as a presidential candidate. Polygamy, practiced secretly in Nauvoo since at least 1842, increased, both in the number of male participants and in the number of plural marriages performed that year. Significant to the continuing development of Mormonism, earlier in the year Joseph had continued Nauvoo's doctrinal expansions. Joseph, preaching the funeral sermon for elder King Follet, explained the nature of God and the eternal possibilities of Man; the temple was well under way, and the ordinances which were to later be administered there had already been introduced to a select few whom Joseph trusted. While for some Church members these developments stood as symbols of continuing social and doctrinal progression, for
others they represented a turn from divine practices. Some whole-heartedly accepted Joseph's doctrinal developments, others regarded them as aberrations and were unwilling or not yet prepared to accept their novelty. When personal fealties were dissolved by Smith's lynching in Carthage, these ideological rifts in Mormon Nauvoo became obvious.

The difficulty of Joseph's task of preparing the saints for these new or expanded doctrines and practices is easily seen in the hot and cold reactions to what he did introduce to the populace. For those who reacted negatively, their faith in the Prophet and the gospel he was revealing jeopardized strong personal beliefs about the direction the Church should move and their understanding of the gospel and principles he had revealed. The quiet rejections of these new practices and doctrines before the Prophet's death marked the beginning of a new era of Mormon history.

While he was yet alive, Joseph Smith was generally able to hold in abeyance the doubts and disagreements that eventually fractured the Nauvoo kingdom. Though Joseph's personality was strong—a force that held many in the Church despite what they disliked about it—there were cracks beginning in the wall of believers that the mortar of a charismatic personality could not repair nor even hide. Though he attracted strong supporters, the Prophet also provoked strong enmities. Smith's demise brought into the open disagreements over these doctrines and institutions. His death provided the first open opportunity to separate one's self from the Church on the issues of doctrine alone. The binding tie of personality that attached some to the church they now disagreed with was gone. The natural social process of secession that had begun before his death was accelerated. Shards—excommunicated or disaffected members of the Nauvoo kingdom—had begun to fly off before Smith's death, eventually turning as sharp-edged weapons in the hands of anti-Mormons, who used the accusations of
these dissatisfied members to jab at the Mormon prophet and the Nauvoo culture.
Worse than the truth about the adoption of polygamy and the questionable activities of a minority of the Mormons were the overstatements and outright lies of those seeking to destroy the city and culture of which they had once been citizens. Non-Mormons firmly believed that the fractures, begun in Nauvoo before Smith's death, would now prove too deep to repair and that the kingdom on the Mississippi would crumble. His death did serve as the fracture point that launched some followers from the body of the Church into varied flight paths of the dissenting and schismatic sects, but opponents were hasty in their judgment. The Mormon kingdom stayed mostly intact.254

Following the Prophet's death in midsummer came a special conference meeting in Nauvoo, where, by a sizable majority, the membership of the Church voted to accept Brigham Young and apostolic leadership, though competing groups soon rose around the claims of other leaders.255 Conflicting assertions of proprietorship drew off a minority of saints, some of whom had been closely involved with Joseph Smith in the operation of the Church. Within five years Sidney Rigdon (counselor in the First Presidency), apostle Lyman Wight (who led a group to Texas), and James Strang, a new convert with grand designs of a kingdom in Wisconsin, had all collected followings with varied degrees of success. Despite the popular negation of Rigdon's claim to "guardianship" of the Church, Wight's excommunication, and the summary dismissal of Strang's claim, each was able to collect a following, including some from among those in Nauvoo. Besides Strang, Rigdon, and Wight, excommunicated apostle William Smith, the only surviving Smith male of Joseph's immediate family, led a short-lived group in Kentucky before throwing in with Strang. Nauvoo high council member Alpheus Cutler gathered his family and others around his authority claim in Iowa. Charles B. Thompson, James C. Brewster, Austin Cowles, William
McLellin, David Whitmer, and others would hold a few converts together for a time also. 256 There were a very few pre-martyrdom schisms (including perhaps Bishop's first following in Nauvoo), but their impact on the culture of Mormonism is minor compared to post-martyrdom history. Whether or not there was an actual crisis in leadership succession, there was a perceived one. 257

During the whole of Church history (to the time) the Prophet Joseph Smith lived as the very personification of Mormonism. As events progressed and the Church expanded, Joseph created unconsciously a tradition of charisma or "prophetic persona" that became an issue following his death. The charismatic tradition was deemphasized by the Church's acceptance of the parallel corporate or "church" tradition, an authority held, protected, and championed by the priesthood quorums, particularly the apostles upon whom much of the daily corporate responsibility rested. 258 Most of those in Nauvoo and its satellite settlements together with most European converts accepted this interpretation of the authority or succession question and followed Brigham Young and the priesthood quorums to the West.

On the other hand, the saints in Nauvoo were not the only partakers of Mormonism. The congregations existing in the Midwest outside of Nauvoo's pale were of real concern for both Joseph Smith and the apostolic leadership after his death. These were the scattered, isolated, and almost always small branches throughout the United States that for one reason or another would not or could not come to Nauvoo. 259 Many never did come, did not gather to the Nauvoo area and never went west.

Following the Mormon flight from Nauvoo many chose to separate themselves by remaining, preferring to wait for a rectification of conflicting authority claims. They were among the first sought out and absorbed into the post-Martyrdom schismatic groups. About this latter group it must be understood that by and large theirs was a
separation not from "the Church" but from its direction, a disagreement with the selection of Young and the Twelve as stewards of Smith's legacy. Ofttimes this was coupled with a rejection of doctrines and institutions made public only after Smith's death, especially polygamy and temple rites.

What is herein discerned is a differentiation and division between the larger traditions Mormonism had engendered—allegiances based on "charismatic" and "corporate" valuations. Smith had championed both, organizing and developing Church structure and initiating ordinances, and providing prophetic direction and spiritual focus. At his untimely death, the Church stood at a crossroads, forced to choose between the traditions that had hitherto grown together. The choice was made. It was under Young in Nauvoo that the Church as a functioning corporate entity began to come alive and draw a corporate net around Smith's followers.\(^{260}\)

Many or most of those who chose to stay in the Midwest soon became attached to one of the prophetic rivals who challenged Brigham Young as steward of Smith's legacy. From the Utah perspective (as stewards of the corporate tradition), this created a need to define "the Church" in the face of contradictory claims. The first ecclesiastical step taken towards establishing a line between the two orthodoxies, eliminating from corporate authority potential counter-claims and divisions and shedding those that did occur, was taken in the Nauvoo conference in August of 1844. Sidney Rigdon's claims of guardianship were essentially nullified and his followers excommunicated.\(^{261}\) In organizational terms, the Church rejected not the doctrine or practice of the prophetic call but rather the idea of the superiority of that call to the operation of priesthood (i.e. quorum or corporate) authority; the mission of the Church as greater than that of its prophet. This action with Rigdon set a precedent for dealing with successive claims. The Mormons under Young followed the pattern and
thereafter simply rejected the validity of rival claims.

Once this step had been taken, attention shifted from internal to external issues. Faced with continuing negative public opinion in Illinois and the subsequent logistical nightmare of moving en masse an entire society and settling a desert, the apostolic leadership did little else to formally define the new boundaries of the Church. Dissenters, schismatics, and laggards were generally left behind to their own devices. The overland trek became a corporate definition of "Mormonism" and was substituted as the measure of faith, in a way, with the concept that those who would not come to Zion were not "faithful." But the demanding overland experience failed to keep the church the socially and spiritually strong entity it needed to be to survive. Though the question of authority had been settled in the minds of the priesthood leadership in Nauvoo and largely accepted by those in Nauvoo who became the Utah Church, a thriving body of dissenting "Mormons," who very much considered themselves orthodox, still inhabited the Midwest. In looking at the entire scope of post-martyrdom Mormonism the distinction between followers of the two traditions is often difficult to make since both sides claimed to be doing exactly the same thing—faithfully curating the legacy of Joseph Smith.

In an 1847 letter to sister Anna Maria, Isaac H. Bishop captured unintentionally the attitude and issue that was to foster dissension in the culture of Mormonism for the next three decades. Of brother Gladden, Isaac wrote simply that "he is as much a Mormon as ever." The statement is innocuous on the surface but captures the essence of the Dispersion identity. Mormonism under Joseph Smith maintained a powerful ideological influence in those converted to it. "Verry few, fully apostatize from, or renounce a belief in the principles of what was calld Mormonism," wrote one such individual, "Orthodoxy! is my doxy." Until the 1860s, those who
had once been involved with the Latter-day Saints, unless there had been a purposeful apostasy, generally considered themselves to be "Mormons"—partakers in the Mormon cultural experience—no matter where they were or who they were following.

To historically classify the period of division, characterized by the myriad of conflicting leadership claims that grew out of the stresses of 1844, I borrow a term—Diaspora—from Semitic history describing the dispersion of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The Mormon Diaspora began with the death of Joseph Smith in 1844 and lasted until about 1865 or 1870. This era saw the rise of hopeful leaders seeking to reclaim and regather Joseph's scattered heritage. Their followers were often drawn from other Diaspora groups, and they themselves had often followed other schismatic leaders. Mormon culture, particularly in the Midwest, was characterized at the time by a nearly constant state of flux. The awareness of conflicting leadership claims was strong among Diaspora followings. Most of those who did not go west with Brigham Young and the apostles were conscious that the Church had been fractured. Too, they were aware that very different leaders and doctrinal emphases were presented seeking to gain a following of "Old Mormons," as they began to be called. But by 1846 new converts, who had never been members of the Church under Joseph Smith's leadership, began to be added to all sects claiming his authority. This influx of new converts complicates the historian's task in separating claims about total membership and who was following whom, when. One characteristic of the Diaspora outside of Utah was the cross fertilization of ideas as individuals and leaders in one organization shifted allegiance to another.

Compounding the confusion, each of the Diaspora leaders claimed to be an authoritative successor to Joseph Smith and his following to be the "true faith." Thus,
for Issac Bishop, once a member of the Springfield, Illinois, stake presidency and now following Austin Cowles, to speak of his brother as "as much a Mormon as ever" is entirely appropriate. Isaac H., brother Gladden, and their westering sister Anna Maria, their allegiances as diverse as their geographic movements, were all partakers of a larger and as yet undivided social and incompletely divided religious culture. There really existed no socially clear, mutually acknowledged dividing line between the "faithful" and the "unfaithful" on either side. It remained for the Gladdenites in Salt Lake a decade after the martyrdom to set in motion the forces that would finally isolate the Utah branch of the Church as "the Mormons" and separate it from the larger scope of Joseph Smith's spiritual legacy.  

Through 1844 the name of Joseph Smith had been synonymous with leadership for the entire fourteen-year history of the Church. By his death "The" prophet became permanently sequestered and could not interfere with or contradict the claims of whatever bodies or individuals chose to try for the Church's leadership. The death of Joseph Smith snapped the restraining hold on Bishop's call to divine responsibility, as it did for others who felt destined to "lead the Church." So long as the Prophet was alive there was little that could be done to advance a competing claim of authority. Joseph's untimely death could be conveniently interpreted as the prophetic capstone to a faithful ministry or a divine rebuke for waywardness. For Bishop it was the latter. For the Mormons in Nauvoo and surrounding area, once the shock of the Carthage lynching had dulled, there remained the very real question of what to do next. Was that leadership gone with the man? In their various ways each Diaspora leader cried emphatically "No!"
CHAPTER VIII
SEVEN MOVEMENTS IN SEVEN YEARS

The handful of years between 1844 and Francis' second Kirtland era (beginning in 1850) were for him important developmental years. They are also years of which we have next to no record. Aside from a few sparse occasions when Bishop's name stumbles into mention under someone else's pen there is nothing substantial from which an accurate or consistent chronology or historical assessment may be drawn. Even Bishop himself referred to this time in his own life only by a series of short sentences and sporadic mentions in his later publications. Nonetheless, he is mentioned often enough that, as like his early life, specific occurrences may be reconstructed.

Bishop's precise whereabouts during the crescendo of events in 1844 is not known. He lived for a time in Augusta, in the southeast corner of Hancock County. It was in 1842 from this town that he penned his letter to Joseph Smith seeking readmission to the Church. Here he may have stayed with Roger Orton, an inactive Mormon who had served in the Seventies quorum, who kept a public house there. Mobs burned Mormon settlements surrounding Nauvoo through the spring and summer months of 1845. Bishop always considered himself a Mormon and may have partaken of this newest round of anti-Mormon sentiment; he may have used his excommunication from the Church as a shield from mob depredations; he may have been nowhere in the country. There is no discernable record to settle the issue.

During most of the time after leaving Hancock County, Francis seems to have continually been on the move, which partially explains his absence from national
records. Between 1846 and 1854, he surfaces in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, and eventually in Iowa, a substantial area in which to travel. How long he spent in one place as well as how he supported himself and wife Irena remains an undocumented mystery. Twice he refers to failed or abandoned business ventures of an unknown nature.  

Given an elegant but not uncommon first name and odd middle name by his parents, he had into his thirties been known as Francis, or in print as F.G. Bishop. By the time he reemerges in Kirtland he is firmly known and referred to most often by his middle name, as Gladden Bishop. Bishop may have decided to be known by his middle name because the name was unusual and attracted attention. Francis G. Bishop became Gladden Bishop, and it was by this name that his followers, Gladdenites, became known.

By late spring of 1846 Bishop had moved deep into the state and settled in Mt. Vernon, Illinois. On the second of May, 1846, he was received into membership in the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Marion Lodge #13, one of the first candidates received following the Lodge's organization the previous fall. 

Late that fall Gladden asked for a membership card and withdrew from the Lodge. The reason remains clouded, but like Aaron's budding rod, the splintered followings of Diaspora were beginning to take root and collect new converts like green leaves. The largest group, second to the westering saints under Young and the Twelve, had followed a slight, balding man to Wisconsin—James J. Strang.

Weeks after Joseph Smith's death in 1844, Strang, a convert of four months, presented before the saints a letter bearing a Nauvoo postmark which he claimed had come from Smith. Strang claimed an appointment as head of the Church upon the authority of this letter, augmented with a claim of ordination at the hands of an angel at the moment Joseph had fallen in Carthage. The letter was promptly labeled by the
apostles as a fake and a bad one, but it attracted to Strang and his cause a number of followers from the Nauvoo population. Though Strang's emphasis on the prophetic aspects of Mormonism, his letter, and ordination claims were countered effectively in Nauvoo, he was able to eventually capture the allegiance of such notable locals as stake president William Marks and excommunicated apostle William Smith, the only surviving brother of the dead Prophet. He also tapped the reservoir of saints who scattered into the state instead of fleeing west. Strang settled his adherents at Voree, Wisconsin, and later moved them to Beaver Island, in northern Lake Michigan, where he had himself crowned king.

By 1846 Strang's missionaries had gleaned many of the Mormons out of the Midwest who had not gone to Nauvoo in the days of Joseph and thence on towards the Salt Lake. This core of believers was bolstered with people converted directly to Strang's brand of Mormonism. It is entirely possible that Bishop's move from Mt. Vernon, Illinois, had been effected because of contact with a Strangite preacher and of becoming convinced that Strang's claims were authoritative. Or, he may have noticed the opportunity such a group presented to his own work.

Across the ocean in Liverpool, England, late that same year, Strangite missionaries landed with Martin Harris, witness to the Book of Mormon, seeking converts to Strang's variety of Mormonism. Immediately the pages of the Latter-day Saints' English periodical, the Millennial Star, filled with challenges to the Strangites, warnings to the saints, and doctrinal defenses. One exposition, written by apostle/editor Orson Hyde informing the saints against the sophistry of the Strangites' claims, demonstrated the theological folly of ordinations such as claimed by Strang. Hyde's example was taken from personal experience and out of Church history—the 1832 trial of Gladden Bishop before the School of the Prophets.

During the years Gladden spent moving about the Midwest he stayed in
contact with his older brother, Isaac. Isaac, once a member of the Springfield, Illinois, stake presidency, had stayed in Illinois and accepted the Church of Christ under the auspices of James Brewster. In an 1847 letter to their sister, who was moving west with the Mormons following the apostles, Isaac mentioned that he had recently received a letter from Gladden and that he (Gladden) and Irena were then living in Indiana. The couple may have been visiting Irena's parents, who had apparently never left their home in or near their daughter's birthplace in Martinsburg, Indiana.

Some time during 1847, Gladden received the divine commission to commence his work anew. One of the few clues Bishop offers relating to his activities prior to 1854 was a cryptic remark that he had been instrumental in seven different movements in as many years. This action, he explained in retrospect, was representational of the seven dispensations of the earth's existence. Less coincidentally, it was the number of failed followings Bishop began between 1847 and 1854. Unfortunately, he himself left little record of them. Details of three of the seven leadership attempts are known at least in part: one begun and abandoned in Voree, Wisconsin; another in Kirtland, Ohio; and his most successful one in Council Bluffs, Iowa. The others remain unknown to history.

By the end of the year (1847) Gladden had returned to Illinois and sought out a previous Nauvoo associate, former stake president William Marks. If his seven-year timetable is an annual one then Bishop should have arrived at Marks' following the failure of his first group. Travelling alone, Gladden spent some weeks in the Marks family home in Shabbonah Grove, Illinois. In December, Gladden obtained from Marks a letter certifying the quality of Bishop's conduct and character. Marks and his family were then followers of James Strang, and Bishop may have hoped to eventually use this letter as an introduction to the Voree prophet.

Strang's Wisconsin settlement had that summer been invaded by another
Mormon group following the leadership of former apostle William McLellin. The incursion of the McLellenites was short lived but claimed several of Strang's key supporters and found a following in Voree. Strang demonstrated a firm grasp of current events in Mormonism. In combating McLellin's disruptive influences while reassuring his own people that he was yet the Lord's chosen, Strang had scoffingly "called down fire from heaven" upon the McLellinites by suggesting that Gladden Bishop come and lead them away with other weak ones in Strang's own following. His gauntlet, flung half in jest, was eagerly recovered by the challenged.

It may have been while Bishop was at Marks that he saw in Strang's Gospel Herald a derisive "invitation" for him to come to Voree and claim the leadership of those who had recently quit Strang's fold. Bishop had been active enough to be well known to Strang and is referred to with farcical familiarity in the Gospel Herald. Unlike most schismatic leaders, James Strang, sure of his leadership, had a sense of humor when addressing a challenge. Close on the heels of the McLellin faction came another, more obscure claimant to the Mormon throne: Gladden Bishop.

Letter in hand, Bishop travelled to Wisconsin, hoping after one false start to begin his "great work" by drawing away Strang's following. Gladden arrived in Voree with his letter from Marks and his message of the gospel truth early in the spring of 1848. Here he began to teach of his calling.

Bishop's doctrine was essentially the same as it was when he'd gotten into trouble with the Massachusetts Conference, thirteen years earlier. He preached that the two witnesses spoken of in Revelation 11:3 and the olive trees of Zechariah 4:11 were one and the same: the prophets who would come before the return of Jesus Christ at the opening of the Millennium. These witnesses he identified as Oliver Cowdery (scribe for the Book of Mormon's translation, who was living and practicing
law close by but had been excommunicated a decade previous) and Joseph Smith; but that since Smith's death James Strang had been appointed to replace him. Bishop's 1832 ordination by the "Ancient of Days" and his Nauvoo visitations played a large role in his doctrine as he claimed for himself the office and position of custodian of the High Priesthood. The witnesses held only the Lesser or Aaronic priesthood and served as forerunners to him, to "make his path straight," as John the Baptist had prepared the way for Christ. Additionally, Gladden claimed a dual identity as the incarnation of the Holy Spirit and as the "Branch of David." Neither "witness" was interested in performing his role.

Despite the scope of his grand claims, few joined him. After an almost fruitless labor, by the beginning of April Bishop had come to the conclusion that Strang was not going to herald him as prophet. His preaching had a small effect, and he attracted several devotees; but unless something were done to remove the scales of darkness, Strang's followers would never see Bishop's greater light. With this concern in mind, Bishop set about to fulfill scripture and, with melodramatic solemnity, organized the Kingdom of God on the earth.

Three accounts of Bishop's actions have survived, and one is probably a summation of another; but it is apparent that Bishop put on a spectacle. Sarah Scott confided to her sister that "this new Saviour of Latter Day Saintism" produced "the queerest performance I ever saw." Editor of the LDS Frontier Guardian, apostle Orson Hyde, who heard about the ceremony second hand, wasted no charm in describing his reaction to Bishop's performance and claims. Strang's own humor was piqued as he told about the prophet Gladden and the great "dispensation" he claimed to be ushering in.

Bishop had searched the surrounding woods and found for use as a standard or flagpole a straight sapling with branches that forked near the top. On a Sunday
afternoon, April 9th, Gladden troupèd his band of followers to a hill near town where Strang occasionally held meetings, popularly known as the Hill of Promise. A small flag was tied to each fork of the pole, and the standard was raised on the hill as prophetic fulfillment regarding "an ensign to the nations."293

With the ensign erected as a sign for scattered Israel to gather and while the pennants fluttered weakly in the breeze, Gladden produced a small, striped snake. Bending down he placed the unsuspecting reptile on the ground and with a grip on its tail swiftly stomped on the creature's head, killing it. Standing erect with his foot on the snake he called in a loud voice for the nations of earth to take heed, for "the seed of the woman had crushed the serpent's head." Gladden declared Satan bound for a thousand years and in the name of the prophet Daniel proclaimed the peace of the Millennial reign.294 Having previously been ordained a high priest by Gladden, former Strangite Sally Shumway was on the Hill robed in a white chemise. The misplaced undergarment was presumably a hasty substitution for a white robe, which Bishop said the faithful needed to wear in order to receive the seven Sacred Things in the "ordinance of the Kingdom," the performance of which was to give the worthy their exaltation and eternal glory.295

This event must have given the gossips of Voree something to chatter about. Despite the buzz, even this display, comic or impressive, failed to affect the Strangites lastingly. A week later Gladden and his few followers again repaired to the summit of the Hill of Promise. This time the resurrection trump was sounded ("a tin horn was blown long and loud" Strang said), and those involved invited the curious onlookers to feast on old wine and bread.296 That evening Gladden presented himself in Strang's worship meeting. Given the opportunity to address the assembly, Gladden thanked his spiritual hosts for their kindness and announced that he must go, for Joseph Smith had been resurrected and would soon appear.297
Nothing happened.

Bishop by this time had essentially failed in Voree. He had all of the ambition but none of the flair for showmanship that Strang possessed. Seeing his opportunity waning Bishop tried a stronger attack. On the 20th he paid Strang or another printer in the area enough to print up four pages of a doom-saying pamphlet, *A Voice of Warning to All Those in Voree*, directed towards Strang's following.\(^{298}\) Strang's lack of concern about Bishop and his success in Voree were revealed as Strang reprinted the text of the *Voice of Warning* and published a whimsical stab at Bishop and his escapades in the *Gospel Herald*.\(^ {299}\) Editor Strang related the events of the past weeks for the benefit of his followers outside the town and at the conclusion scoffingly suggested that to compensate for his failure in Wisconsin, Bishop try to gather the quickly failing following of McLellin's Church of Christ in Ohio.\(^ {300}\) Either beaten, sensing an opportunity, or both, Bishop abandoned Voree and left the Strangites to their spiritual fate.

For the next year and a half Bishop remains, retrospectively, anonymous. Bishop was mentioned in a letter to Strang by another claimant to Joseph Smith's legacy, Austin Cowles. Cowles had recently broken with James C. Brewster, taking with him Gladden's brother, Isaac H. Bishop. Francis in the meantime visited his brother Henry's family in Michigan and addressed at least one letter to Isaac from that state in 1849, as Henry made and then aborted plans for the gold fields of California, determining instead to follow his younger brother Gladden to Kirtland, Ohio.\(^ {301}\)

A theme common to many Diaspora schisms was the reestablishment of the Mormon church in its purity; a claim asserting that in his later years Joseph Smith had led the Church and the Latter-day Saints astray. This attitude had existed with those who left the Church before Joseph's death, but the unnatural death of the Prophet accentuated the force of the claim.\(^ {302}\) A parallel concern was that the Church might
have been rejected at Smith's death with the temple in Nauvoo uncompleted. Diaspora leaders offered restored Christian authority and a continuation of Mormon prophetic claims to those with little root in the doctrines of Mormonism; to those who had grudgingly left the Church they offered the appealing chance for a "new" start by resurrecting the purity of the "Old Church." Thus, Kirtland and the success it once represented became a gathering spot and symbol for those who sought to revive former days.

Kirtland had been James Brewster's headquarters, but most recently it had hosted William McLellin's short-lived Church of Christ, and it was currently home to Moses Norris and his minute following. It seems that Bishop had taken seriously Strang's flip suggestion that he try to capture the main body of the McLellinites. By late fall, 1850, Bishop had relocated and settled into the society of his former home of Kirtland, Ohio.\(^\text{303}\)

Some time in the three years between Isaac's 1847 letter to Anna Maria and Gladden's arrival in Kirtland in 1850, Irena and Gladden had either divorced or Widtsoe's claim of polygamy was based in fact. Irena may have remained with her parents in Indiana, suing for divorce when her husband began actively preaching his odd prophetic call. So it was that when he arrived in Kirtland, Gladden brought his second wife, known to us only as Phebe M. Bishop. Phebe was three years older than her forty-one-year-old husband, and the seventh federal census noted no children in the household.\(^\text{304}\)

The fall of 1850 found Bishop in decidedly narrower financial straights than he had enjoyed in Nauvoo. Eight years of wandering had been expensive to maintain. The year's tax records show him without real property and a total personal taxable value of only $75.\(^\text{305}\) To sustain Phebe and himself, Gladden engaged in watch and clock repairs, but his occupation and financial status was not to hinder his purpose in
the town.

Here in Kirtland Gladden began, as he had among the Strangites in Wisconsin and earlier, to preach of his divine calling as "the Branch" and as the rightful leader of the faithful. As evidence of his divine calling he claimed to have in his possession, or at least free access to, the seven Sacred Things he had been shown in Nauvoo in 1842. These seven items, he explained, together had significance in the new dispensation that Bishop headed and was establishing, to be used collectively in bestowing the "ordinance of the Kingdom."

Gladden also staged a performance that again was intended to establish the Kingdom of God. Gladden, Phebe, and Gladden's brother Henry baptized themselves face down in the east branch of the Chagrin River, which ran through Kirtland. Having performed this ordinance Gladden "called himself the father and his Br[other] the son and his wife the holy ghost." With their performance complete, Gladden and Henry rode off some time later to the small group of LDS members in Cleveland. To those who were "the wekeest in faith" Gladden preached his Ordinance of the Kingdom, speaking of how those who were faithful (to him, of course) would become kings and priests. His doctrines again gained some believers; however, his success was short lived.

James Bay, a missionary from Utah on his way to England, was able to regain Bishop's converts as he told the wavering Cleveland saints that "Joseph [Smith] taught thos things years ago to some[,] and even his last sermon [sic] at Nauvoo opens all that is necessary at present." Of heresy in general and Bishop's doctrines in particular he observed that "some saints and Elders want to have things that will be no use to them . . .," things today Mormons would call "fringe doctrines" or "mysteries of the Kingdom." Bay was not impressed by the Kirtland of the 1850s, and he wrote that "there has been all kinds of spirits and fals prophets here." Gladden Bishop with
his Kingdom of God was only one of many.

Bishop had again established the Kingdom of God and had gained, at least in name, a prominent follower—Book of Mormon witness Martin Harris. Part of Harris's attention came because Gladden claimed to have or to have seen the 116 pages of the Book of Mormon manuscript that Harris had carelessly lost in 1828. Bishop described the pages as "on ruled paper of a blueish cast and foolscap size, the writing coarse and heavy." Gladden reported that Harris, who for these pages had acted as scribe to Joseph Smith's dictation, concurred with his description, and he claimed the older man as a witness to the truth of his work.

Harris's biographer, LDS educator Rhett James, feels that the much-connected Harris probably did not believe strongly (if at all) in the doctrines of any of the many factions that claimed his allegiance. In James' opinion, rather than being an active believer, Harris sought the opportunity such connections provided to testify to the truthfulness of the Book of Mormon as one of the book's Three Witnesses. In bearing testimony of his faith, Harris was thereby drawn into association with those seeking to capitalize on his past history with the Mormons—Bishop included—but broke relations when it became apparent that his name was being exploited.

On April 16th, 1851, Gladden reached perhaps the pinnacle of his popularity in Kirtland. On this day, riding a wave of approval that put him temporarily at the head of the Mormon schismatic circles in town, he occupied the pulpit of the Kirtland Temple and delivered a sermon concerning his restored gospel and personal mission on the earth. To reinforce his prophetic claims he read a description of the Sacred Things to the audience, which, he said, filled the hall. In his discourse he promised the faithful in the group that those who would purify themselves and who would receive him (Gladden) would have the crowns placed on their head by the Ancient of Days in the Ordinance of the Kingdom.
Gladden's description of the Sacred Things was published on a sheet together with a revelation which introduced himself as the new prophet in Joseph's place. Titled *A Proclamation From the Lord to His People, Scattered Throughout All the Earth*, the 8.5x21-inch double-sided sheet was intended to fulfill Zechariah's prophecy of a "flying roll" to go out over the earth, an act which was to herald the gathering of Israel from its corners.\(^{315}\) The heading date, April 16th, 1851, coincidental to Gladden's meeting in the temple, suggests that it had been readied for distribution in that setting to reinforce his words. During the spring, Bishop's meetings were well attended, and for awhile Gladden held sway over the religious atmosphere in Kirtland.

The euphoria of April's success did not last for Gladden. Here, as it had in Voree, his popularity began to wane. Some of Kirtland's residents who had signed a testimonial of character the previous October now turned against the odd prophet.\(^{316}\) With this crisis and the prospect of losing followers to apathy or another leader, Gladden was faced with the need for quick action. Declining popularity redirected Gladden's thoughts towards his ultimate goal: leadership of the faithful and readying the preparatory church (organized by his forerunner Joseph Smith) to receive his leadership and the Ancient of Days. Gladden had thus far not been successful in attracting a following among the loosely attached Diaspora saints, but the Salt Lake Mormons were a group that had preserved social integrity and Church doctrines as Bishop understood them. Now that they were away in the wilderness, perhaps they were prepared to receive greater things.

In the summer of 1851 Bishop published a pamphlet, again from Kirtland, entitled *An Address to the Sons and Daughters of Zion Scattered Abroad Through All the Earth*.\(^{317}\) The *Address* was intended to explain and expound the broadside revelation, the *Proclamation*, as a commentary of sorts. It also called Gladden's faithful to gather in Zion—the Salt Lake Valley. Just when Gladden had made the
decision to remove his followers to Utah isn't known. There are several possible
explanations why from Kirtland Bishop suddenly turned his attention westward. His
sister Anna Maria and her husband had been in the Winter Quarters/Kanesville area
since fleeing Nauvoo in 1846 and by early 1852 were planning on going west. Gladden
may have been planning to go with them, but family ties were certainly not
enough reason to attempt a frontal assault into hostile territory. He felt the need to
expand his area of influence and to give the Utah Church a chance to espouse his
doctrines and receive the blessings he promised to his followers.

On the other hand, throughout his career Bishop was consistently very good at
"poaching" on someone else's congregation and drawing off the disaffected members
under his own leadership. This had happened at Voree under Strang and at Kirtland
under McLellin. Unfortunately for himself, and just as consistently, he was not as
good at keeping those whom he had drawn off. By the summer of 1851 Bishop
needed to remove his dwindling following from the tense atmosphere of the Kirtland
schismatic circles, or a new challenge was needed in order to breathe life into it. Such
a challenge, as well as promise, would have been found in the direction of the Utah
church. Maybe he decided to move west to fulfill Old Testament prophecy. Too,
missionary James Bay had reported to Brigham Young that there were many Old
Mormons who were willing to gather to Salt Lake City. Gladden may have taken that
idea as his own. Like so much of what Gladden Bishop did, the exact motivations
remain a mystery. But by the time of the Address's July publication it is clear that
Gladden had been preparing his Kirtland congregation for some time for the trip to the
"fold."

To the outside observer the progression of Bishop's life may appear to be at the
mercy of constant reaction—often rapid and seemingly without forethought—in a
disjointed, patternless way, much as a steel sphere careens among bumpers in a pinball machine. His earliest zeal, ever so slightly off tack, sent Bishop pursuing a course that culminated in the pivotal point in his life and ministry, his 1832 vision, and which forever changed (or at least heightened) his ideas about himself and his new-found religion. His adamant belief in the divinity of his call and the eager zeal in its pursuit had led to apparent impetuosity. This motivating force drew him at will across the continent in all directions at any call. It prepared him now to flee to Zion, "in the tops of the mountains"—Utah.
CHAPTER IX
MORE A MOVEMENT THAN AN ORGANIZATION

The task . . . of sifting first-hand account from third-hand plagiarism, of fitting Mormon and non-Mormon narratives into a mosaic that makes credible history, absorbing all the while the long-forgotten realities of religion and politics . . . is not a dull one.

Fawn Brodie, No Man Knows My History, viii.

Under the leadership of the apostles, the largest body of Mormons had fled the United States in 1846 and moved deeper into the continent. Settling a year later in a desert valley on the rim of the Great Basin, they established a city, free to practice their religion and prepare for the second coming of the Son of God. By 1851 the followers of Brigham Young and apostolic leadership enjoyed a virtual political and economic autonomy, ensconced firmly in the Salt Lake Valley. The Territory of Utah had been established by Congress as a part of the Compromise of 1850, and the governor was none other than Brigham Young. In his dual capacities, this man wielded both the weight of the law and the word of the Lord. Too, the territorial government was staffed from among the ranks of Mormon leadership. Locally, Great Salt Lake City was subdivided into wards, patterned after those in Nauvoo and Winter Quarters, each headed by a bishop who also functioned as de facto municipal officer and the wards as municipal divisions.

Great Salt Lake City was the only substantial white settlement between the Pacific coast and the military outposts in Kansas and along the Missouri River to the east. The settlement closest to the Mormons' location was Ft. Bridger in present day Wyoming which was of no substantial size. The stage on which the "apostate"
incursion of Gladdenites attempted to play was well controlled by the parent socio-religious group. At no other time in history would the LDS church maintain such control over an entire populace, Mormon and Gentile.

During the nineteenth and into the twentieth century, the Utah Mormons were widely regarded, among other things, to be fanatically loyal minions of their leaders, ever ready to do their bidding regardless of Christian propriety. Two statements routinely pointed out in support of this accusation are of particular interest in examining the role of dissent within the Church. One was made by Jedediah Grant in his famous "blood atonement" speech in 1856. The other was Brigham Young's metaphorical injunction to cut off the tails of "sheep that stink the flock . . . two inches behind their ears." The statement of Grant has been contested for years without resolving the underlying meanings and it would not be profitable to rehash what has been said elsewhere. The statement by Young has often been taken out of context. Less often was the following paragraph quoted. Brigham continued: "But instead of doing this [cutting off the "tails"], we will try to cleanse them; . . . . That is what I am doing now." "I do not want to destroy the people, I want to wash them." The focus of both speakers was the purity of the saints and the imperative to prepare for the second advent of the Lord. Part of this millennialist mystique was generated by the church and its extreme separatism over several decades. This enthusiasm within the leadership was expressed in an isolationist policy that approached nationalism.

To understand the reactions of Mormons towards those they considered apostate, it is first necessary to understand the implicit "social contract" of group membership. A group by definition is a closed (or bounded) set, meaning that an object's characteristics, compared against those of the group, allow or prohibit its inclusion within the set. Translated into human terms for a discussion of group dynamics in abolitionist associations, Ronald Walters wrote: "Groups cannot exist
without rules regulating interaction among members and between members and non-
members. Belonging to a group inevitably prescribes what a person can and cannot do
without risking excommunication." By voluntary membership one acknowledges
and accepts the group's prescribed limits. Walker's statement focuses on the
demarcation between performance of acceptable and unacceptable actions. Yet action
must be preconceived, and thought is untouchable by proscription; an unvoiced belief
cannot be exorcised, and a group cannot censure personal belief, only as that belief is
translated into actions. Eliminating real or suspected heresies in group members is the
purpose of repression. Examining the church's reaction to personal actions and belief-
-particularly repression--has been particularly sensitive in the study of Mormonism,
especially regarding nineteenth-century Utah.

The Gladdenites represented an early and thus far unique problem in Utah. They challenged from within the established order and the Latter-day Saint spiritual
focus at a time when the Mormons were turning inward to defend themselves from
external "corruptions." Grant's and Young's quotes reveal how intent the leaders were
for a purified church, unified in belief and purpose. It was in the late 1840s and into
the 50s that for the first time the Mormons, especially the leadership, would have a
chance to react unchallenged to those who threatened the divinely revealed order and
to demonstrate to what ends they were willing to go to impose social values upon
freedom of the individual. How much and over what did the church exercise control?
Where did the bounding limits of religious cum legal control fall? What happened
when the line was finally crossed? Once out, what became of the pariah, and what
further actions were attempted?

The story of the Gladdenites in Utah is an important one for these reasons but
has not been known factually since its occurrence. It is still clouded by the sand of
time blown by winds of rumor and legend. Sifting through the extant records it is
possible to construct at least a chronology of events and actions surrounding the rise of the first "apostate" sect in Utah; the first instance of heresy in the orthodox heart of the saints' desert retreat.

Prior to effecting his move from Kirtland to the Salt Lake Valley, Gladden sought to renew his ties with the church. Initially he mailed copies of the Proclamation and the Address in the summer of 1851 to the church's presidency and other individuals. As many as sixty of each were sent by his own count. His exegetical success was not without a price, however. The publication costs had broken Gladden financially. Still in Kirtland in 1851, Francis Bishop paid 32 cents combined state, county, and township taxes on a total personal value of $40.

Before mailing the Address, cognizant of how he was regarded by church leadership, he penned a letter addressed to "Governor B. Young" recounting his calling as head of a new dispensation, quoting testimonials to his character, and rather bluntly asking to be welcomed in to take his position as head of the church and leader of the faithful. Most importantly, Gladden's letter explains that he had been encouraging people to "accept the gospel" and had been sending them to gather in the Salt Lake Valley. The letter, written in his verbose style, states that in the Kirtland area because of his work:

people are coming forth some saints, and some not, . . . declaring that God has given them a testimony of the truth, of this great and Glorious work, now begun by my hand, and the consequence is, that many of the Old Mormons who previously had no idea of going west; . . . are stirred up on every hand, endeavoring . . . [to] get away to the valley.

By this time the ranks of Diaspora followings, both in Utah and the Midwest, tended to be populated with a combination of proselytes new to the sphere of Mormonism and "Old Mormons" who had not gathered with the saints to Nauvoo and
Utah. Some of these to whom Gladden was referring were his own converts, whose only exposure to Mormonism was in the doctrines of Gladdenism. From the religious perspective in Utah, these people represented an aberrant Mormon theology that could taint the larger body of Mormonism and interrupt pre-millennial preparations. In mid-nineteenth-century Mormon theology, the injunction from the Lord to "be one, and if ye are not one ye are not mine" was taken very seriously.  

Having Gladdenist-indoctrinated Mormons in the valley was a threat to the orthodoxy and solidarity of the church at the very time when many there would be reeling from the church's impending public announcement of the practice of polygamy. Additionally, many travel-weary immigrants from Europe, some now disillusioned, were trekking from the way-station at Kanesville (Council Bluffs), Iowa, across the plains into Utah. They represented another group for Gladdenites to potentially draw from. "And I am now," Bishop continued in his letter to Young, "preparing myself to remove to the valley, via, of Kanesville Iowa, as fast as possible, and shall bring all I can persuade to go with me. Several families are now preparing to remove with me." The Nauvoo heretic was coming to Utah.

Had Gladden and Phebe been able to leave Kirtland in July or August of 1851, they would have most likely travelled south across Ohio, then by water down the Ohio and up the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. On such a route they could have been settled in for the winter in Kanesville by September or October, readying themselves for the overland part of the trip west the following spring.

Without the names of Gladdenites in Kirtland there is no way to tell if some of his converts went directly to Salt Lake City or if their enthusiasm for the journey and their religion waned in the Midwest. The Kirtland congregation was one of Bishop's "seven movements" in seven years, and he hints that many of his faithful wandered and were never reclaimed.
Gladdenite sympathizers arrived with the saints in the valley undiscovered at an early date, for there was a group under the leadership of Thomas Lewins meeting quietly with a degree of regularity by late 1851.\textsuperscript{335} Still, there is no way to discover the identity or the date of entry of the first, if any, of Bishop's Kirtland following. The first contemporary mention of a known Gladdenite in the valley was noted in the arrival of John Gallop, who crossed into Utah with James Cumming's company of 5 October 1851, only six months from the release of the April 6th Proclamation.\textsuperscript{336} By the time Gallop arrived, Bishop's publications had been circulated and had collected some few new adherents.

Early the next year (January 1852) there was an incident at the church offices that brought the schism directly to the attention of church leaders. Polly Conklin was an older widow and a Gladdenite whom fellow-believer Ezra Strong later claimed had been one of Hyrum Smith's plural wives. She with several other people arrived at the church offices one morning, Polly wanting to be sealed to a John Booth. While waiting in the offices, adjacent to Brigham Young's Beehive House, the subject turned to Gladdenism. Polly made the mistake of defending Bishop's leadership claims and doctrines in the presence of Brigham Young. Young wasted no love for those whom he considered unfaithful, particularly apostates, but he was especially irked by Gladden Bishop, whom he regarded as a "poor, dirty curse."\textsuperscript{337} After hearing Polly's adamant defense in the face of contrary comments by everyone else present, Strong reported that regarding Bishop Brigham spat: "I can shit a better prophet, and fart better revelations." A statement of this nature would not be out of character for Brigham, but regardless of its authenticity he did suspend her from the church.\textsuperscript{338} She chose to remain a Gladdenite, and Brigham now knew, if he didn't before, that there were Mormons/ Gladdenites actually arriving in Utah.

As the weeks passed and spring crept into the valley, the tiny band of
Gladdenites began to gain a few members. Alfred A. Smith lived in the Fourteenth Ward, was a member of the Second Municipal Ward Seventies' Lyceum and the group's delegate to the General Lyceum, and was by trade a bookbinder. As a member of the Lyceum, Smith regularly participated in the weekly gatherings. In a December, 1851, meeting he had defended the practice of locally printed scrip in a debate addressing a means to replace the barter economy then operating in the valley. He was opposed by Charles Lambert from the Seventh Ward, who contended that such a practice would openly invite counterfeiting and instead of assisting the saints would reduce them to poverty.339

Had Smith been plying his trade in the saints’ city, he would probably have been working next door to the church offices in the Deseret News office, the only bindery in the city at the time. It may have been at the News office that Smith first encountered Gladden's doctrine in one of the publications that had been sent to the city. The paper's editor had probably received--and discarded--copies of the works Bishop had mailed abroad. Smith read Gladden's works and became convinced of Bishop's calling. In coming months, the young English convert (who with his wife had been endowed in the Nauvoo Temple prior to the flight from the city) would draw attention to himself as a vociferous defender of his new doctrines, but for now he was a relatively unknown heretic. Alfred Smith would later play a role in Gladden's church organization as a witness to his work.340

In 1852 the Deseret News was in the midst of serializing Joseph Smith's posthumously completed History of the Church. By coincidence, Bishop's 1835 suspension trial in Kirtland was printed in February, barely a month after Polly Conklin had confronted Brigham Young. Not so coincidentally, an editorial also appeared, "To the Saints," dealing with the subject of deception and of trying the spirits. It dealt with the reality of good and evil spirits, how each inspire Man, and
contained a caution to the readership not to be deceived by false spirits. From the context it appears that Conklin may have been quoted in the editorial--as one deceived by a false spirit.\textsuperscript{341} Church leadership was certainly now aware of the movement afoot. By the time of the annual conference of the church at the beginning of April they decided to counter the rising heresy.

Any social group uses implicit or explicit coercion to enforce order and define its boundaries. This often takes the form of peer pressure, official sanctions, withdrawals of membership rights, or expulsion. A common practice used in compelling obedience in nineteenth-century Mormonism after the move to Utah was to call a wavering brother to serve a proselyting mission. Filling a mission demanded of those who served a regimen of study, prayer, and sacrifice for the sake of the gospel. It was felt that if a man would not accept a mission "call" to defend the gospel then he was truly "apostate." A mission was (and remains so for the Utah branch of the Church) an intense period that often helps a man get in or get out. By 1850 the mission call had become a routine institution in the church. In one of the general conference sessions the names of those who were appointed to missions were simply read--without prior notice to the individuals concerned. A man so called was at liberty to accept or reject the call without justification. On April eighth, Alfred Smith's name was read with an appointment to an unspecified "foreign mission."\textsuperscript{342} Smith chose to decline the call and by so doing cast his lot with the heretics.\textsuperscript{343}

Upon his arrival in the city of the saints the previous year, John Gallop had been rebaptized and established himself and family in the Seventh Ward.\textsuperscript{344} By early spring it became apparent that he favored the leadership claims of Gladden Bishop over those of Brigham Young and the apostles. A neighbor, Charles Lambert, became incensed at Gallop's "false reasoning and bitter, malignant spirit" and proffered a charge against Gallop to the bishop. Gallop was called to appear before a general
ward assembly to account for his religious opinions.

At this meeting, when asked about the character of the Prophet Joseph Smith, Gallop replied that he considered him to be "a wicked and adulterous man . . . [whose] lot was cast with the hypocrite and unbeliever . . . and [who] has gone to hell."\textsuperscript{345} Lambert, despite a right shoulder dislocated by severe rheumatism, would not stand to hear Joseph's character so assailed. He sprang over the benches at Gallop and raised his right arm to deal the blasphemer a blow. In mid-stride he was intercepted by others attending. Once restrained, someone cried out that "Father Lambert has regained the use of his arm!" Lambert went home swinging a useful and now painless right arm, rejoicing at the miracle, and Gallop was disfellowshipped.\textsuperscript{346}

By midsummer of 1852, Alfred Smith had supplanted Thomas Lewins as the leader of the local Gladdenist congregation "probably because of more zeal, than knowlege, & prudence" in Gladdenite Ezra Strong's opinion.\textsuperscript{347} In August, Smith was given an opportunity to preach his sect's doctrines publicly from the pulpit of the Old Tabernacle on Temple Square. Perhaps this was an effort to be fair to Smith and his views; more likely it was to give him a chance to expose himself as the follower of a false prophet. It evidently worked. Smith preached at 5 P.M. to a full congregation, and several recorded their impressions of the proceedings in their journals.\textsuperscript{348} Apostle Wilford Woodruff was in attendance and recorded under the date of August 1st:

In the evening Alfred Smith addressed the Saints advocating the claimes of Gladden Bishop who had tried for many years to gather a company together that He might lead them as many other foolish men & fals teachers have tried to do at different time[s]. Much confusion rested upon Alfred Smith while speaking. He made many fals statements & at the close was followed By President Young. . . .\textsuperscript{349}

Brigham spoke for a few minutes, and on motion from one of the congregation, Alfred and Ann Smith, Polly Conklin, John Gallop, and David Heron were formally excommunicated from the church.\textsuperscript{350}
Meanwhile, a year had passed since Gladden's rapprochement letter of July, 1851, had failed to produce a warm welcome. As his converts were contending for their faith in Great Salt Lake City, their leader was stalled on the eastern bank of the Missouri River. Bishop and his family had gotten as far west as Kanesville, Iowa, before stopping. He hadn't waited in Kirtland for a reply to his epistolary emigration notice to Brigham Young but expected a positive response for the letter ended by requesting an answer be forwarded to Kanesville.

This compounded problems with the gathering Mormons outside the Salt Lake Valley. In late 1851 an epistle was issued to the saints who were still in Iowa, particularly the Kanesville area, to leave and gather to Zion. While Bishop's expected advent certainly wasn't the primary reason for its issuance, the descent of a prophetic rival into the midst of the faithful would be like welcoming a wolf among the sheep and may have hastened its issuance. A concerted effort was made to get the saints out of Iowa by 1852. This raised some hackles since many there had established farms and homes.

If Young deigned to answer Bishop's letter it was certainly not what Gladden had hoped for nor expected. Once in Kanesville, Gladden's attitude towards the Mormons changed as drastically as did his plans to continue west. His 1851 letter to the church presidency had been filled with prophetic positivism and brotherly sentiments. Brigham's reply, if one was sent, flew in the teeth of Bishop's prophecy. Gladden did not continue west. In Kanesville, through the mails or by east-bound emigrants, Bishop further learned of the noisy confrontations his followers were involved with within the very "fold" in which he had hoped to establish them. This no doubt troubled him. One is not hailed as a leader where one's followers are causing problems.

Before the close of 1852 Gladden had recovered well enough financially to
publish the first installment of a pamphlet titled *The Ensign. Light of Zion. Shepherd of Israel! And "Book of Remembrance."* In this publication his attitude towards the church and its leaders switched from the conciliatory tone of his Kirtland letter to one of harsh condemnation. This publication was also mailed to individuals in the Salt Lake Valley.

The *Ensign* was intended to be published in three yearly installments. The first section, forty-two pages, was published in November or December of 1852. It consisted of a seven-and-a-half page "Proclamation, and Voice of Warning to the Inhabitants of the Earth, both Gentiles and Jews" and a compilation of revelations received by Gladden in Kanesville. It constitutes the largest extant body of Gladden's revelatory pronouncements. It also heralded the intended end of Gladden's revelations to the world. "[A]fter the 'Book of Remembrance,' is finished," says the *Ensign*, "I [the Lord] shall speak unto them [the Gentiles] no more." This did not preclude the Church, nor those in the world whom Gladden was instructed to warn, for in coming years he continued to prophesy. "The world" was distinct from believers in the Book of Mormon. Bishop was a true Diaspora leader; he focused his efforts to those who had been and who were now participants in Mormon culture.

The *Ensign* also addressed other pertinent topics, giving the name of the church to be organized in this final mortal dispensation, "The Church of Jesus Christ of the New Jerusalem"; it addressed the role of offices and appointed officers; commanded the printing of the "Covenant of Peace." The Covenant was to be signed by those seeking admittance to the church (there was no baptism, for Gladden viewed it as a fulfilled preparatory ordinance, like Mosaic blood sacrifices).

The second division of the *Ensign* was to be six pages long. It was printed a year following publication of the first division, but no copies have been located. The third section of the *Ensign* was intended to be forty-eight pages long. It was to
contain the names of all those who had signed the Covenant of Peace. It was never
printed since Bishop's following fell apart before the three-year publication schedule
was up and the Ancient of Days remained stubbornly ensconsed in the heavens. 354
Had even the manuscript for this section survived it would have provided the
membership rolls of the New Church (as they were wont to call themselves), including
the fifty or so Gladdenites that were claimed in Salt Lake. 355

Even though he was aware that he and his followers were not welcome in
Utah, as late as October of 1852 Gladden still planned on making the trip west, hoping
that his publications and vocal Salt Lake followers would prepare the way. 356 But in
the three months between October and the the last revelation published in the *Ensign*
(December), Gladden seems to have decided that relocating his following to Utah was
impractical and potentially dangerous. The final revelation reveals this change in
plans as it called Alfred Smith and others from Salt Lake City back to Kanesville,
Iowa. Smith was instructed at first opportunity to gather the names of the faithful
there and to bring the list--and their offerings--with him to Kanesville. 357 The
collation complete, the first division of the *Ensign* was finally printed and mailed to
Salt Lake City.

With the publication of the *Ensign* Bishop created--perhaps unintentionally--a
potent weapon to capture the allegiance of disgruntled or disillusioned Mormons
outside as well as within Utah. Many of these had not followed the twelve apostles
across the continent but remained nominal members of the Church in isolated groups
all over the Midwest. These groups included those who had been enlisted in one of
the many followings of lesser charismatics who fronted an authority claim. 358 In both
cases, these groups remained largely out of touch with the body of the Church and its
leaders. Those who prior to 1844 had been members of the Old Church (as it began to
be called), yet had not gathered to Nauvoo with the saints, had not developed the deep
social and experiential roots in their religion those in Nauvoo had. Joseph Smith had been a prophet who received and publicly declared revelations and in Nauvoo had continued expounding ideas that were exciting and stimulating, keeping the interest of many who may not, under other circumstances, have belonged to the Church. Brigham Young had not overtly followed his predecessor's revelatory pattern. Among the Midwest Mormons, those who were unafraid to speak in the name of the Lord gained adherents. The revelatory proliferations of Charles Thompson, James Brewster, James Strang, and Sidney Rigdon helped to gain each of these a following from Church members, augmented by new converts to their particular brand of Mormonism.359

Bishop (and others) tried to replicate what they understood the prophetic role to be by taking up the more visible tradition Joseph had laid down of the prophet who received from the Lord and made public his word. This capitalized on the dissatisfaction with Brigham's leadership and his lack of revelatory pronouncement. It was a successful tactic. Although Bishop's doctrine seemed almost incomprehensible to anyone but himself, people joined his standard. The Ensign, which appeared in Kanesville around the end of December of 1852, contained revelations of nearly weekly frequency--for those looking around for another prophet a powerful drawing card.

Bishop's influence was not limited to his immediate locale. Passing through Cincinnati in late November on his way east, Utah missionary Jesse Haven noted in his journal that he had encountered a Mrs. Painter, a believer in the popular practice of Spiritualism. She told the missionary, "I have called up the spirit of Joseph Smith and he has told me that Gladden Bishop is the man to lead the Church."360 Her experience dovetails with the variety of testimonials other Gladdenites related when speaking of their beliefs.361
As the spring of 1853 broke in the Salt Lake Valley, general church leaders in Great Salt Lake City had been aware of the small successes of the rising heresy but so far not had not taken direct actions against it as a body. During the late fall and winter Alfred Smith had been busy proselyting and drawing converts into the faith, one of whom was Ezra Strong. Apparently there were a sufficient number of saints who in midstream changed their spiritual horses and signed on with Gladdenism to cause concern among church leadership. Here was an apostate sect finding some success in the heart of the church, yes, but the real concern that Smith and the Gladdenites caused was not the number of converts they won (which was small) but their visibility, noise, and the divisiveness they created.362

It was about this time that confrontations began in earnest. Ezra Strong reported later to his son that a man named Grey, who was leaning towards the schismatic sect and had allowed the Gladdenites to hold meetings in his home, was given a pointed and rather strongly worded threat by the local bishop if he allowed such to occur again.363

In February of 1853 a week-long fast was proclaimed for the Gladdenite faithful. During the week meetings were held twice daily. Smith posted flyers in any Gentile establishment that would allow them, giving notice that the public was welcome to attend a Sunday sermon to be delivered at his home. The implications of this act, as much as any religious issue, set LDS teeth on edge. In the minds of the Mormons, Smith's act may have been interpreted as a move to join forces with the Gentiles in the city. These non-Mormon merchants represented a part of the society the church could not directly influence but who held a definite stake in the society. The perceived alignment of the Gladdenites with the Gentiles, who did not appreciate Mormon domination, was a classic warning sign of trouble. By posting notices in Gentile establishments Smith unintentionally sustained the fears of a repeat of past
coalitions. Ezra Booth had published the first anti-Mormon letters in a hostile paper in Ohio; George Hinkle had betrayed Church leaders to the Missouri militia, and William McLellin aided the Missouri mobs in depredations on the Mormons; John C. Bennett and William Law had involved themselves with publishing scandal in Illinois. Past experience demonstrated that neither heretics nor apostates simply left the church alone. Remembering this, the Mormon reaction to this meeting was the most severe action to be taken against the heretics in Salt Lake City.

Shortly before the appointed 10 A.M. meeting time, John Gallop and Ezra Strong (who lived out of the city and had stayed the night with Gallop) set out for Smiths, a few minutes' walk to the north. Approaching the house, Strong reports meeting with a "company of beings, call'd Men, Said company of men, had Staves, & crooked Sticks, or cudgels[]." Their leader was a former bishop, Addison Everts. Strong bid the men good morning and received the same in reply, although Everts declined to shake his hand.

Once Strong and Gallop had arrived and had seated themselves in the front room, the band crowded around the door. Again Everts asked if there were a meeting to be held at the house and added that he "had orders to break up" the same. Alfred Smith came to his feet and called in a loud voice for the men to "repent, of their mob[bl]ing Spirit & practices." Gallop, anticipating a row, rose to leave and was seized at the door by two men. Strong's hired man, also a Gladdenite, dodged out the back way and avoided capture. Strong himself, an older man, moved to leave and at the door was accosted rather roughly by two other men.

The pair escorted Strong and Gallop (flanked by his retainers) back to Gallop's home. When Gallop remonstrated that they (the Gladdenites) had not infringed upon the Constitution but that the "Mormon Mob" had, Strong wrote that one of the men replied angrily "Damn the Constitution! We cares for no constitution only our Gover-
nors." Strong availed himself of the situation and preached to his "captive audience" all the way to Gallop's, where they were apparently released, shaken, but uninjured.

A few weeks later apostle Wilford Woodruff was working in his garden when he was approached by a man bearing a copy of Gladden's Proclamation. Woodruff listened to the warnings of the bearer, as the man "wished to teach [him]." When the delivery was concluded, Woodruff asked in turn if the man believed Joseph Smith were a prophet and that he had ordained apostles as witnesses to the work of the Restoration. The man replied yes, he did. Woodruff then informed him that he was such an apostle and pointedly stated that he judged the man's doctrine as coming from the devil and worth nothing. Without an answer, the man departed, chastened.

After receiving the newly published Ensign and Gladden's call to gather in Kanesville, the spring of 1853 probably presented the first opportunity for Smith and others to leave the valley. Before leaving Salt Lake for the trip east Smith decided to try at really cracking the Utah church. On the 20th of March, a Sunday, Smith positioned himself in a wagon on the street outside the Tabernacle, loudly preaching doom and the destruction of the city as the saints left their meetings. A crowd gathered to watch, and some young men laid hold of the wagon tongue to remove it from the area. Smith's harangue evidently had an effect on some of the listeners, for a man in the crowd spoke up to leave Smith alone and let him continue. Mayor Jedediah Grant, following this outcry, dismissed the crowd.

The following Sunday, March 27th, Parley Pratt, Erastus Snow, Amasa Lyman, and Brigham Young all gave biting speeches on the character of both Bishop and Smith and explained that the two and their followers were to be avoided. Brigham's sermon was filled with his typical hyperbolic exaggeration. Through it all came the message that impurity in the form of apostasy would not be tolerated. "I say
again, you Gladdenites, do not court persecution, or you will get more than you want, and it will come quicker than you want it. "Let this people alone in these valleys of the mountains, or you will find that which you are not looking for." He went on to instruct bishops not to allow Gladdenites to preach in the wards and recounted some of the troubles of years past.\footnote{371}

It was apparent that church leaders were upset by this latest incident, not necessarily by the Gladdenite doctrines, but by the disaffected company that the Gladdenites represented generically--apostates. Said Brigham, speaking to those who had experienced the persecutions in Missouri and Illinois:

\begin{quote}
I will ask, what has produced your persecutions and sorrow? What has been the starting point of all your afflictions? They have begun with apostates in your midst; these disaffected spirits caused others to come in, worse than they, who would run out and bring in all the devils they possibly could.\footnote{372}
\end{quote}

Brigham's rhetoric oversimplified a complex history but states clearly the concerns of church members and the leadership.

The previous week's occurrence had not daunted Smith nor had the remarks against his faith of this day. After meeting he was again loudly preaching outside the downtown temple block. This time the city marshal took Smith into custody and only released him when he promised not to disturb the peace again.\footnote{373}

The public condemnations of Gladdenism from the Tabernacle were apparently interpreted by those in the city as a license to persecute their fellow citizens who now belonged to the sect. Former Territorial Secretary Benjamin Ferris in his 1854 book \textit{Utah and the Mormons} stated with some bias that from then on persecution was the order of the day for the Gladdenites.\footnote{374} Ferris believed that the church leadership was behind the attempted suppression. "Instead . . . of treating the subject with ridicule, they," speaking of Brigham and the other church leaders, "resorted to
the very doubtful expedient of persecution.\textsuperscript{375} Topping this statement twenty years later, piling wild overstatement onto rumor, J.H. Beadle reported to the eastern anti-polygamy cliques that Gladdenites had actually been sacrificed in the Mormon Endowment House.\textsuperscript{376} The opposition was not that bad, but the Mormons let their prejudices be known. Such opposition as there was backfired. Ferris recorded that because of the opposition, the Gladdenites attracted interest and converts. The ex-Secretary hoped it would contribute to the permanent breakup of the church.\textsuperscript{377}

After the March sermons by both church leaders and Gladdenites, others joined the spiritual fray. About the first of April, Reynolds Cahoon, a member of the temple committees in both Kirtland and Nauvoo and the motivator behind Bishop's Nauvoo excommunication, began to speak in ward meetings against the Gladdenites. Ezra Strong credits a second-hand account of Cahoon reportedly stating to the members of one ward that "if they killd them [the Gladdenites], they would not be hurt for it;" possibly the first recorded public mentioning of the bugaboo doctrine of blood atonement.\textsuperscript{378}

In the second week of April, Salt Lake City mayor Jedediah Grant (who also had known Bishop personally) called on Gladdenite Calvin Siddell and asked him to visit the governor before Young left on a spring tour of the southern settlements. Unable to find anyone else willing to accompany him, Siddell enlisted the help of zealot John Gallop. On Saturday, the 16th of April, the pair presented themselves at the office of President/Governor Young. Gallop commenced speaking with the governor "as tho to convert him," but Brigham raised his hand and asked Gallop to go to hell. Siddell then stated (as reported second-hand by Strong):

Well Governor, I was informd by the Mayor of the City, that you said, you wish'd for an interview with some of the Gladenites, & I have acordingly come, & [I am] glad, & thankfull for the opportunity. And govenor, I come not, to talk of, or about religion" --- "but I come before you -- the Govener, as the Goovenor of Utah Territory;
& myself as a citizen of Utah territory over which you preside; - to ask of you, Govenor for my self, & any others who you may deem heretics; If we can have the privileges which the Constitution of the United States, Garuntees, to each, & every man.  

Brigham replied that he might. "Then" said Siddell, "Will the Govenor be so kind as to givit [sic] out from the public Stand tomorrow?" Brigham agreed that he would.

The next day, Sunday, April 17th, Brigham made good his word. This day his characteristic hyperbole was tempered with more realistic discretion, but Brigham again spoke against Gladdenism. Regarding the heretics in the city he stated clearly that he was quite willing to allow Gladdenites to coexist in the city, "but I do not wish them to stir up strife." He explained more about his own experience with Bishop and stated that he still considered him to be a deceived prophet and of a wicked character. In addition he denied that Gladdenites had been mistreated "anywhere save in the pulpit." Brigham and other church leaders may not have initiated action against this coterie of dissenters, but their words had most certainly given popularly assumed sanction to it.

Soon after this it was Ezra Strong's turn to put his allegiance on the line. He, with his wife and wife's parents, was called before a church court. When asked about his feelings on the endowment, Strong stated plainly that he had no faith in what he considered a system of "speculation." He expressed the reservations he had harbored since Nauvoo as the endowment was being given there, saying that he considered it all a plot to "get gain," and added that "the old Speculative craft, calld [sic] Masonry, . . . is much cheaper, you know." Soon after Strong's excommunication, Alfred Smith and a small number of his converts left the Territory. Those who went with him were the ardent defenders of Gladdenism, undercutting the active defense of the sect. The Gladdenites who were left continued to struggle on gamely for another year. With the agitators gone, there
were no major confrontations between Mormons and Gladdenites recorded nor were any more diatribes delivered by church officials. Young's passive remarks of April 17th quieted the overzealous among Mormon congregations and gave official sanction to the peaceful existence of the Gladdenites in the city. For their part the remainder of Gladden's followers were a bit more wise about courting persecution.

Bishop had explained in the Ensign that his people were not "called to suffer" in Utah and stated that "I the Lord [would] speak unto them in my wrath." But once it became clear that the Gladdenites were not welcome among the saints in Utah, Gladden was faced with a dilemma. He could try to force his way into Utah's society or ignore the Utah saints and try to gather his faithful in another area. He opted for the second choice but was not happy about it. By this time Bishop seems to have abandoned hope of immediately settling his followers in the fold and had to content himself by at least pulling them together. Still, he had to resolve his prophesied intentions to travel to Utah. Fortunately, in his search of the Holy Writ he was able to assemble a doctrinal justification why he should not go to the Zion he had identified only two years earlier. The fact was that he had been rejected. Gladden did not go to Utah as he had once planned.

Word of the plight of the Gladdenites in Salt Lake even reached the East. Apostle Orson Pratt published in The Seer in Washington, D.C., an injunction against any advocating the claims of Gladden Bishop or C.B. Thompson. The tiny sect also became the latest point of derision in U.S. papers regarding the Mormons. The Public Ledger of Philadelphia carried a column on the flux of emigration and apostasy among the Mormons. Their example of this was the treatment of the Gladdenites in Salt Lake City. Mormonism, because it lacked an exterior unifier, persecution, would feed on itself and "be restricted within a narrow circle of operations, and be of limited duration." Against the potentially divisive backdrop of recently announced
Mormon practice of polygamy the article's author believed that "Without the outside pressure of persecution to hold it together, there is not sufficient adhesiveness in its internal constitution to keep it from falling to pieces."

At the end of another year, spring of 1854, it was plainly obvious to the Gladdenites in Great Salt Lake City that the group was not wanted in Utah and that opposition in the valley was not going to cease. The remnant of the small sect began to look eastward to Kanesville and the larger body of followers. That place had been identified in the Ensign as a place of "gathering," even though it was not the ultimate "fold." In June of 1854 a wagon train with sixty or so Gladdenites, probably the balance of the sect's Utah population, and a few others who were unhappy with life in Zion, left the Salt Lake Valley for points east. Gladdenism, the first heresy in Mormon Utah, was over.

Gladdenism's short tenure in Utah left little obvious imprint upon the Mormon church or its members. Because the dissenters physically removed themselves from the Salt Lake arena, what they did leave was mostly just a memory, and even this faded rapidly. In hindsight, however, their presence and actions in the valley of the Great Salt Lake in several ways bequeathed a legacy that was to change the Utah church indirectly and aid it in becoming the entity that it is today.

Initially, Gladdenism represented the first organized apostate movement to gain a following within the Territory. The Morrisites, Godbeites, and other groups later enjoyed more success (and more press) but did not rise as early as did the Gladdenites. Their existence in the earliest years of the building of the new Mormon stronghold revealed several issues that had been left unresolved when the Mormons fled Illinois. It's rise illustrated that the Utah church was not homogeneous, and that control over the people was not a well-established dictatorship. Though Brigham
Young and the twelve apostles had been generally recognized as Church leadership, the door had never closed to rival claims. Another way to express this idea is that individual opinions, even on doctrinal subjects, within members of the Utah church were still strong and were not quelled by membership in an authoritarian system.

The Church’s general decision in August 1844 to follow Mormonism's corporate tradition had indeed set a binding standard for membership in the church but still allowed individuals the freedom to accept or reject that position. Many did choose to follow other leaders and left "the Church," following instead Mormonism's charismatic or Prophet-ic tradition. Technically, excommunication drew a line between faithful and faithless for a few but defined bounds only in individual cases. Because some dissenters occupied key ecclesiastical positions, the corporate tradition was challenged from within the very quorums it sought to protect. The ban of excommunication could not be used widely enough to define effectively the post-martyrdom boundaries of the faith.388 From another angle: with the populace moving out, many who stayed in Illinois and surrounding states simply slipped through the cracks. Many persons active in the Diaspora never were formally excommunicated from the Church; hence, there remained an undrawn line to separate the "faithful" from the "unfaithful."

Viewed from one perspective, the Mormons' attempted to draw a line around themselves, defining their social and religious boundaries, by removing to the Salt Lake Valley. This solution worked but only partially. Cultural Mormonism still existed outside the Great Basin. The Diaspora Mormons in the Midwest still considered themselves part of "the Church" but following a different leader. The rise of the Gladdenite heresy in Utah illustrated there the need for an unmistakable division to distinctly divide "the sheep from the goats."389 As Leonard Arrington has pointed out, Zion was not only a place but a community and an attitude of gathered
believers.  When that community was compromised, Zion was no longer. To keep faith and unity strong, the line circumscribing membership in the LDS church had to be recognizable from the outside, as well as from the inside of Utah. The Mormon Reformation of 1856-58 would draw that line; enclosing and defining the faithful and severing the rest. It's coming was nudged closer by the Gladdenite incursion.

The early rise of the Gladdenite sect within the centralized Utah settlement area gave the dissatisfied there an option to shift to. It created a space for those who had become disillusioned with the saints or their leaders and then moved them out of the territory, much as the Reorganization would later do. Gladdenism thus early on helped to keep the Latter-day Saint structure in the valley strong and without as many weak members. Although it was small, it was noisy and voiced its views widely, attracting attention and the opposition it thrived and grew on. This idea ties into another point, one to which Gladdenism and similar groups as a whole unknowingly contributed, not only to the Utah church, but to the whole realm of the Dispersion.

Benjamin Ferris stated: "Fanaticism is generally honest, but always dangerous, because no one can foresee in what direction its burning focus may be turned." He also explained briefly about Gladdenism and particularly about the Gladdenites in Salt Lake:

This sect is small, but spreading in the very seat of Mormon power, and is the more dangerous and troublesome because it is composed of the more fanatical of the Saints. I . . . became acquainted with some of these fanatics, and have no reason to doubt their honesty in [their] belief.

Fanaticism is one thing that an established group, such as the Utah church, finds difficult to cope with. Even Brigham Young acknowledged Gladden's followers as having "an extra charge of Mormon blood." In these statements Ferris and Young hit the proverbial nail on the head.
Gladden exacted literal interpretations from prophetic symbolism in Old Testament scripture (particularly from his favorite text, Zechariah) and blended them with his own flair and ideas into complex interpretive doctrines. Although this hodgepodge is almost dizzying, to the confused or dissatisfied it may have been convincing (or dazzling) enough to draw attention and discipleship. His doctrine was straight from the scriptures, even if it was ignoring the context in favor of literality. In addition, recorded experiences of conversions to Gladdenism reveal a tendency towards the more titilating, relatable sort of personal visions and visitations, things once common in the Church.395

Gladden's doctrines and willingness to accept any supermortal experience as divine helped collect to himself and his organization the mystics, the zealous, and the dissatisfied from out of rival Smith/Mormon-based factions. Bishop always managed to collect a queue of reverential devotees. It happened at Voree, Kirtland, Kanesville, later in Cincinnati, and even by proxy in Utah. In every Diaspora organization he touched there existed a number of discontented to draw from, and Gladden successfully, if only briefly, tapped that. In some cases the change seems to have been motivated as much by revulsion of another as by what pull Bishop demonstrated doctrinally. By rallying these zealots and "malcontents" other groups were spared the problems of dealing with them. Like a special discipline class in a school it pulled the disruptive away from the main body. In Utah the recently announced practice of polygamy, or plural marriage, was a sharp point of contention. Bishop's written and his followers' vocal stance against the doctrine and practice attracted others of a similar opinion.396 Gladdenism helped disperse the effects of disruptive zeal away from other post-martyrdom churches, such as the Latter-day Saints in Utah. In short, Gladdenism and groups like it gave place for the firebrand faithful to burn. Once they became a little less heated and more settled in their beliefs, Gladden's followers tended
to return back from whence they came or to sidestep into another following. Some wanted to return to the Salt Lake Valley; some made the switch into other groups, particularly into the rising following of Zenos Gurley and Jason Briggs, which later evolved into the Reorganization.

The Mormons reacted against this first apostate intrusion for a variety of closely related reasons. Simply stated, these "apostates" denied the validity of the Church's leadership tradition. From the perspective of LDS social doctrine, the priesthood had been given a chance for uninterrupted governance under revealed principles. Those unwilling to live principles were covenant breakers, the same class of individuals as had brought judgments down on the whole people of Israel in Moses' day. The church had been commanded to create a theo-democratic utopia, unified in belief and faith. Right or wrong, an apostate incursion hurt this process by introducing gritty dissention that, unlike an oyster, did not produce pearls and could not be allowed. Too, apostates had been the cause of many of the Church's past conflicts. Their ill-sworn affadavits, biased testimonies, and outright lies had served to fuel the ignorance, prejudice, and misinformation that had led to murderous mobs. No one in Utah was eager for a repetition of Missouri--or Carthage.
CHAPTER X
THE KINGDOM OF GOD ESTABLISHED

While his western congregation was fighting for recognition in Great Salt Lake City, Gladden was living in Kanesville, Iowa. The Mormons had largely abandoned this station of the old Mormon Trail since most American members had departed the States, crossed Iowa, and were now in Utah. Those who remained favored the Winter Quarters area on the Nebraska bank and upriver about three miles. St. Louis, Missouri, now outfitted most of the Utah-bound saints for the cross-continent trek. Mormon days in Kanesville were largely over.

Bishop failed to record how he provided for his family during this time. He had recorded in Kirtland in 1851 that publishing the Proclamation and Address had nearly broken him financially, but he managed to scrape enough together to make the trip to Kanesville. In the year following he was able to finance publication of the Ensign but did not seem to be in a sufficient financial position to complete an outfit for the journey to the Salt Lake Valley.

Just before the Utah Gladdenites left the Salt Lake area in the summer of 1854, the settlement of Kanesville was incorporated as the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa. Upon incorporation, residents were allowed to purchase for the price of a filing fee the lots which they occupied. Gladden and Phebe Bishop filed for town lots 61 and 62 on Madison Street (formerly Hyde Street in honor of apostle Orson Hyde), the main street in the heart of the Mormon area of town. On June second, Francis G. Bishop paid $4.35 to county judge Franklin Street and with Mormons Almon W. Babbitt, Lyman O. Littlefield, William Marks, and Isaac Beebe became a charter resident of
the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa.  

Securing title to land was a positive step for Bishop and offered a feeling of permanence. Despite the fact that by this time Bishop had lost the allegiance of nearly the entire body of believers that had travelled with him from Kirtland as well as the earliest Kanesville converts, the ranks of the faithful included enough new converts to keep the faith alive. A fairly large congregation in Council Bluffs (in relation to previous followings) and more gathering from Salt Lake City, the publication of two pamphlets, and a small property base offered at least a collective glimmer of hope and security. For Gladden Bishop, accustomed to constant declension, the present, more than at any previous time, seemed to hold out lasting promise for a formal organization. In June, 1854, while the last of the Utah converts were on the plains, Gladden again set about establishing the Kingdom of God.

A fortnight before securing his property titles, Bishop had anointed on May 28, 1854, "two witnesses" from among his faithful, Alfred A. Smith and Joel Shearer. This was intended to fulfill the scripturally prophesied "two witnesses" as Gladden carried forth the "work of the Father." They were also to function with Bishop in administering the affairs of the church. With the ordinations already completed and before the Utah emigrants had arrived in Council Bluffs, Gladden officially organized the seventh of his seven movements. The detailed retrospective explanation he constructed, outlining the significance of the previous six failed movements and the importance of this seventh, bespoke his confidence that he was finally on the right track. The New Church (as they were wont to call themselves) was formally organized as "The Church of Jesus Christ of the New Jerusalem" on June 11, 1854.

The organizational conference was in all likelihood held in the Bishop home. Joel Shearer, one of Gladden's anointed witnesses, was elected to the chair. One of the first orders of business, had it not been decided previously, was to commission
publication of a periodical, to be called Zion's Messenger. It was next resolved that
the officers, who had been functioning without a formal organization, be presented for
acceptance and support. Chairman Shearer presented Gladden to the congregation "as
the first president of the Church, and shepherd of Israel, according to the order of the
New Church, as given in the Book of Remembrance." Gladden was sustained as
thus, unanimously.

Taking his seat as leader of the faithful, Gladden then presented Shearer as his
assistant in the church. As such, Shearer was to have oversight of the church in
Bishop's absence. Alfred A. Smith was presented and accepted as an assistant to
Bishop "in the vineyard abroad" to assist primarily in spreading the word of Gladden's
call and gospel.

With a presidency organized, the body of the church was formally ordered. Eli
B. Hewitt, a former member of the Mormon Battalion, was sustained as "president of
the second department," functioning as the head of the unspecified "seven lesser
branches authority" in the church. Gladden may have had seven branches of his
followers outside Council Bluffs, or he may have been simply planning hopefully.

With this position secured, Henry Suits was accepted as the deacon of the Council
Bluffs congregation.

Once the priesthood of the church had been organized, a parallel order was
established for the women. Phebe, Gladden's wife, was sustained at the conference as
"first president of the female department, and mother in Israel." Her second was
Lydia F. Shockly. Harriet P. Hewitt was called to be "the president of the seven lesser
branches of the female department." Wife of the Council Bluffs deacon, Phebe Ann
Suits, was sustained as Deaconess.

After Chairman Shearer had delivered some instructions to the assembled body
of believers, the conference closed and conference clerk Alfred A. Smith signed and
closed the record.

The actual function of the women's offices in the New Church remains unrevealed, but it is clear that in comparison to the larger culture women occupied an unusually prominent commission. Bishop appears to have created the first functioning female priesthood order in Mormon history—certainly the first in the Diaspora. With the exception of the office of Steward (apparently the highest position), there is a distinctly defined female counterpart to each male officer in the general organization of the church. The organization of the New Church is curious in this respect. This organizational pattern remains significant and may have been one idea transferred to other Diaspora sects. One of Bishop's closest adherents would in another decade be serving as president of the quorum of twelve in Sidney Rigdon's following during the time Rigdon's group was ordaining women.

Soon after the conference, Gladden travelled east to Illinois to make a brief visit to branches of his following in that state and perhaps to see for the last time his brother Isaac, who would die on Christmas Eve this year. Several meetings were held in Illinois, and a small number of new followers signed the Covenant and were confirmed members of the New Church. Unfortunately Bishop fails to record for us who, how many, or where they were.

Upon returning to Council Bluffs towards the end of July, Bishop set about finalizing the publication of the periodical commissioned by the conference in June. This work, *Zion's Messenger*, was the last of Bishop's known published writings. The *Messenger* appears to have been written entirely by Bishop. It contains lengthy expositions on the call of the New Church's principal member, large sections of his history and reprints of many certificates, the minutes of the organizational conference, and a pair of reprinted articles meant to bolster the work. The single surviving issue of the first—and probably only—number is not complete, lacking the covers and first
pages of text, beginning in the middle of a sentence on page three.

The publication of *Zion's Messenger* was another manifestation of Bishop's hope in the future of his movement and may have been viewed as a step forward for the New Church, yet it was a step financially unaffordable. Gladden's verbosity, while it preserved for us his history, doomed the *Messenger*'s continuation. Though intended to be a monthly periodical, the printing cost for the first number, over eighty 3 3/4 x 6 1/2 inch pages of fine print, probably precluded further publication. Since Bishop tended to circulate his works gratis, the recovery of the printer's costs could not be expected.

On August second, the Pottawattamie County clerk recorded the sale of two town lots to Bird B. Chapman from Francis G. and Phebe M. Bishop. Bishop made a substantial return on his investment. For the lots secured with a four-dollar filing fee two months earlier, the Bishops collected $400. Part of this money undoubtedly went to retiring publication costs for the *Messenger*. Part also funded the next of Gladden's adventures. At about the same time as he disposed of his Council Bluffs properties, Gladden gathered testimonials of character from the local citizenry and headed unexplainably for the East.

With their leader gone, the Church of Jesus Christ of the New Jerusalem quickly crumbled. The converts who had left Utah in early summer arrived in Council Bluffs on the 16th of August, missing Gladden by no more than a week or two. The Salt Lake members were discomfited to find their leader gone without a clear plan to return but found Gladden's "assistant in the Church," Joel Shearer, an able spiritual guide.

Soon after their arrival, acting in his position as second-in-command-at-home, Shearer advanced the idea of a mission to neighboring schismatic organizations. This was presented to the body of the believers and agreed upon. Joel Shearer and two
converts from Utah, William Swett and Ezra Strong, volunteered for the assignment. Before leaving it was deemed "important to have something more definite written in regard to our faith to present to the people with Gladden's publications." Shearer persuaded Swett to co-author a work with him and issued a pamphlet for the sizable sum of fifty dollars. The resulting Comments on the Kingdom of God and the Gospel was a moralistic treatise rather than a doctrinal defense. Gladden was sent a copy, but he did not countenance the publication for unspecified doctrinal reasons. Far from the approbation they had expected, the co-authors had to foot the entire bill for their troubles.

With their pamphlet in disfavor, the intended mission suffered an initial setback. But the three still departed for their fields of labor, which concentrated on other "believers in the Book of Mormon" in the surrounding areas. Ezra Strong departed for parts unknown, while Shearer and Swett went to rival schismatic Charles B. Thompson's (Baneemy) settlement at Preparation, Iowa. Alfred Smith also left Council Bluffs for St. Louis, where he had determined to serve. With Bishop also away, this mission removed the three central leaders of the New Church, leaving the deacons to try to carry on the work at home without guidance. Those who had had experience in Gladdenism were gone. No wonder the organization fell apart.

In Preparation, among Charles Thompson's Baneemyites, Swett was promptly converted to Baneemyism. The next year he authored a letter, which appeared in Thompson's Zion's Harbinger and Baneemy's Organ, to explain to the New Church his reasons for leaving Bishop's following. He would become one of Thompson's apostolic body and assist in the dissolution of Thompson's failed economic experiment. Still later he would join with the Reorganization, be silenced in that group, and eventually become attached to Sidney Rigdon's following under Stephen Post.
Bishop had maintained his pattern of following the Spirit when he left Council Bluffs to further his own work, but at the same time he "pulled the plug" on his group and enabled the dissolution of his strongest following. Bishop's organization in Council Bluffs disintegrated soon after he left. Perhaps it was inevitable. Gladdenism possessed inherent flaws that handicapped it as a social group. Though the following was organized, Bishop was constantly recalling or sending out the strongest members in an effort to bolster the sagging ranks of the faithful. Without a central core of leadership there was no direction. Though he usually had a few faithful believers who clung tenaciously to a belief in the veracity of his calling, the theology of Gladdenism was unable to sustain faith in most proselytes long enough to build a social infrastructure that would insure survival. Time would prove that due to the ever-changing nature of Bishop's revelation, Gladdenism was doctrinally unsound. Joel Shearer would write tellingly of his former sect in a later pamphlet: "[C]an it be said that they [the Gladdenties] are united in any belief?" Without the immediate presence of prophetic leadership to hold it together, Gladdenism had little but a transient common belief upon which to build.

Gladden and Phebe departed Council Bluffs at the beginning of August, soon after their town lots sold. Rather than travel overland, they opted for the easier route down the Missouri River. Travelling downriver by steamer would have taken them past the saints' home of two decades past, Independence, Missouri, and that city's growing suburb of Kansas City. Few Mormons remained in Missouri; though in Independence, had he stopped, Bishop could have found those who remembered the troubles the saints had been involved with in the early 1830s. He would also have found a few individuals who had left the Church during that trying time, but people with Mormonism in their history would more likely have been found further north in Daviess and Caldwell counties. Here the Mormons had settled after being driven from
Jackson County, and it was here where the "Mormon War" had occurred in 1838-39 as Bishop labored in North Carolina. Had Bishop entertained the idea of designating Independence as a gathering spot for his faithful, he would have soon cooled his interest. If he had landed in Independence with hopes of establishing a "Mormon" church, he would have ascertained that the Mormons still were not appreciated nor welcome. He continued his trip downriver.\textsuperscript{425}

Gladden and Phebe eventually landed in St. Louis, a thriving Mississippi River port and once the base of the western fur trade. St. Louis was also the disembarking point on the overland leg of the journey for Mormon emigrants coming from England via New Orleans on their way west to Great Salt Lake City. The town was home to a sizable population of Mormons, enough for a stake under the leadership of apostle Erastus Snow.\textsuperscript{426} With so many uprooted Mormons in the city, St. Louis provided a ferment for dissent.\textsuperscript{427} It was also the place where a small group of Gladden's faithful had gathered.

Though Gladden's followers had left Utah in June of 1854, their story does not end in Council Bluffs. Travelling east on his way to the British Mission, Orson Spencer wrote in a letter dated 19 September 1854 to the \textit{Deseret News} that he "saw some of the apostates in St. Louis, and that `some of the Gladdenites were very sorry they left the valley, and intended to return.' [italics in original]"\textsuperscript{428} Given the speed of overland travel at the time, it was probably not the group that had left Salt Lake in June of that year but rather some of those who left with Alfred Smith the year before or another unnoted group. Gladden and his gospel did not have a strong hold on those who were converted to his church. Whether or not the group did indeed return is not known.

Gladden likely arrived in St. Louis by late September or October of 1854. If he came this late in the year he may have missed the few of his followers seen by
Spencer earlier in the summer. In St. Louis Gladden sought the opportunity to preach of his calling and his gospel to those of the saints who would listen. Apparently he gained no new followers from among Mormons in the city--his reputation had preceded him. William Eddington, a returning missionary, wrote to T.B.H. Stenhouse in England that he had taken the opportunity while in St. Louis to speak with "some of the greatest apostates (even the now almost celebrated Gladden Bishop)." By the time Bishop arrived in St. Louis, Orson Spencer had met Gladden's followers and had written his letter that reported them ready to return to Utah.

Spencer's letter illustrates what Parley Pratt had said a year and a half earlier about Bishop's success. "His difficulty all the time was, that the people would not be deceived by him." Gladden's gospel centered in himself. Without him present to receive revelation there was nothing much to believe in. His group easily strayed when the stress that bound a group together, such as persecution in Utah, was removed.

Bishop's goal was not the St. Louis immigrant saints but the land from which they had come. England must have been a great temptation to him. Since first arriving in 1837, Mormon missionaries had enjoyed phenomenal success in the British Isles. Thousands of Welsh, English, and Scots had joined the LDS church and were emigrating from Britain to Zion in the Salt Lake Valley. It was probably the hope of similar success that moved Bishop to abandon his church on the edge of the wilderness for the greener proselyting fields he perceived in Europe. The letters he had solicited in Council Bluffs hint at this destination. Gladden also carried letters of introduction to Iowa's congressional delegation. Why he asked for these remains a mystery.

Finding himself not well received in St. Louis, Gladden and Phebe departed again by boat upriver on the Mississippi to the Ohio River and thence on to
Here there was a small branch of the Church that either lacked the initiative to move west or had decided not to follow the leadership of Brigham Young. Here they remained, slowly gaining and losing members, briefly following various schismatics, and hoping for the Prophet's son to take their lead. Bishop stopped to preach here and was able again briefly to establish an interested following. Wrote an east-bound missionary from Utah: "Gladden Bishop is among the apostates in Cincinnati, and has adopted a part of their doctrines, and they in turn have embraced part of his; thus they have amalgamated, tho' Gladden of course, reserves the prerogative of standing at the head." In this case Bishop's draw may have been amplified by a push away from another Diaspora leader, as if this congregation followed Bishop because he represented an opportunity to get away from someone else more than because his call attracted them.

Bishop's undoing in Cincinnati was at the hands of other schismatic preachers. The Reorganization movement, began under the leadership of Jason Briggs and Zenos Gurley in the early 1850s, was barely two years old when Bishop arrived in southern Ohio, but emissaries had been sent to the area. The congregation here had welcomed the new missionaries in and had listened to their ideas. The first issues of the True Latter Day Saints Herald were to be published in Cincinnati beginning in January of 1860. This periodical continues to be the official organ of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Gladden engaged the future editor of the Herald, Isaac Sheen, in at least one serious discussion concerning post-Martyrdom leadership claims. Bishop was discredited when he was drawn into a logical trap on the subject of polygamy. Those opposed to the leadership of the twelve apostles, particularly those later involved with the Reorganization, were highly sensitive to this subject since rejecting polygamy, and those involved with it formed the core of their organizational and theological identity.
The query put to Gladden was whether polygamy should ever be sanctioned or practiced. Bishop stated that polygamy would be practiced but at the command of the Lord and only during the Millennium. Sheen argued that Bishop was then no different than the Bringhamites (the LDS church in Utah) in his beliefs, since Bishop preached himself and his work as the advent of the Millennium. In reporting this discussion in retrospective summary, the Herald in the next issue went on to further dissect and discard Bishop's and Brigham's claims.

Upon leaving Cincinnati, Gladden and Phebe travelled east and south towards the nation's capitol, where they remained for the winter. He had apparently planned on making the capitol his destination or a significant stopping place, but the reason he did so and how long he stayed in the city remains unclear.

In the spring of 1855 Gladden travelled north to New York City, the most active point of departure for those travelling to Europe, intending to sail on to England to preach. There was also another reason for this move--New York's large Jewish population. Gladden had a true affinity for the Old Testament and its promises of the restoration of the House of Israel. The Holy Land had been dedicated by apostle Orson Hyde for the return of the Jews in 1841, and Gladden may have hoped to begin this restorative process with himself and his divine commission at their head. Since his advances had recently been rejected by the "Gentiles" of the LDS church, he may have turned his attention to the Jews so that the first might be last and the last be first.

Arriving in New York in 1855, Gladden spent time preaching about the Jewish sections of the city. While in New York, Gladden kept up a lively correspondence with faithful follower Ezra Strong, though nothing of the exchange has surfaced.

It is impossible to distill the appeal of Gladdenism from the fragmented histories that remain, but the sources suggest that Bishop gained believers for two
reasons: because his doctrines appeared to be couched in the scriptures and because his doctrine corresponded to the personal beliefs and experiences of those who chose to follow him. It was only after a period of adherence that those who followed him cut though his knot of Gordian logic and decided that his doctrine was not as substantial as it appeared, that it ignored more than it circumscribed, and that it was more firmly rooted in Bishop's mind than it was in the scriptures. For this reason, without Bishop present to hold a congregation together, there was little unifying force. So it was in 1855. While Gladden was laboring to preach his gospel to the New York Jews, a thousand miles to the west his congregation in Council Bluffs, Iowa, was languishing, if not, in fact, entirely dissolved by inertia. Francis Gladden Bishop had by 1855 passed the highest point of success he would achieve in the Mormon Diaspora and had begun a slow descent into near oblivion.
CHAPTER XI

THE BRANCH BROKEN

There is little documentation for the concluding decade of Bishop's life. It is doubtful that he ever departed for England, but there is no indication that he did not leave the New York area until 1857. Spending two years in or around any one place seems uncharacteristic, considering Bishop's general wanderlust. It may have been that he felt he should remain in the city until called away or that he just used New York as a temporary stop and continued travelling. Without supportive information neither conclusion may be defended nor disproven.

The dearth of source material relating to this segment of Bishop's career obscures a particularly unusual claim made by him in 1864. Writing to Brigham Young eight years after the event, Gladden related the episode:

I may perhaps here state that in 1857 being in the city of New York and learning that the Saints in the Valley of the Mountains was threatened by a mob from California and other Western States - I went to Washington and after labouring for months with President Buchanan and his Cabinet succeeded in calling their attention to the danger which threatened [sic] the Saints. When to save violence and rapine as he told me, he (the President) [sic] sent to Utah a force of the regular army.\(^440\)

Though he was liberal with facts when recounting his actions and purposes, an outright lie was probably above him--particularly if he were aware of how the Utah Expedition was viewed by the Mormons at the time he wrote to Young. Beyond this unapologetic statement there is no contemporary proof. Unfortunately for historians, before the James Buchanan papers were deposited in the Pennsylvania Historical Society they had been through a fire, sections were lost, the collection divided among
The only contemporary support for Bishop's claim, tangential at best, is a reported appointment in the spring of 1857 as an Indian agent in the Utah superintendency. Even discounted in the face of his tendency to exaggerate personal importance in a situation, this claim of responsibility by Gladden Bishop remains in a curious niche as an unproven part of American history.

With or without Bishop's assistance, the Utah Expedition was commissioned, funded, equipped, and dispatched to Utah. After being harried for better than five hundred miles and spending a nearly disastrous winter in Ft. Bridger, Wyoming, their entry into the territorial capitol was less than a triumphal parade. The command, under A.S. Johnston the pride of the U.S. forces and incredibly well equipped, staggered ingloriously into a silent city, abandoned in welcome by its inhabitants, in June of 1858. The city they passed through had been vacated and the homes and buildings piled with straw, ready for a torch, if necessary, should the slightest provocation be given by the troops. By July tempers had cooled on both sides and the U.S. forces had garrisoned at Camp Floyd, forty miles south and west of Great Salt Lake City.

With the Army arrived a staff of new territorial officials. So, too, did notice of Gladden's appointment to the Indian service. Newly arrived Governor Alfred Cumming, who had been appointed to replace Young, was apparently cognizant of the Mormon leaders' regard for the prospective appointee. Anxious to alleviate any problems that might complicate or jeopardize newborn trust and the cooperation of the Mormons, the governor took action that might be regarded as a political favor. Cumming asked the department to revoke the appointment. Bishop never served.

From this mention at the arrival of the Utah Expedition, Bishop drops from sight. For five-and-a-half years, from mid-1854 to the beginning of 1860 when he surfaced in Iowa, he remains untraceable. There is simply no record at hand.
During the time that Bishop remained at large, significant events were occurring within the pale of Mormon culture. As the decade of the 1850s closed, the curtain began to fall over the era of the Diaspora. The earliest ripples of a significant new force had begun reaching out, seeking those of a now-dispersed Mormon heritage. At the turn of the year 1860, the formal organization of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints took place. Within a few months the Prophet's son, Joseph Smith III, stepped forward to assume the leadership position he would occupy for the remaining 54 years of his mortality.

The Reorganization succeeded in the Diaspora where other groups and leaders had failed. It was able to capture the allegiance of many new converts, who constituted most Diaspora followings after the death of Joseph Smith, together with the greatest number of pre-martyrdom Church members outside of Utah. The moderate position of the Reorganization appealed to those who rejected Joseph Smith's late doctrinal and institutional developments, disliked the rigors of Latter-day Saint Mormonism, or who had little experience with the doctrines and practices of the early Church. It was also able to secure the allegiance of Joseph Smith's sons, who themselves had only the barest experience in the Church but who personified the popular belief in the lineal descent of Church leadership.

Of the groups formed in the swirl of events surrounding the death of Joseph Smith, only the one headed by the Church's apostolic body under Brigham Young continued to flourish into the 1860s and beyond. Its growth in membership came primarily from widely successful missionary efforts in Europe and a secondary field of labor in the United States. The Utah Mormons did not actively seek to reclaim those of schismatic cultures, regarding them as unfaithful in the cause. They thereby left the door open to the Reorganization to actively pursue the scattered flock.

During its earliest years, the Reorganization concentrated its efforts in the
Midwest, gathering together those with a heritage of Mormonism. The RLDS organization was able to consolidate a substantial percentage of Diaspora Mormonism and happened along fortuitously at a time when earlier Diaspora followings were beginning to break apart. By 1860 James Strang had been assassinated and Charles B. Thompson (Baneemy) chased across the prairie by unhappy followers. Former apostle William McLellin had given up his efforts to re-establish a Kirtland "Church of Christ." Sidney Rigdon had failed to lastingly establish his Pittsburgh following, though a resurrection of his claims would come under Stephen Post and again under William Bickerton. Lyman Wight had died, and Alpheus Cutler would soon pass away. Diaspora Mormonism was at a point in 1860 when the organizations of original schismatic leaders were fading and followings were becoming disorganized. Believers as yet remained leaderless, since most leaders had not focused on creating a social stability nor ecclesiastical hierarchy. They continued, perhaps unintentionally, the pattern of charismatic leadership of the Prophet Joseph Smith but without generating the cultural tradition that kept the largest part of the Church together in 1844. Yet for the most part, dissolving followings remained geographically close. These groups with a history of Mormonism were thus fertile grounds for the efforts of RLDS missionaries.

The Reorganization movement began in a few isolated Midwestern congregations in the mid 1850s. It sought, like William McLellin, to create a reestablishment of the Church of a former--the pre-Nauvoo (i.e., purer)--era. The church abandoned practices that post-martyrdom Diaspora converts had no experience with, disagreed with, or which seemed unusual. Joseph Smith's teachings introduced late in his ministry, such as the corporeal nature of God, were allowed to dissipate. The movement also disavowed some later institutions, most noticeably polygynous "Plural Marriage," and hotly denied its practice by Joseph Smith, thereby avoiding
social and political conflicts that plagued the Utah Mormons for decades. The ordinances associated with the temple, rebaptism for the living and proxy baptism for the dead, and the Kingdom of God or Council of Fifty suffered similar fates—death by being purposefully ignored. By focusing attention on the gospel before Nauvoo, the Reorganization was by its own admission a moderation—a softening—of Mormon doctrines and a denial of offensive institutions, becoming an "easier to swallow" Mormonism.\textsuperscript{446}

The Reorganization was primarily an attempt reclaim Mormonism by purging the culture of distasteful practices and doctrines, denying the doctrinal validity of developments in Nauvoo that had continued in the Utah church and deeply branded those Mormons. This was accomplished by almost dismissing the Nauvoo era of the Church in favor of the doctrinal "middle era" (1833-1838) of Mormon history. But in seeking to reinstate the past, the attitudes assumed in the Reorganization became actually a doctrinal stasis or retrogression—a "snap-shot" acceptance of middle-era Mormonism.

The Reorganization was one group that was able to make the transition away from charisma by continuing the congregational independence of the earliest days, making the church more eccumenical. Still, as new problems presented themselves for revelatory or authoritative resolution, the Reorganization would experience the stresses of adapting to doctrinal change. As change became inevitable, the RLDS church would draw on the tradition of its earliest history (1853-1859) as a coalition of largely independent groups and would move toward becoming in the long run more democratic than theocratic or authoritarian.\textsuperscript{447}

Within its temporal framework it is not unseeming for the (re)organizers of the RLDS Church to claim the same organization as taught by Joseph Smith. Just as the death of Joseph Smith severed the ties of personality that bound some to the Church,
allowing the fragmentation of part of the Church and the introduction of new ideas, the Reorganization made possible a gathering of those individuals and groups under the "same" banner, this time without the institutions that caused many of the 1844 divisions. Importantly, the movement offered a solid tie to the past in the person of the Martyr's oldest son, who also possessed the magical name of Joseph Smith.

Drawing its leaders from those with experience in the smaller schismatic followings, the Reorganization became an amalgamation of early Church and Disapora ideas. Members sought to remain integrated in the general American population and worked to placate negative public memory of Joseph Smith, Jr.'s following, to represent themselves (as distinct from the "Mormons" and/or "Brighamites" in Utah) as well-behaved, mainstream U.S. citizens.

The Reorganization's earliest proselyting focus concentrated on the scattered fragments of Smith's religious heritage. The missionaries of the Reorganization canvassed any concentration of Mormons locatable and gathered many from Diaspora followings, including Bishop's. Missionaries proselyted effectively in Illinois, Wisconsin, and in Iowa, where followings of Alpheus Cutler, Charles B. Thompson, and the eastern vestiges of the Mormon Trail settlers were centered. At least ten people known by name to have once been Gladdenites were recorded in the "Early Reorganization Minutes." 448

Gladden had by 1860 also migrated to Iowa, where it is understood that he had again managed to collect a small following. 449 Little Sioux, Iowa, was close to Preparation, where Charles B. Thompson's "Baneemyism" had been headquartered. Two years earlier (1858) Thompson had been chased across the prairie by his followers when he refused to surrender the deeds to his followers' "consecrations." Bishop may have seen an opportunity and come seeking converts from among this dwindling group as he had in Voree, Kirtland, Kanesville, Salt Lake City, St. Louis,
and Cincinnati. If he did, it represents another of his failed efforts. It seems that by this time his following was small, if not indeed nonexistent. The time spent in pursuit of the Jews in New York had taken its toll on his church.

At the beginning of 1860 Bishop was actively preaching of his own calling among Baneemey's former followers. He had drawn into the New Church several followers of Charles Thompson while living in Council Bluffs in 1852. Eight years later, his reputation had again preceded his arrival in Preparation.

At about the same time, twenty-four-year-old missionary of the Reorganization Edmund C. Briggs (brother of leader Jason Briggs) also arrived in Preparation to preach the gospel. Upon arrival in the middle of February, a former apostle and local elder in the remaining Thompsonite following, Charles C. Perrin, asked to meet the young missionary in the afternoon prior to the commencement of an appointed meeting. While walking with his host Briggs was told: "Elder Briggs, I want to throw a stone to-night and hit Gladden Bishop. It will hit you, too, but I want to hit Bishop the hardest. . . . When I get through speaking, I would like to have you speak, but not be very hard on me; and when you [are] through with your remarks, I will close the meeting." Briggs agreed.

A large crowd had gathered for the evening meeting, who were aware of the several rivals and appeared to have come to see the fire fly. In his opening remarks Elder Perrin only alluded to the recent Reorganization by acknowledging the doctrine of lineage. His attack was instead directed at Gladden Bishop's claims and doctrines, whose author had attended the meeting. As Perrin said "amen" in closing, Bishop was on his feet. As had been agreed upon, Perrin ignored Bishop and turned the time to Briggs. Bishop took his seat.

When Briggs had finished his remarks defending the Prophet Joseph Smith and the doctrine of lineal descent of priesthood leadership, Bishop was given an
opportunity to speak. His half-hour discourse attacked the idea of patriarchal authority and the character of Joseph Smith. When he was done Gladdenite John A. Forgues rose to speak. Briggs cut him off and demanded the right to answer the charges leveled by Bishop. "Just as I closed my address" Briggs recorded in his journal, "Elder Bishop was seized with some violent sickness, and was so prostrated that four men carried him out of the hall." Thus afflicted, Bishop prophesied that he should never meet Briggs again. As far as may be ascertained, this was a true prophecy.

After this scene had been played, Bishop left Preparation, Iowa, and disappears from record for two-and-a-half more years. While the Civil War gathered and flung its fury he probably traveled as he had for the past two decades, seeking to reveal himself to the world (at a safe distance from the conflict) as the herald of the millennial peace and arbiter for the Ancient of Days.

By the late summer of 1862 Bishop moved still further west and had settled in a town called Springville along the Platte River Road in Nebraska. From a surviving letter written to Joseph Smith III and the "Nauvoo Saints" it appears that the prophet, aging at 51, had again managed to collect a small following and had settled them in this tiny settlement. This was a fortuitous location, for the Utah Mormons had established an overland way-station at Genoa, only five miles distant. Though the reference is not specific, Bishop hints that Springville had been settled by his following. He also raised a clarion to those remaining in Nauvoo to "come before the winter shall hinder you: yea come now with your stuff and build houses and till the soil even as others now here and find rest a season."

The call was ignored.

The following spring Gladden wrote again to Nauvoo, seeking to stir those in the town. This letter, written as the prophetic word of the Lord, warned of great
calamities to come on those who refused to heed his (the Lord's) call. Conveying the
divinely inspired warning, Bishop wrote that those who rejected the former words had
not been forgotten, and they will be punished for "judg[ing my mouthpiece, Gladden] to be corrupt . . . a lying prophet, and a whoremonger." Gladden warned that the
scattered Church would first be purged and then the sword of vengeance would fall
upon the nations of the gentiles.

Again the call was ignored. Through the spring and into summer Bishop waited for the arrival of converts who would never come.

Gladden was faced with still another failure. Finally, Gladden received the
inspired word to go himself among the saints. He had been rejected by those in the
East. The only route left to go was west. Springville, Nebraska, was thus no longer a
place of refuge, for, he wrote, "in the spring thereof even of 1864 is the highway open
to Zion." By the commandment and under the aegis of heaven Gladden was bound
at last for Utah.

In summer or early autumn of 1863 Gladden began his trip west. The most
logical route was the well-travelled Overland Trail that followed the North Platte
across present-day Nebraska and into Wyoming. Before reaching the Wyoming
border the trail forked, the southern road running to the former gold fields of Cherry
Creek around Denver, Colorado. It was this south-bound road that for some reason
Gladden chose to follow.

Bishop arrived in boom-town Denver no later than the middle of March, 1864.
On the 20th he penned a long letter to Brigham Young. Ten years and the westward
trail had mellowed the once vituperous pen. This letter laid aside the bitterness
Gladden had expressed a decade earlier in Zion's Messenger in favor of conciliatioin,
reminiscent of his 1851 letter written from Kirtland. "You may have thought me your
enemy - But such has never been the case notwithstanding my pen has been sharp,"
wrote the aging prophet.\footnote{461} His letters to Young continued over the next month. As he wrote the reason for this attitude change became evident.

Gladden first acknowledged the members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints under Brigham Young as the chosen people of God. But Gladden was attempting more than repentance or a simple rapprochement. His interest in the gathering of Israel dovetailed with his pre-millennialism. He was travelling west to actively prepare for the imminent return of the Ancient of Days. Appended to his still lively belief in the vitality of his own calling, this preparatory activity placed the mountain-ensconced Utah Mormons in the forefront of his attention.

Gladden wrote to Brigham that the "deliverer" was to come out of Zion. A few pages later Gladden quoted Isaiah 16:5 and explained: "According to this it seems that he is to be sent as a harmless Lamb to him who rules in Mount Zion; . . . which circumstances will result in his being established upon the throne as David the Shepherd of Israel."\footnote{462} It is almost transparently obvious that Gladden had applied his earlier doctrine of mortal "represention" of the divine to imply that the Ancient of Days was to return in representation--as he had formerly claimed Christ would return the second time--represented by Gladden Bishop.\footnote{463} Gladden had offered the seven Sacred Things to the people in Kirtland in the early 1850s; he now offered to the saints in Utah under his representational hand, the blessing of the Lord and the reign of the Ancient of Days.

The Salt Lake Temple, which had been begun while his followers were first in Salt Lake City, was to play a large part in Bishop's newest appeal. It was to this edifice that the Ancient of Days was to come and where he would "endue [endow] the Saints with power from on high."\footnote{464} Here also would he sit to judge the people and reign as Lord of the Earth until the third (remember, Gladden represented the Second) coming of Jesus Christ. Bishop offered to give to Brigham the Crowns of Israel and
of Glory first and then to allow Young to continue in his place at the head of the saints after Bishop, representing the Ancient of Days, had returned “to sit.”

To begin this process Gladden thought that it would be advisable to have Brigham introduce the Preparer (himself) to the Mormon people.

While Young laughed over his letters in Utah, Bishop set about preparing for the final leg of his journey. Gladden had brought his family west with him and was faced with the necessity of providing for them. He worked in Colorado during the spring but did not do well enough financially to complete the trip. To overcome this obstacle he asked if Brigham would lend him the money for teams and a wagon. Once in Salt Lake City Gladden would gladly return the rigs to Young's stable.

He referred to himself as "old and infirm" but hoping to start for Utah on the first of June. Though Young was generous, it was stretching his generosity to bring apostates in among the saints. Not only are his financial records devoid of mention of monies directed to Bishop, but his available letterbooks are silent in reply to Bishop's letters. Without the needed assistance from Brigham, Gladden was forced to make his way to Salt Lake City on his own. Just when and how he was able to collect enough money for the trip is not known, but he did come. Strangely, he had asked Brigham Young in one of his spring letters not to inform anyone of his coming.

Fifty-five-year-old Gladden Bishop climbed down anonymously out of a stage or wagon onto the dusty streets of Salt Lake City in June or July, 1864. In light of his request for anonymity from Young there seems to be no reason why he would broadcast his arrival at this time. Bishop probably showed up unannounced on his sister Anna Maria's doorstep soon after his arrival. It was a meeting that closed at least a twenty-year gap in association between these children of Isaac and Mary Bishop.

What Gladden did while he was in Salt Lake remains a mystery. He certainly
walked about the city and the temple grounds at its heart. He may have quietly visited former acquaintances from the past years at Kirtland and Nauvoo. It is also possible that he called on Brigham Young, though he is not mentioned in the office journals. While in the city he still maintained a correspondence with someone (perhaps Phebe) from outside Salt Lake City. In the middle of July an unclaimed letter for T.G. Bishop appeared in the *Deseret News*. Gladden had neglected to call at the post office for mail. He noticed the mail list during his usual newspaper reading and claimed the letter, for it was gone from the lists of the next week.

Gladden remained quietly in Salt Lake City for the rest of his natural life. Through the summer and fall of 1864 he lived quietly in a boarding house or with a friend. He was unable to or did not try preparing the saints for the blessings that awaited them at the hand of the Ancient of Days. The temple in the city lingered in construction for another thirty years, Gladden's following had left the city a decade before. He was an unknown to the church now; a church which was largely populated by immigrants and second-generation Mormons who had only heard of Kirtland and Nauvoo.

During a scarlet-fever outbreak in November that year, the aging prophet took to his bed. On the last day of November, 1864, Francis Gladden Bishop, who had recently returned to--but in his own mind had never left--the Mormon church, died in the Salt Lake Third Ward. His sister Anna Maria's family arranged to have him buried in the their family plot. On a cold day in December, Gladden was laid to rest.

On a rise at the top of Block 7 of Plat D in the Salt Lake City Cemetery is the Brim family plot, where Bishop was supposed to have been buried. The stones marking the family graves--if there were any--have disappeared over time. In their place collectively stands a single granite monument to the family dead, placed there in
the 1920s by Francis' nephew. On the reverse is a list of the names of those in the plot. Near the bottom and concealed for years by a now-removed bush is the name of Francis G. Bishop.

Unfortunately Gladden does not lie near the marker that bears his name. His life had been full of missed opportunities and contradictions. In death he suffered a final injustice. On the cold December day that he was buried either there had been a family argument over his burial or the correct grave site had been forgotten by the sexton. Rather than placement in the Brim plot, Gladden was interred instead at the head of a draw among other "singles" from the city. He is buried in the wrong grave--a final act of being in the wrong place at the right time.

Visiting the pioneer section of the Salt Lake City Cemetery today, over a century and a quarter later, the neatly kept lawns seem to lap up against the headstones from that bygone era like wavelets in a quiet bay. The headboards are decayed and gone like those they once memorialized, and most of the headstones in Lot 4 are now only fragments, raggedly grouped in a semblance of rows like the pilings of an old pier. Here and there a date is readable below a break that cleft the stone; but for the most part, the slabs of native red sandstone and imported marble that have not toppled have been scoured clean by time and the elements. With many others, Francis Gladden Bishop's grave is now unmarked. He lies silent beneath the grass-green tide.
CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSIONS: MORMONISM, THE DIASPORA AND THE REORGANIZATION

In the opening pages of his autobiography, Parley Pratt, apostle, missionary, and early Church member, told of his quest for religious fulfillment, his encounter with the Book of Mormon and subsequent conversion to the early LDS church.\textsuperscript{478} He, like Francis Bishop, spent time reading heavily in the scriptures and asking questions of those around him. Like Bishop he joined the Baptists, left their association to preach independently, and eventually joined the infant following of Joseph Smith, where he served long as a missionary. There the similarity ends. The parallel experiences of the two men skew to almost opposite directions, as Pratt soon became a member of the leading councils of the church and Bishop soon was called before them for heresy.

What makes one convert an apostle and another an apostate? How does one draw the line between faithful activity and zealous heresy? For the historian the task to define such a distinction is difficult, if not impossible, for the intangible proofs that reinforce faith lie beyond the reach and scope of mortally comprehensible definition. While the historian may compare the recorded experiences of one person against similar experiences of another to determine why paths diverge, I am not as certain that the claimed or assumed interactions with the divine or demonic may be weighed or assigned values. We may analyze situations and circumstances, but in historically considering intangibilities of faith it may be said securely only that something happened confirming belief and orthodoxy in one, while "that something" was either
missing or misinterpreted in the another. We are, after all, speaking of peculiar individuals.

The faith experience is particularly important in the study of religion. It was (and remains) a major force in determining the reaction of the religious to the issues of heresy and to the claims of detractors and in the evolution of a socio-religious culture. Once again it must be asserted that the realities of a faith experience—visions, revelations, and comparable events—are not as important historically as are the recipient's actions in response to them. Regardless of the actuality of such events, they in fact become "real" because those who are so involved then act as if they are real.

As an emerging institution Mormonism was in need of creating a social tradition and identity. This identity was tied inextricably to membership in the Church itself, to the priesthood, and to belief in the gospel of the Restoration. A convert's acceptance of the institution dictated that they become a submersed, not just nominal, participant in a broad and increasingly complex social and corporate identity. However, each person retained an individual schedule of priorities that in some cases was not subsumed to the set of larger institutional values. This individuality was clearly manifest as the natural process of minor social fragmentation in the Church, a process accelerated by the death of Joseph Smith. Smith's death was a social dysfunction that allowed—but did not cause—a deeper cleavage of the Mormon society than at previous times. Historically, the Diaspora, which grew out of these riven splinters of Mormonism, divided the Church along lines of intellectual allegiance to the traditions generated in the Mormon cultural experience, traditions not necessarily definable as issues of "truth."

The institutional or corporate tradition of the Church emphasized institutional authority; that is, authority of the established priesthood quorums—the Church's "body
politic"--and Church symbols and ordinances. Those who followed the ideal (variously interpreted) of the charismatic or prophetic tradition emphasized the primary the importance of a character in the prophetic station and the sigil of a prophet--revelation. Of this tradition Francis Gladden Bishop is a good example.

Both traditions had internal problems, but the prophetic or charismatic tradition was inherently unstable. The social identity of the prophetic tradition centers in an individual and the call he or she has received. The idea of the superiority of the prophetic call leaves a huge opening for ceaseless challenges from other claimants of divine authority. The struggle for coherent leadership will be constantly replayed in times of crisis or when problems arise for which the leader's solutions are unsatisfactory.

The Reorganization was able to collect Diaspora followings because it successfully melded the attraction of the prophetic station in a very competent leader with selected hallmarks of Church institutions. It was very appropriately, then, a re-organization. But at the same time it was a selective one, gleaning from the Mormon past those traditions that would not jeopardize acceptance within American culture. The Reorganization institutionalized itself differently than the Mormons under Brigham Young. While Young essentially placed church leadership as a shade between the people and the direct light of revelation, the Reorganization drew on its earliest history of congregational independence and essentially placed a representative eccumenical body there, almost equating democratic ratification of the *vox populi* (voice of the people) with the revelatory pronouncements of the *vox Dei* (voice of God). In recreating a Mormonism of Church traditions founded upon the principle of congregational independence, the RLDS church successfully blended Mormonism with democratic liberalism. This may have kept it from the political rigors experienced by the Mormons in Utah.480
While the Diaspora enabled the Reorganization to revive the values of middle-era Mormonism (1833-1838), from the opposite perspective of the LDS church tradition, the Diaspora meant the loss of Mormons "unfaithful" to Smith's corporate tradition. In reality this was a back-handed benefit for this branch of the Church. The division of the Church in Nauvoo and subsequent westward movement of the main body of the saints separated out those who were not loyal to the wards of apostolic leadership: Church institutions. For the Utah Mormons the issue of the Diaspora was as simple as deception or apostasy. It was actually not so simply explained. Outside of Utah, Diaspora identity centered around the idea of allegiance to a person or position more than in intangible institutions. The loss of those who would not go west--while it represented a scattering of the flock--from the perspective of the LDS corporate tradition actually kept the core of believers solid. By diffusing the polarizations Smith's doctrines engendered, it kept divisions from occurring more deeply by breaking away the beginnings of divisive splinters.

Francis Gladden Bishop was a partaker of the flock divided. With both feet planted firmly in Diaspora values, Bishop was a believer in the charismatic or prophetic tradition of Mormonism. He personifies the Mormon tradition of leadership of the charismatic prophet. But Bishop was caught inextricably in the charisma of himself and his ideas. Like many other leaders in the Mormon dispersion, his failing was the inability to create for his followers beneath his gospel ideas, as Joseph Smith had, a social system or foundation of cultural values that would enable his following to survive.

Bishop attempted--perhaps unconsciously--to do what Smith had done unconsciously in the earliest years of Mormonism: that is, to break free of the past. He produced revelations, printed them as scripture, pronounced the opening of a new dispensation. But unlike the Prophet, Bishop was unable to truly break with the past.
Bishop kept trying to drag with him, to serve as testimony of his present actions, the past he had ostensibly left behind. He was theologically unsuccessful in directing value to his intended fulfillments of scriptural prophecy. Instead of building on a new foundation of revealed truth as Joseph Smith had done, Bishop attempted to disassemble the value structures built on Mormonism's foundation and rebuild on it. Bishop was never able to clear the value-rubble he had left on that foundation. He was unable to reinterpret and revalue the historical past as Smith had done nor to successfully capitalize on setbacks. He was further handicapped by a lack of status—he was an unknown and relied heavily on his own talents and ideas for advancing his cause. Furthermore, he never had the supportive core of believers that Smith relied on to spread his gospel, share in revelatory experiences, and carry a share of the ecclesiastical burden.

Bishop seemed throughout his life to be playing at cards, constantly pulling new ones from the prophetic deck, piling up discarded ideas and prophecies around himself, ever reforming his doctrinal hand, and always looking for the one trick that would fill his hand, collect a body of faithful, and, with the return of the Ancient of Days, win the suit. In the end he never discovered that by so often seeking to outguess his challengers he was forever betting on the wrong cards.
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Pearl of Great Price, Joseph Smith-History 1:19.

Jan Shipps, Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition (Urbana and Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1985), 51-54. Contrary to Trinitarian belief, Joseph maintained that the Father and Son are separate and distinct physical, but not mortal, beings. D&C LDS 130:22. The distinction was not so firmly made in the early 1830s when Church doctrine was still developing rapidly, but before the end of Smith's life the doctrine was clear. D&C LDS 130:22-23; Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook. The Words of Joseph Smith (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young
University, 1980), 340-362. The Athanasian Creed, which set the Trinitarian doctrine, was one of those creeds referred to in what Mormons call the First Vision.

68 Prior to the death of Smith few individuals claimed visitations in a claim of authority. Most often the argument was that Smith had erred in doctrine or judgment. See Steven Shields, *Divergent Paths of the Restoration*, 3rd ed. (Bountiful, Utah: Restoration Research, 1982), part 1.

69 For a discussion on authority see Lewis Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict* (Glenco, Illinois: Free Press, 1956), 68-72. A person may dissociate himself motivated by any variety of reasons, but each must justify his actions. Whether it be for doctrinal, personal or historical reasons, or because they never "got into" the Church, there must be a point at which the person says "I can't believe because. . . ."

70 Lyman Wight, Sidney Rigdon, James Strang, Alpheus Cutler, and James Emmett were a few of the earliest to claim a prophetic commission. David Whitmer, George Hinkle, James Brewster, Oliver Olney, and the motivators behind the *Nauvoo Expositor* as well as Francis Bishop were of this second group.

71 *Millennial Star* 8(20 NOV 1846):139; Bishop, ZM, 9.

72 The precise date of Bishop's arrival in Kirtland is open to conjecture, since discovering how long his actions went unchecked is probably impossible. The branch of the School of the Prophets in Kirtland was a private assembly of no more than 22 high priests who met generally during the winters. A similar group under Parley Pratt was active in the Mormon settlements in Missouri. The first meetings occurred in Kirtland in January 1833 and were held weekly till April. Bishop's first visit to Kirtland would probably have been no later than November 1832, with his hearing being in February or March the following year. Lyndon W. Cook, *The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith: A Historical and Biographical Commentary of the Doctrine and Covenants* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, c1985), 186ff.

73 *Millennial Star*, 8(20 NOV 1846):139.

74 Given a charge such as his, it is highly unlikely that restorative action would have been taken without the accused having confessed his error and asking for forgiveness. See *History of the Church*, 1:355; 2:228, 312, 527.
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76 Ibid.

77 Bishop, ZM, 9; Bishop, Address, 24; FGB to Brigham Young, 1 APR 1864, Brigham Young Papers, Incoming Correspondence, LDS Church.
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99 *Messenger and Advocate* (Kirtland, Ohio) 1(SEP 1835):186; "Kirtland Council Minute Book," LDS Church Historical Department, typescript, Utah State University Special Collections, Logan, Utah, and in possession of the author, 121. Bishop remembered the charge differently. By the time he recorded his version of the event in 1854 he seems to have forgotten the charge he was cleared of and remembered only the one that was upheld, that of false prophecy. See Bishop, ZM, 31.


101 Bishop, ZM, 32.

102 *History of the Church*, 2(7 AUG 1835):241; Bishop, ZM, 31. The initial charges were reintroduced, or at least addressed, in the hearing before the high council. "Kirtland Council Minute Book," 121.

103 Bishop, ZM, 32.

104 "Kirtland Council Minute Book," 120. The full charge brought against Bishop was not recorded and is not to be had today. The council minutes and the suspension notice in the *Messenger and Advocate* are mere summations but confirm that Bishop was teaching things not sanctioned as doctrine.

105 Rev. 11:3.

106 "Kirtland Council Minute Book," 120-122. A word concerning the odd claim of women falling in love with Bishop: Brigham Young in 1853 made an equally curious statement to the effect that Vilate Kimball, Heber C. Kimball's wife, had "suffered
much" at the hands of Bishop. Young did not elaborate on his statement. George D.

107 *Messenger and Advocate* (Kirtland, Ohio) 1(SEP 1835):186; *Journal History*, 28 SEP
1835; *History of the Church*, 2(28 SEP 1835):284-5; Bishop, ZM, 32; "Kirtland Council
Minute Book," 122.

108 *History of the Church*, 2(28 SEP 1835):285. The council minutes state that there was
a question "Whether his case could be legally brought before this court [the high
council] or not, which was decided in the affirmative." "Kirtland Council Minute Book,"
typescript, 120.

109 D&C LDS 102: Intro. The Quorum of Twelve Apostles was not organized until the
following year.


111 In outlining my conclusions about Bishop, I am heavily indebted to the analysis
model provided by Carlo Ginsburg in his book *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos
of a Sixteenth Century Miller*, trans. by John and Anne Tedeschi (Baltimore: Johns
Hopkins Univ. Press, 1980).
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112 In July 1833 the Mormon-run printing press was destroyed by a group of citizens in
Independence, Missouri. The following November the Mormon population of Jackson
County was forcibly evicted and homes burned. For an overview of events see *History
of the Church* 1:372-493.

113 Backman, *The Heavens Resound*, 150-152; *History of the Church*, 2:206; "Kirtland
Council Minute Book," typescript, 194.

114 D&C 1835 7:36; D&C LDS 88:117-126; D&C RLDS 85:36a-c.


116 Ibid.

117 In the Church a quorum is an organized body of priesthood bearers of a particular
office. The numbers in a quorum were set by revelation. D&C LDS 107:85-91; D&C
RLDS 104:38-42a.
118 Bishop, ZM, 32.

119 Ibid. It seems odd that Bishop would have taken the responsibility upon himself to depart for missionary work. By the Nauvoo era missionaries were clearly "called" or appointed to missionary responsibility. One evidence of this is the large body of elders called in 1844 to campaign for Smith's presidential candidacy. (Times and Seasons, 5, 8(15 APR 1844):504-506.) Yet, in 1836 the Church was still evolving quite rapidly. An early revelation stated "If ye have desires to serve ye are called to the work." (D&C 1835 31:1; D&C LDS 4:3; D&C RLDS 4:1c.) Early calls were often for missionaries, though individual missionaries were appointed. Another revelation (D&C LDS 68:2; D&C RLDS 68:1b.) stated that all who had been ordained to the priesthood were called to so labor. Little focused research has been done into the general dynamics of missionary activity during the earliest years of LDS history. Such work might provide a context for Bishop's free-handedness.

120 Ibid.; Times and Seasons (Nauvoo) 1(4 FEB 1840):77.

121 History of the Church, 2:429. A "solemn assembly" in the LDS church is a specially called meeting of priesthood holders who gather to receive instructions. It is by invitation only and takes place in a temple.

122 The LDS church, under the direction of Brigham Young and the apostles, carried on the work of the endowment. Today "going through the temple" is an important part of Latter-day Saint identity. With few exceptions (the followers of Alpheus Cutler and a smattering of later fundamentalist polygamy groups), the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is the only of the schismatic sects to continue temple rites.


125 Ehat, "Joseph Smith's Introduction of Temple Ordinances," 122, 239-240. The compiled listing of ordinances performed in the Nauvoo Temple shows that 5582 persons, male and female, received their endowments from December 1845 through the first week in February 1846. Nauvoo Temple Endowment Register, typescript (Salt Lake City: Geneological Dept., 1974), Family History Library. Eight of these are known to have been followers of Bishop at some later date. See also Appendix C.

126 Cook, Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 185. For the full account of the dedication see History of the Church, 2:410-428.
In a forthcoming dissertation from the University of Utah, Janet Ellingson argues that the pentecostal outpourings of Kirtland, particularly in the dedication of the temple and subsequent meetings, were not as widely experienced as is claimed in the remembrances of those in attendance. Working from primary sources contemporary to the dedication she argues that relatively few were actual recipients of the spiritual manifestations and experienced them privately; but that as time went on and the significance of the temple was manifested to the Latter-day Saints, memories were reawakened and the experience mythologized, taking on significance and broadening the scope to include most or all of the congregation. I am not certain I accept her full interpretation, but in light of Ellingson's incomplete research (the text is presently not written) I have chosen to follow the commonly accepted recounting of events in official sources and later remembrances, freely acknowledging the possible validity of her argument. Janet Ellingson, conversation with the author, APR 1989.


The Church sponsored schools to instruct children and adults as well as Church leaders in classical languages. Francis' sister Anna Maria attended school there as a child. Brim, "Journal," 2.

Such blessings are today given to an individual once in a lifetime by a holder of the office of "patriarch" in the Melchizedek priesthood. A father has the right to pronounce such a blessing by virtue of his role as patriarch of the home. But though the blessing was recorded as a "patriarchal blessing" (since it had been given by the patriarch of the Bishop family), it should more correctly be called a "father's blessing."

Unfortunately Francis neglected to have the document recorded in the Church's official patriarchal blessing records, and no complete record of it now exists. None of the "Patriarchal Blessing Books" in the collection of the LDS church archives record Bishop's blessing. This extract Bishop later published in Zion's Messenger. Ibid.

George A. Smith, now an apostle in Utah, reminisced from his own experiences and observations about the Kirtland experience. "He thought it highly significant that some
of those 'who manifested the greatest gifts, and had the greatest manifestations' later left
the Church." Some of them, he thought did not "demonstrate that humility and quiet
dignity necessary for the experiences to be edifying. He contrasted them with those who
received knowledge of the things of God "by the power of his spirit, and sought not after
signs and wonders." These were the men, he concluded, who remained faithful. Journal
of Discourses, 11:10, George A Smith, 15 NOV 1864; cited in Ronald K. Esplin, "The
Emergence of Brigham Young and the Twelve to Mormon Leadership, 1830-41." Ph.D
diss., Brigham Young University, 1981, 199.

136 Two-thirds of the revelations published in the Prophet's lifetime were received before
the summer of 1836. More than half were received before 1834. Cook, Revelations of
the Prophet Joseph Smith.

137 By the time the saints were finally forced out of Missouri by the governor's
Extermination Order, all of the Three Witnesses, several of the Whitmers, apostles
Thomas Marsh, William McLellin, Luke and Lyman Johnson, as well as George Hinkle
of the LDS militia had left the church or joined the forces intent on exterminating the
saints. It was those who stayed with or returned to the Church who became Joseph's
circle of trusted associates in Nauvoo.

138 Based on a sampling of records from the recently released fifty-volume Membership
of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 50v. (Provo, Utah:
Brigham Young University, 1989), it appears that the Church grew with an average
yearly percentage of 5.5% between 1840 and 1844. Before 1848 the Church population
doubled. Susan Easton Black, "The Search for Early Members of the Church," Ensign
(JUL 1989):28-30. The article does not specify if this included the numbers of those
who abandoned the Church after Smith's death.

139 Cook, Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith, xii.

140 Ehat, "Joseph Smith's Introduction of Temple Ordinances," 29. Ehat here cites a draft
sheet of the History of the Church dated 4 MAY 1842 in the handwriting of Willard
Richards, wherein Richards cites Joseph as saying, speaking of ancient orders,
imagination, and the newly revealed endowment: "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, ("them" struck out) and a proper place is prepared to communicate
them, even to the weakest of the Saints: therefore let the Saints be diligent in building
the temple. . . ." The condition of this bestowal being that they were "of things spiritual,
and to be received only by the spiritual minded:. . . ." Joseph, therefore, had to ready the
people to receive them.

141 Cook, Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 361-364, lists thirty-four recorded
uncannonized revelations received by Joseph between 1831 and 1844. Fourteen were
received in Missouri and Illinois and concern such topics as the words used in the
marriage ceremony of himself and Sarah Ann Whitney, missionary calls, and the constitution of the "Kingdom of God."

142. The above exegesis is my own synthesis of the Prophet's evolving role, drawn from readings in works such as Ehat and Cook, The Words of Joseph Smith; Robert B. Flanders, Nauvoo: Kingdom on the Mississippi (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1965); History of the Church; Ehat, "Joseph Smith's Introduction of Temple Ordinances;" and Ronald K. Esplin, "The Emergence of Brigham Young and the Twelve to Mormon Leadership, 1830-41" (Ph.D diss., Brigham Young University, 1981) as well as manuscript materials not necessarily specifically cited. Glen Leonard, speaking of his forthcoming book on Mormon Nauvoo, related much the same view as herein expressed, drawn independently from his reading in contemporary diaries and over 500 Nauvoo letters. He mentioned that Mormons who came to Nauvoo sought out the Prophet, and often their recorded impression of him was essentially "here was a man who could better open my mind to the scriptures than anyone previous." Glen Leonard, conversation with the author, 5 JUL 1989. Also Cook, Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith, xii.

143. This discourse is not accepted as doctrine by the RLDS church. For variations of the speech see Ehat and Cook, The Words of Joseph Smith, 340-362.
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144. Bishop, ZM, 33; Journal History, 4 JUN 1837; Messenger and Advocate 3(JUN 1837):519.
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147. See "Record of elder's licences issued at Kirtland" microfilm, LDS Church.

148. History of the Church, 2:446.

149. The farms were actually too small. "In the spring of 1836, Latter-day Saints were assessed land taxes on over twelve hundred acres in Kirtland, representing about 5.7 acres per family. The average farm size of non-Mormons in the township was about 50 acres, a minimal amount at the time for a satisfactory farm operation." (Backman, Heavens Resound, 313.) Though there were shops and craftsmen, the land-base was insufficient to sustain the large laboring population. R. Kent Fielding, "The Mormons in Kirtland," Utah Historical Quarterly 27(OCT 1959):345.
150."Kirtland Safety Society Ledger Book," 1836-37, Mormon Collection, Chicago Historical Society, as quoted in Marvin Hill et. al., The Kirtland Economy Revisited: A Critique of Sectarian Economics (Provo: BYU Press, 1977), 76. Though the price seems ridiculously low it was above the 24 1/4 cent average price paid per share.


152. Journal History, 2 JAN 1837.

153. Milton V. Backman, Jr., Susan Easton, and Keith Perkins, compilers, Profile of Latter-day Saints of Kirtland, Ohio and Members of Zion's Camp, 1830-39; Vital Statistics and Sources (Provo, Utah: Department of Church History and Doctrine, 1982), "Saints Land and Tax Records," 133. Bishop's lot was Tract 2, lot 12.


155. History of the Church, 2(3 FEB 1836):391. The first Quorum had been chosen and organized in 1835 at the same time as the Twelve Apostles.

156. Journal History, 31 DEC 1836.


161. Bishop, ZM, 33. An elder may preside over a congregation since his office is of the higher priesthood. D&C LDS 20:45; D&C RLDS 17:9.

162. FGB to Sidney Rigdon, 28 NOV 1838, Sidney Rigdon Papers, LDS Church.

163. Deseret News 5 MAY 1869. Bishop addressed his letter to Rigdon from Webbs, NC. Six months earlier Grant had given Webbs as his address to another elder. Bishop was not just in Grant's area, he was in the heart of those who knew Grant and his capabilities. See Gene A. Sessions, Mormon Thunder: A Documentary History of Jedediah Morgan Grant (Urbana, Illinois: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1982), 18-20.

164. Smith, History of the Church, 3:175. Notice which option was given first.
When the Quorum of the Twelve was organized members were placed in seniority by age. Thomas B. Marsh, president of the Quorum of the Twelve had apostatized and David W. Patten had been killed by a stray bullet at the Battle of Crooked River in Missouri. Brigham Young as senior remaining Quorum member assumed responsibility for directing the Church while Joseph and Hyrum Smith and Sidney Rigdon were incarcerated in Liberty Jail. See Esplin, "The Emergence of Brigham Young and The Quorum of the Twelve to Positions of Mormon Leadership, 1835-1841," 300-388.

FGB to Sidney Rigdon, 28 NOV 1838.

Smith, Rigdon, Hyrum Smith, and three others were held from November 1838 to the following April on a charge of treason. Mormon witnesses were jailed before appearing, and the judge voiced his intent to see the religionists dead or in jail. For narratives of the Missouri actions see Donna Hill, Joseph Smith: The First Mormon (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1977), 221-257; Esplin, "The Emergence of Brigham Young and the Twelve to Mormon Leadership, 1830-41." A more recent work by Stephen C. LeSueur, The 1838 Mormon War in Missouri (Columbia, Mo.: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1987) is a comprehensive if flawed examination of the topic, accepting without reservation the statements made by apostate Samson Avard and ignoring contradictory statements by contemporaries.

Concerning the fracas at Gallatin see History of the Church 3:56-58; about the Haun's Mill Massacre the affidavit of Joseph Young, Ibid., 183-186.

F[Francis] G[ladden] Bishop, A Brief History of the Church of the Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, from Their Rise Until the Present Time, Containing an Account of, and Showing the Cause of Their Sufferings in the State of Missouri in the Years 1833-1838. And Likewise a Summary View of Their Faith (Salem, [N.C.]: Blum & Son, 1839). The only known copy is today at the Library of Congress. Historian Dale Morgan incorrectly identified this pamphlet as published in Salem, Massachusetts. This is unlikely since Bishop was laboring in Virginia and North Carolina. Dale Morgan, "A Bibliography of the Churches of the Dispersion," reprint, Western Humanities Review 7(Summer 1953):158.

Most works on the history of the Mormons had been written by non-Mormons and were less than favorable. Oliver Cowdery's famous letters were not published separately until 1844 and then in England. Some LDS pamphlets contemporary to Bishop's were John Taylor's A short account of the murders, robberies, [sic] burnings, thefts and other outrages committed by the mob & militia of the State of Missouri, upon the Latter Day Saints. . . . (Springfield?, Ill., 1839); Parley Pratt's History of the late persecutions inflicted by the State of Missouri upon the Mormons, . . . (Detroit: Dawson and Bates, Printers, 1839). Manuscript histories had also been written by John Corrill, Reed Peck,
John Whitmer, and others, though none were available publicly at the time.

172. Times and Seasons 1(MAR 1840):77-78; Bishop, ZM, 33. The Prophet failed to obtain assistance.

173. Elias Smith, "Book of Records of Seventies," 53, LDS Church, typescript in possession of the author; Sessions, Mormon Thunder, 23.

174. Bishop, ZM, 33; Sessions, Mormon Thunder, 18-21.

175. Bishop, ZM, 33. Joseph had stated in 1837 that a Seventy "may preside over a church or churches until a High Priest can be had." (History of the Church, 2:477) Apparently Grant had been acting in this capacity. The issue was of the propriety of Bishop's actions. He had acted on his own authority without permission.

176. A few of the first number of the Times and Seasons were printed in July of 1839, but due to an attack of "the chill fever" (probably malaria) the editors suspended publication until they had regained health. Rather than reset the entire sheet, the date was changed to November, an explanation was added to the last page, and the "first number" was reissued. See Times and Seasons 1(NOV 1839):16. I doubt that Bishop had seen the epistle. On the other hand, in his defense written years later, Bishop responded to these two points very specifically. There is little doubt that he understood the Church's position on missionaries and was at least aware that his actions were highly questionable.


178. Ibid.


180. Bishop stated that the precise charge was made known only after he arrived in Nauvoo, several months later. Bishop, ZM, 33.


185. Joseph had escaped from the dungeon in Liberty, Missouri, with the sympathy—if
not outright aid—of the jailer and sheriff. See Hill, Joseph Smith, 255, 265.

186. See Chapter 2.


188. Bishop, ZM, 10; Address, 29-30.

189. There is here a curious dilemma that cannot be resolved from the extant record. Bishop claimed an ordination but also sought an ordination to the office he claimed. How these two seemingly contradictory actions regarding his ordination meshed is not clear from what he later wrote and from the records maintained by others.

190. Bishop, ZM, 33-34. Joseph Smith was at this time in or returning from Washington, D.C. in a failed attempt to redress damages sustained in Missouri.

191. Bishop, ZM, 34.

192. Ibid. So far as can be determined from the implications of his past and as yet future actions it does not appear that Bishop had ever previously been ordained to the office. The only "ordination" to the office of high priest he could claim was his visionary experience, which had been rejected at least once before. See Chapter 2.

193. I believe this may be inferred from Bishop's statement and other actions: his being placed in the high priests' quorum by Hyrum, and the letter from the Seventies' presidents that elicited Joseph Smith to place Bishop back in the Seventies because Bishop had apparently never been ordained a high priest. See Chapter 6, notes 3 and 4.

194. Ibid. See also chapter 4, note 5.

195. Times and Seasons 1(MAR 1840):77; Journal History, 4 FEB 1840.
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196. Flanders, Kingdom on the Mississippi, 39-40; additional description is taken from my own surveys of the area in 1987 and 1989.

197. Bishop, ZM, 34.

198. History of the Church, 4(6 APR 1840):105.

199. Ibid.; Times and Seasons 1(APR 1840):92.
The implication here is that no ordination had taken place or that an invalid ordination had occurred. Because of his interest in securing the high priest's office, Bishop would surely have left some record of protest in defense of a questionable ordination had one taken place. He did not. The only "ordination" that could have been acted upon by Hyrum Smith was an expurgated version of the 1832 visitation of the "Ancient of Days."

See the statements of the Prophet in History of the Church, 2:221-2, 431, 477; also Smith, "Book of Records of Seventies," typescript, 13.


A similar action had taken place in Kirtland at the organization of the second Seventy. Several of the presidents had previously ordained high priests and on this basis were removed from office and made general members of the high priest's quorum. See History of the Church 2:476.

"Elder's licenses and Recorded Ordinances, 1836-1846," 32. The date of the license is 14 APR 1840, recorded by Hyrum Smith.

Indiana, Washington County, Marriage Record, vol. D, 25 JUL 1837-6 MAR 1844, p.69, microfilm, Family History Library. Irena was born 7 OCT 1819 in Martinsburg, Indiana and outlived Francis by a year, passing away 23 JUL 1865. Descendants of her sister have listed the marriage incorrectly as occurring in the following month. Milda Holt Murray, Dandridge Overton family group sheet, Family History Library.

The term "high priesthood" as used in this context refers to the office of high priest; the offices elders and Seventies belong to the Melchizedek or high priesthood, as opposed to the Aaronic, or lower priesthood.

(Nauvoo) Wasp, 1, 5(14 MAY 1842):3. No records exist for the transaction. He may have secured the lots before going to Indiana.

Flanders, Nauvoo, 125.

211. Times and Seasons 2, 4(15 DEC 1840):256.

212. Times and Seasons 2, 5(1 JAN 1841):257.

213. See the list of agents on the last sheet of the Times and Seasons for volume 2 numbers 5-18. He might have served longer or begun earlier, but the list was not printed in subsequent issues.

214. Hogan, Founding Minutes of Nauvoo Lodge, 8. I must admit an inability to discover where Bishop had learned this trade. He may have learned while a boy in the Greece/Rochester, New York, area. It does not that he apprenticed with any individual associated with the LDS church.

215. Illinois, Hancock County, Nauvoo City, Personal Property Tax Record (1842), 217, microfilm, Family History Library. The property value breakdown in dollars was as follows: cattle, 20; horses, 30; waggons, 10; clocks, 10; watches, 20; (no heading), 0; stock-in-trade, 0; property not enumerated, 40; private property; 90. The location is given as "6N8W". No specific mention is made of silverwork nor the tools needed, though "property not enumerated" might have included such.

216. (Nauvoo) Wasp 1, 5(14 MAY 1842):3. In the advertisement Bishop is specific in giving the location of the house and lot. I spoke with the present owner, Mr. Joseph Nelson, in 1987 about the history of the home he now occupies, which is built on the adjacent lot west. The land has been in his family since the early 1870s, and he remembers nothing of a house in the place Bishop specifies. A planing mill was constructed on the site in the 1870s that operated until it burned. A detached garage now occupies part of that foundation. Like most Nauvoo land titles the abstract is no help since the Mormons reserved the right to record their own deeds by virtue of the Nauvoo Charter, yet few did so formally.

217. Other temple sites had been dedicated in Independence, Far West, and Adam-Ondi-Ahman in Missouri, but besides laying the cornerstones no building was actually begun. The Nauvoo Temple thus became the second temple.

218. Hogan, Founding Minutes, 8. The term "under dispensation" refers to an allowance of limited duration granted for a lodge to function until a former charter is granted. Upon charter the dispensation is superseded, and the phrase "of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons" becomes part of the official lodge name.

219. Hogan, Founding Minutes, 10.

220. Bishop, ZM, 34-5.

222. "Minutes of the High Council of the Church of Jesus Christ of Nauvoo Illinois," LDS Church Historical Department, 11 MAR 1842, typescript, Utah State University Special Collections, Logan, Utah, (hereafter cited as Nauvoo High Council Minutes); History of the Church, 4(11 MAR 1842):550.

223. Those known to have been in attendance were Joseph and Hyrum Smith, Brigham Young, Wilford Woodruff, Reynolds Cahoon, mayor John C. Bennett, constable Solon Foster, and the high council: stake president William Marks, councilors Austin Cowles and Charles C. Rich, and council members Samuel Bent, Lewis D. Wilson, David Fulmer, Thomas Grover, Newell Knight, Leonard Soby, James Allred, Elias Higbee, George W. Harris, Aaron Johnson, Daniel Carrier, William Huntington, Sr., and clerk Hosea Stout. Others may have been present. The council list is from Times and Seasons 3(15 FEB 1842):700.

224. Doctrine and Covenants 102, especially verses 13-19.

225. The charges as recorded in the Council minutes were typically general: of "setting himself up as a prophet and a revelator to the Church. Second for an improper course of conduct in meetings." (Nauvoo High Council Minutes, 11 MAR 1842.) Years later when the official church history, extracted more from Smith's journal than from the official minutes, was being edited for publication in the Deseret News the second charge was ignored. In relation to it we have no information. History of the Church, 4(11 MAR 1842):550.


227. Brigham Young, Manuscript History, 115.


229. Compare the list in note 27 of this chapter with the lists of men raised to membership in Hogan, Founding Minutes, 16-30.

230. (Nauvoo) Wasp 1, 5(14 MAY 1842):3; Bishop, ZM, 36. See also note 21.

231. Bishop, ZM, 35-6; FGB to Joseph Smith, 26 SEP 1843, Joseph Smith Papers, LDS Church. Hyrum's intervention here was not a unique case. At his trial for apostasy after the martyrdom, high council member Leonard Soby testified that Hyrum Smith also
sought to repair or downplay a breach between Soby and Joseph. Nauvoo High Council Minutes, unbound minutes (7 SEP 1844). Wilford Woodruff noted that Sidney Rigdon's excommunication had also been sidetracked by Hyrum's petitions to Joseph. Millennial Star, 5, 7(DEC 1844):109.

232 3 Ne. 28:4-9. See Chapter 1 for a discussion of this early vision.
233 Bishop, Address, 26-27.
234 Ibid. Joseph said he received the plates from Moroni, the last Nephite prophet and last custodian of the plates. The Three Witnesses to the Book of Mormon were shown the plates by "an angel" but left no record of his identity. Presumably it was Moroni. See Joseph Smith—History 1:33; History of the Church 1:11 and 54. The testimony concerning these men's vision of the plates is printed at the front of any copy of the Book of Mormon.
236 Bishop, Address, 27; For an account of the lost manuscript see Bushman, Beginnings, 89-92.
237 1 Ne. 4:6-9;
238 Bishop, Address, 29. This event is reminiscent of the visionary circumstance of 1832 discussed in Chapter 2.
239 Bishop, ZM, 36. This prophecy may have been written in retrospect.
240 Ibid.
241 The Messenger (Salt Lake City) 3(JAN 1877):1. The Messenger was a little-known RLDS periodical from Salt Lake City.
242 Illinois, Hancock County, Index to Town Lots, 11:535; Hancock County Deed Records, book N, 547, both at Hancock County Recorder's Office, Carthage, Illinois. The Nauvoo Charter granted by the Legislature gave the city the right to record land title transactions independent of the county structure. Land titles in Nauvoo were controlled by the LDS church trustee under the Nauvoo city charter without county supervision or registration. Only as non-Mormon purchasers arrived as the saints were fleeing Nauvoo were deeds recorded in the county offices.
243 Journal of Discourses, 1:83, Brigham Young, 27 MAR 1853.
244 John A. Widtsoe, Joseph Smith: Seeker After Truth, Prophet of God (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1951), 238. His footnote for these names reads: "There can be no
question about the matter since the written records are so extensive as to places, dates, and witnesses." Widtsoe cites unspecified "records in the Historian's Office" and the Nauvoo Temple Records as proof. How Bishop and Strang got included is open to conjecture. Strang joined the Church a bare four months before the assassination of Smith and it is nearly impossible to believe that he would be trusted enough to be invited into the Prophet's confidence. Strang initially claimed that polygamy was an aberration but later embraced the practice. Bishop was married to another woman before Irena died in 1865 but as far as is known was never involved in polygamy. This does not preclude the possibility that he was involved after Nauvoo. Neither man was a member of the Anointed Quorum, those who received their endowment from Smith and who were the only ones known to have participated in sanctioned polygamy prior to 1844. Ehat, "Joseph Smith's Introduction of Temple Ordinances," 107.

245 Orton had been a member of the Kirtland High Council and sat at Bishop's 1835 trial for heresy. "Kirtland Council Minute Book," 119.


247 FGB to Joseph Smith, 26 SEP 1843, Joseph Smith, Jr. Papers, LDS Church.

248 Ibid.

249 He clearly does not fit into an acceptance of the pattern that Jan Shipps has identified in the Mormon cultural break with the past and reordering of historical value. See Shipps, Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition, 51-65.


251 1 John 2:19.

252 Joseph was constantly faced with the problem of discouraging competing pronouncements while encouraging the seeking of inspiration. D&C LDS 28; D&C RLDS 27; Times and Seasons 4(1 DEC 1842):32.

Notes to Chapter 7

253 See Klaus J. Hansen, Quest for Empire: The Political Kingdom of God and the Council of Fifty in Mormon History (Michigan State University Press, 1967), 45-6, 60-64.
Most Nauvoo saints followed Brigham Young to the west across Iowa. There were still a sizeable body of American Mormons, maybe 5000, left east of the Mississippi. Richard E. Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 1846-1852 (Norman and London: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 227.

The minutes of this general conference were printed as a supplement to the Millennial Star in 1845. The earliest record of the proceedings was in this publication. Young's' forceful personality definitely carried weight, as did his position as president of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles. See History of the Church, 7(8 AUG 1844):231-243; Millennial Star 6(DEC 1845), supplement; Ehat, "Joseph Smith's Introduction of Temple Ordinances and the 1844 Mormon Succession Question," especially pp. 189-236. Dr. Richard Bennett calculates that between 1848 and 1852 no more than 11.2% of the church members (2132 people) could have left the Church body for schismatic followings. Even if an equal number left before 1848, the majority still rested solidly with the Utah faction under Brigham Young. "Lamanism, Lymanism, and Cornfields," Journal of Mormon History 13(1986-87):59. Joseph Smith III testified in the Temple Lot Case that relatively few who had been in the Church before the martyrdom ever joined the Reorganization. Abstract of Evidence in the Temple Lot Case (Lamoni, Iowa: Herald Publishing, 1893), 83, 90.

See Shields, Divergent Paths of the Restoration for brief histories of the groups and leaders claiming Smith's legacy.

D. Michael Quinn, "The Mormon Succession Crisis of 1844," Brigham Young University Studies 16(Winter 1976):187-233. Two works which challenge Quinn's interpretation of the situation are Esplin, "The Emergence of Brigham Young and the Twelve to Mormon Leadership, 1830-41," and Ehat, "Joseph Smith's Introduction of Temple Ordinances." I believe that all three are correct—Quinn in asserting that there was no popularly understood succession mechanism and Esplin and Ehat in stating that prophetic succession had been taught and was understood by the majority in the church councils before Smith's death.

Esplin, "Brigham Young and the Emergence of the Twelve to Positions of Leadership," passim; Conversation with Glen Leonard, 5 JUL 1989.

Estimates vary widely concerning the Mormon population outside of Nauvoo's environs. In the Temple Lot Case Joseph Smith III's estimate of over 100,000 at his father's death far exceeds the numbers that could have actually been members. See Bennett, Mormons at the Missouri, 89-90.


Millennial Star 6(DEC 1845), supplement.
262. Isaac H. Bishop to Alexander Brim, 4 AUG 1847, LDS Church.

263. Ezra Strong to Solomon Strong, 30 SEP 1855, Ezra Strong Letters, Washington State University Special Collections. Typescript of letter in possession of Dr. Barre Toelken, Utah State University. In the Nauvoo Expositor William Law editorialized "We all verily believe, and many of us know of a surety, that the religion of the Latter Day Saints, as originally taught by Joseph Smith, which is contained in the Old and New Testaments, Book of [Doctrine and] Covenants, and Book of Mormon, is verily true." Cited in Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery, Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1984), 181.

264. In the third part of his bibliographic series on the lesser Mormon groups, historian Dale Morgan used the term "churches of the dispersion" to refer to the period of scattering following Joseph Smith's death. Dale L. Morgan, "A Bibliography of the Churches of the Dispersion."

265. The classic examples of this practice are William Marks, former Nauvoo State president, and apostle John E. Page. Both were sought for the prestige each would lend to an organization, and each was involved with several followings. Both "ordained" several schismatic leaders. John Quist, "John E. Page: Apostle of Uncertainty," Journal of Mormon History, 12(1985).

266. These events will be explored in Chapter 9.

267. Bishop, ZM, 10.

Notes to Chapter 8

268. Times and Seasons 6:1009–10; History of the Church, 7:462. An examination of the land records to 1845 in the Hancock County recorder's office showed no transactions in Bishop's name anywhere in the county.

269. Bishop, Address, 24; Bishop, ZM, 27; Bureau of the Census, Seventh U.S. Population Census (1850), Kirtland, Lake, Ohio, 223.

270. Bishop, ZM, 26; Grand Master of Illinois, Independent Order of Odd Fellows to author, 18 MAR 1988. The national headquarters for the IOOF was and is Salem (now Winston–Salem), North Carolina, the town in which Bishop had published his 1839 Brief History while serving as a missionary for the Church.

271. Bishop, ZM, 26. An examination of the Jefferson County land records on microfilm in the LDS Family History Library shows that Bishop had not purchased or sold
property in the county. Just what he was doing there remains a mystery.

272. The original letter Strang claimed to have received from Smith is today housed in the Coe Collection at Yale University. The history of the document is treated in Charles Eberstadt, "A Letter that Founded a Kingdom," reprint, *Autograph Collectors' Journal* (OCT 1950), where the letter is also reprinted.

273. Ibid.


275. Harris's biographer, Rhett James, contends that Harris associated with a variety of schism groups because it enabled him to testify of the *Book of Mormon*, which he firmly believed in. Once he found himself used, his adherence was truncated.

276. *Millennial Star* 8(20 NOV 1846):138–39. This trial is examined in Chapter 2. Hyde reported that Joseph Smith rejected Bishop's angelic ordination because the authority to ordain was already in the hands of mortal man. There was no proper need for supernatural bestowal of this power.


278. [isaac] H. Bishop to Alexander Brim, 4 AUG 1847.


280. Ibid.

281. Bishop, *ZM*, 11–12. Bishop relied on a complex interrelation of Old Testament and Apocalyptic scripture to arrive at this conclusion. It centered on numerical correlation of the "seven Spirits of God" in Revelation and the stone with seven eyes of Zechariah. These eyes and spirits were symbolic of the earth's gospel dispensations, also represented by his seven movements.

282. Bishop, *ZM*, 29; FGB to Brigham Young, Heber Kimball, Willard Richards, 30 JUL 1851, Incoming Correspondence, Brigham Young Papers, LDS Church.

283. *Ensign of Liberty* 1, 3(DEC 1847).


Periodicals, and Broadsides Relating to the First Century of Mormonism, Chad J. Flake, ed. (Salt Lake City: Univ. of Utah Press, 1978) (popularly known as Flake) for successive titles of *Gospel Herald; Gospel Herald (Voree, Wis.)* 3(20 APR 1848):4.

287 *Ensign of Liberty*, 1, 6(MAR 1848). A letter from Cowdery to McLellin herein cited was dated 28 JUL 1847 from Elkhorn, Walworth County, Wisconsin; [Francis Gladden Bishop,] *A Voice of Warning and Proclamation to All* (Voree, Wisconsin, 1848), 1–3.

288 Sarah Hall Scott to sister, 31 MAR 1848, Inez Smith Davis Papers, Notes, RLDS Church; *Gospel Herald*, 3(20 APR 1848):18; Isaiah 11:1, Jeremiah 23:5.

289 *Gospel Herald* 2(20 APR 1848):18; *Journal History* 2 OCT 1848; Sarah Scott to sister, 31 MAR 1848. Orson Hyde's report in the *Journal History* (extracted from the *Frontier Guardian*) is probably taken from James Strang's recounting in the *Gospel Herald*.

290 Sarah Scott to sister, 31 MAR 1848.

291 *Journal History*, 2 OCT 1848, p.4.

292 "Dispensation" is a Mormon term that is used to denote a dispensing of knowledge, power, and authority from God to man. It is usually identified by a great prophet's name, such as the "Abrahamic dispensation." The work of the Prophet Joseph Smith is said to begin the "Dispensation of the Fullness of Times" (which includes today), immediately prior to the Millennial Dispensation.


295 Ibid.; Bishop, *Address*, 12–14. In retrospect, perhaps the most significant act of Bishop's cabal in Voree was the ordination of Sally Shumway. Other Mormon groups presented a widely diverse range of roles for women, but if Strang was correct in his account, Bishop was perhaps the first to actually ordain a woman to the priesthood. Ian G. Barber, "The Ecclesiastical Position of Women in Two Mormon Trajectories," *Journal of Mormon History* 14(1988):63–79. Organizing a church in later years Bishop would create a hierarchy for women paralleling that of the men (chapter 10).


298 The pamphlet is unsigned but is clearly Bishop's work.
This group was begun in Kirtland in 1847 by William McLellin from those who had apostatized in the 1830s. McLellin hoped to convince Book of Mormon witness David Whitmer to lead the Church. Whitmer steadfastly refused and the sect gradually fell apart.

Austin Cowles to J.J. Strang, 24 AUG 1849, James Strang Correspondence, RLDS Church; Shields, *Divergent Paths*, 56; I[saac] H. Bishop to Alexander Brim, 3 MAY 1849; typescript at RLDS Church.

David Whitmer was one such individual, and the Law brothers in Nauvoo were others.

Bureau of the Census, Seventh U.S. Population Census (1850), Ohio, Lake County, 223.


Ohio, Lake County, Kirtland Township, Personal Property, Money and Credits (1850), duplicate tax record, 220, microfilm, Family History Library.

James W. Bay to Brigham Young, 7 AUG 1851, Missionary Reports, Brigham Young Papers, LDS Church. The brother must have been Henry. All younger brothers died in childhood (see Appendix A), and Isaac was still in Springfield, Illinois.

James Bay to Brigham Young, 7 AUG 1851.


[Francis Gladden Bishop,] *A Proclamation From the Lord to His people, scattered throughout all the Earth* (Kirtland, Ohio, 1851), double sheet.

Rhett S. James, discussions with the author, 1987; see also notes in Rhett S. James, *The Man Who Knew, The Early Years: A Play About Martin Harris, 1824–1830* (Cache Valley, UT: Martin Harris Pageant Committee, 1983). Harris's name is still included as a Witness in modern editions of the Book of Mormon published by various schisms.

Many Diaspora movements claimed Harris's association. His biographer, Rhett James, believes that his prime motivation for being identified with these groups was the opportunity they provided to testify of the Book of Mormon's truthfulness, not because Harris found them appealing. To the end of his life he considered his role as a Book of
Mormon Witness his primary responsibility. (*Doctrine and Covenants* 19:29, 37). Bishop claimed Harris as a witness to his own work in the *Proclamation*. In a letter to an LDS paper in St. Louis, Thomas Coburn reported that Harris had followed Bishop and was waiting for the saints' return to Jackson County, Missouri. *St. Louis Luminary* 2 MAY 1855, cited in *Journal History* under date.


317. Although the first page of the *Address* bears the date of "May 13th, 1851," pages 46–47 of the 50-page work bear a revelation dated 15 JUN the same year. A letter written to Brigham Young (cited note 6) on 30 JUL 1851 refers to a copy of the *Address* sent under the same mailing suggesting publication between the latter dates. The cost of publication had broken Gladden financially. In 1851 Gladden paid 32 cents combined state, county, and township taxes on a total personal value of $40. Ohio, Lake County, Kirtland Township, Personal Property, Money & Credits, duplicate tax record (1851), 221, microfilm, Family History Library.


320. Isaiah 2:2.

Notes to Chapter 9

321. An earlier version of Chapter 9 was first delivered at the 1988 Mormon History Association Meeting in Logan, Utah, entitled "The Sheep in the Fold Have Driven the Wolves: Gladdenism and Conflict in Utah, 1850-1854."

322. The wards in Nauvoo functioned initially as municipal wards under the bishop. As
immigration increased, the ward also became an ecclesiastical unit. Still, it remained for the Utah experience to fully develop the ward as a functional body and fully define the activities of a bishop. See Leonard Arrington, From Quaker to Latter-day Saint: Bishop Edwin D. Wooley (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1976), 120-122, notes.

323. As contact with non-Mormons increased, this stigma lessened. Still unwilling to accept Mormonism as Christian, particularly because of polygamy, yet faced with the disapproval of older stigmas by contrary firsthand accounts, opinion shifted and the Mormon people were "discovered" to be only deluded by their leaders, then eventually unjustly repressed by them.


325. Dozens of polemical works may be cited which claim to tell the "real" story of Mormon "blood atonement" perfidy. Two of the best scholarly treatments of Grant and the Reformation are Sessions' Mormon Thunder, 203-242; and Paul H. Petersen, "The Mormon Reformation," (Ph.D diss., Brigham Young University, 1981).

326. Ibid.


329. FGB to Brigham Young, et al., 30 JUL 1851; Bishop, Address, 32. Only a single original copy of each remains today.

330. Ohio, Lake County, Kirtland Township, Personal Property, Money and Credits, duplicate tax record (1851), 221.

331. FGB to Brigham Young, et al., 30 JUL 1851.

332. D&C LDS 38:27, 42:9; D&C RLDS 38:6a, 42:3b.

334. FGB to Brigham Young, et. al., 30 JUL 1850.

335. Ezra Strong to Solomon Strong, 30 SEP 1855, 17, Ezra Strong Letters, Washington State University Special Collections. Typescript of letter in possession of Dr. Barre Toelken, Utah State University. All page numbers will refer to those from the typed transcript.

336. Journal History, 31 DEC 1851. Gallop did not start across the Plains with this company (see "Journal of the 3rd Company of Ten Under the Presidency of Captain Levi Hammon [sic]," microfilm, 17 SEP 1851, LDS Church.)


338. Journal History, 13 JAN 1852; Ezra Strong, 30 SEP 1855.

339. "Minutes of the Meetings of the Seventies Lyceum For the Second Municipal Ward, 1851-2," photocopy at Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah, 21 DEC 1851, 7 JAN 1852; United States, Bureau of the Census, Seventh US Population Census (1850), Utah Territory, Great Salt Lake City, 42.

340. Nauvoo Temple Endowment Register (Salt Lake City: Geneological Dept., 1974), under date of 30 DEC 1845. The Lyceum minutes show Smith as an active participant through at least February of 1852, thereafter he drops completely from mention. The group disbanded in April and reformed in October, but Smith is not listed among the membership that fall.


343. Journal of Discourses, 1:84, Brigham Young, 27 MAR 1853.

344. Salt Lake City (Utah) Seventh Ward record, microfilm, LDS Church, 9 NOV 1851.

345. "Fragments of Experience," Faith Promoting Series, vol. 6. (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Sons, 1882), 88. This was also Gladden's position on Joseph, and he placed Joseph among those whom he calls "the drunkards of Ephraim," though his stance on the Prophet never appeared this strong from his publications.


347. Ezra Strong, 30 SEP 1855, 17.

349. Woodruff, Journal, 1 AUG 1852.

350. Journal History, 1 AUG 1852.


352. [Francis Gladden Bishop], The Ensign, Light of Zion, Shepherd of Israel! and "Book of Remembrance." [first division,] (Kanesville, Iowa, 1852), 12.

353. Bishop, ZM, 47, 69-71. Since the second division appears to have been only for those belonging to the New Church, few copies were likely printed. Too, those of Bishop's publications that have survived to the present were those sent to individuals other than his followers. Because it is likely few of the Ensign's second section were circulated beyond the Gladdenite faithful, none survived. A section of about one-and-a-half pages from the second division was copied into Zion's Messenger. This is the only indication of what was published in this now-unknown pamphlet.

354. Bishop, ZM, 47.

355. Bishop, ZM, 15; Appendix C.


357. Ibid., 37. The revelation is undated but would have reached Smith in Utah too late in the year for him to make an attempt to leave the territory. With this delay he would have had to wait for the passes to open in the spring of 1853. See Bishop, Ensign, 41.


359. A competent introduction to the post-martyrdom proliferation of prophets as well as Young's lack of revelatory pronouncement may be found in Launius, Joseph Smith III, 73-84, and Morgan, "A Bibliography of Churches of the Dispersion."

360. Jesse Haven journal, 27 NOV 1852, LDS Church.

361. Bishop, ZM, 50-54.

362. Benjamin Ferris, Utah and the Mormons (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1854),
327. There is presently no way to determine the exact number of converts proselyted to Gladdenism. Certainly there were no more than one hundred. See Appendix C.

363. Ezra Strong, 30 SEP 1855.

364. A map of 1850 Salt Lake City drawn from land records shows Smith living on the west side of Block 68, on First West between First and Second South. The lot is today occupied by the staff entrance to the Salt Palace.

365. There is some confusion as to who was actually leading the Mormons. Ezra Strong identified "a Nauvoo Bishop — one Everts." (Ezra Strong, 30 SEP 1855, 13.) Everts was a bishop, but in Winter Quarters, Nebraska; Strong recorded Nauvoo incorrectly as his bishopric. Territorial secretary Benjamin Ferris says that the man was "a long, six-foot, scowling Danite, by the name of Cummings." Ferris, Utah, 334.

366. Ibid. Brigham Young had delivered a sermon on 4 FEB 1852 to the Territorial Legislature where he lambasted the violations of Constitutional freedoms for the Mormons. While Young clearly supported the Constitution and its freedoms, the misapplication of those freedoms he decried. "If you will allow me the privilege [of] telling [it] right out, it is none of their damned business what we do or say here. What we do is not for them to sanction[,] and then for us to say what we like about it." He also was loath to support the officials who denied his people their liberties, preferring to depend on divine revelation for government. "In the government[,] affairs of state and territory and kingdoms, by right God should govern." However, this necessitated a mortal spokesman, a prophet. See speeches by Brigham Young, 4 FEB and 5 FEB 1852, Manuscript Addresses, Brigham Young Papers, LDS Church, typescript at Utah State Historical Society.


369. According to an untitled remembrance by W.H. Streeper, a former employee of the firm, written to Benjamin F. Riter in 1924, the non-Mormon merchant house of Gilbert and Garrish was located "directly across from the South Entrance of the Temple Block." It was probably in front of this strategically located establishment that Smith positioned himself. The location and Smith's actions imply that Gilbert and Garrish also may have been one of the establishments allowing Smith to post notices the previous February. W.H. Streeper to B.F. Riter, 5 MAY 1924, Benjamin Franklin Riter Collection, Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah.

MAR 1853.


372. Ibid., 82; see also Ferris, *Utah*, 328.


374. Ibid. Ferris left Utah in the spring of 1853, when the Gladdenite disruption was at its height. Ferris, *Utah*, 339.

375. Ibid.


378. Ezra Strong, 30 SEP 1855, 16.


380. *Journal History*, 17 APR 1853; *The Deseret News* (Salt Lake City), 7 SEP 1853.

381. Ezra Strong, 30 SEP 1855.


385. (Philadelphia) *Public Ledger and Daily Transcript*, 16 JUL 1853.


388. Apostles Lyman Wight, John E. Page, and William Smith; Nauvoo stake president William Marks, and high council members Leonard Soby and Alpheus Cutler; councilors in the First Presidency William Law and Sidney Rigdon, as well as others without leadership position were all involved (some in concert) with competing authority claims after Smith's death.

390. Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, 29; Pearl of Great Price, Moses 7:18.

391. A group of congregations in northern Illinois formed a coalition in the mid 1850s seeking to reform the evils they had believed had crept into Mormonism after Joseph Smith. Smith's son eventually became associated with this group, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and was accepted as the prophet, a position he held until his death in 1914. From 1863 to the 1880s the Church maintained an active and mildly successful missionary effort among the Utah Mormons. Most moved east to Illinois and later to Missouri. See Launius, Joseph Smith III, 218-245.

392. Ferris, Utah, 327.

393. Ferris, Utah, 326, italics added.

394. Journal History, 17 APR 1853; Deseret News, 7 SEP 1853.

395. Bishop, ZM, 50-52, 54. By broadening the prophetic role to include additional presidents, women, and others in an effort to maintain a following, some leaders only introduced potential rifts and divisions. Brewster, Cutler, McLellin and others experienced these problems with too broad a revelation base.

396. Frederick Gardiner, "A Synopsis of the Life and Travels of Frederick Gardiner," 35-6, typescript, University of Utah Manuscript Division, Salt Lake City, Utah; Jacob Norton, Reminiscences and journal, May 1844-Jan 1852, 124, microfilm, LDS Church.


Notes to Chapter 10

398. Bishop, Address, 1.

399. (Council Bluffs) Nonpriel, 27 MAR 1946. Hyde street "was the site of all Mormon activity. It contained the large two-storey [sic] tabernacle, centre of both religious and social gatherings." Gradually the street became a residential district as the Mormons moved out.

400. Iowa, Pottawattamie County, Deed Records, book A, p.348, Pottawattamie county recorder's office, Council Bluffs, Iowa. The lot descriptions are recorded in Ibid., Plat

401. Bishop, Ensign, 34; ZM, 47; see Appendix C for a list of known Gladdenites in Council Bluffs.


403. Zech. 4:11.

404. Bishop, ZM, 11, 12, 36.

405. Bishop, ZM, 56-57. All following information pertaining to this conference is from this reference. The name of the church was taken from Rev. 3:12. Bishop, Ensign, 39.

406. Ibid.

407. Ibid.

408. Daniel Tyler, A Concise History of the Mormon Battalion in the Mexican War, 1846-1847 (n.p., 1881).

409. Barber, "The Ecclesiastical Position of Women in Two Mormon Trajectories." In this article Barber details the authority roles of women in the Cutler and Rigdon followings. Rigdon later claimed that soon after Smith's martyrdom the Lord "showed to us that to bring forth Zion there had to be a female priesthood." Though Rigdon ordained "kings and priests" among his followers in the 1840s, nothing was done for women until the 1860s. Linda King Newell argues that Joseph Smith had organized the Relief Society in 1842 almost as a separate priesthood, and cites numerous examples of "ordinances" being performed by women in Nauvoo and into the twentieth century in Utah. Linda King Newell, "Gifts of the Spirit: Women's Share," Maureen Ursenbach Beecher and Lavina Fielding Anderson, Sisters in Spirit: Mormon Women in Historical and Cultural Perspective (Urbana and Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press, c1987), 115-118.

410. S. Rigdon to J.A. Forgues, 4 FEB 1868, Stephen Post Correspondence, LDS Church.

411. See Appendix A.

412. Bishop, ZM, 52-53; for Isaac's death date see Appendix A.

413. Only a single copy remains today, part of the Eli H. Pierce Collection housed at Special Collections, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. The copy is lacking at least the first leaf and perhaps leaves at the end. Though restored by a conservator, sections of the pages are missing throughout the issue, a consequence of being torn in half across the pages some time in the past. In prosecuting my work a typescript of this pamphlet
was made and is available in the department for general use.

414. Iowa, Pottawattamie County, Deed Records, book F, 142, (deed number 244), Pottawattamie County Recorder's Office, Council Bluffs, Iowa.


416. William Swett to members of the New Church, Zion's Harbinger and Baneemy's Organ 4(SEP 1854):129.

417. Ibid.

418. Ibid.; Joel Shearer and William Swett, Comments on the Kingdom of God and the Gospel (Council Bluffs, Iowa, 1854).

419. Ibid.

420. Bishop, ZM, 55.

421. Dale Morgan's "Churches of the Dispersion" (p.148) says that the September issue (v.4 n.9) was not published until 9 MAR 1855, giving Swett plenty of time to write this letter.

422. Charles B. Thompson, The Law and Covenants of Israel, Written to Ephriam, from Jehovah, the Mighty God of Jacob (Preparation, Iowa: Zion's Presbytery Book and Job Office, 1857), vii, (microfilm, Utah State University); Saints' Herald, 11:124.

423. Joel Shearer, Mysteries Revealed, (Council Bluffs, Iowa, 1856), 36.

424. This route is inferred from the cities Bishop was known to have been in on the trip to Washington.


427. "Dissentions have not ceased any more than persecutions, . . ." Letter of James Kay, 22 NOV 1855, Millennial Star 7(1 MAY 1846):134.

428. Deseret News (9 NOV 1854); Journal History 9 NOV 1854.


432. *Journal History* 22 APR 1855. This information is taken from a letter of Charles Bassett to D. H. Mackintosh.


435. Ezra Strong, 7 FEB 1856, 105.

436. Bishop, ZM, 27.


438. Ezra Strong, 7 FEB 1856, 105.

439. Ibid.

Notes to Chapter 11

440. FGB to Brigham Young, 20 MAR 1864, Incoming Correspondence, Brigham Young Papers, 13. Early that spring (1857) a body of returning gold seekers had occupied themselves on the trail through Nevada by shooting at any Indian they could locate. This may have been the "mob" he referred to. Brigham Young to James Denver, 12 SEP 1857, cited in United States, *House Exec. Docs.*, 35th Cong., 1st Sess., 71:184.

441. I read through the microfilm of correspondence from the time period still extant in the Buchanan collection and found nothing relating to Bishop or even to the Utah Expedition. Presumably it was destroyed or lost, or nothing existed. Neither are there appointment books or similar materials to show if Bishop was able to meet the President as he claimed.

442. Brigham Young, "Manuscript History of the Church," 12 JUL 1858, LDS Church, microfilm, 782.


444. Young, "Manuscript History of the Church," 12 JUL 1858, 782. I have been unable to collaborate this appointment from the Utah Agency files or the appointment files. A search of the correspondence received by the Bureau during this time has revealed nothing about the appointment, though positions in Utah were filled during 1857 and
The gentiles in the U.S. had been "cut off" in 1845 for allowing the death of Joseph Smith to happen and then to go unpunished. *Millennial Star* 7, 9(1 MAY 1846):21.

In 1968 the RLDS church moved to essentially decanonize D&C RLDS 107. As the heading notes, the Church made statements as early as 1886 disavowing most of the practices begun in Nauvoo. For a treatment of the development of RLDS doctrines see Launius, *Joseph Smith III*, 152-153. He credits Smith's pragmatic compromises with the decline of many controversial doctrines widely accepted in the earlier Church. Because Smith did not believe his father to have been responsible for their promulgation and not wanting to alienate many who accepted older Mormon practices and doctrines, the younger Smith simply outlived his opponents and moved quietly to quash heterodox views.

Ibid., 277, 292, 366.

"Early Reorganization Minutes," photocopy, RLDS Church. These followers are identified in Appendix B by "ERM" appearing under the name.


One of these was Richard Stephens, who had been sent by Thompson along with William Marks to find a settlement area for Thompson's following. (Richard Stephens to James M. Adams, 22 MAY 1852, RLDS Church). Stephens had been given the office of Chief Steward in the New Church. Bishop Ensign, 38.


The exact location of Springville remains a mystery. The town appears on no contemporary map nor on the railroad surveys of the 1860s. From postal information on Bishop's letters to Joseph III, Springville was located about on the Nance-Platt County line, five miles from east-northeast of Genoa and fifteen miles from Monroe. This would also have placed it within a stones' cast from the north-east corner of the Pawnee Indian reservation, hinting that Bishop may have sought to convert the Indians.

FGB to Joseph Smith III, 28 SEP 1862, Joseph Smith III Papers, Incoming Correspondence, RLDS Church.

Margaret McNeil Ballard, "Memories of Early Days in Cache Valley," transcription by Joel Ricks, Utah State University Special Collections, File MS 389.
456. FGB to Joseph Smith III, His Mother, and Nauvoo Saints, 25 SEP 1862, p.2, Joseph Smith III papers, Incoming Correspondence, RLDS Church.

457. FGB to the Scattered Saints, 12 MAR 1863, Artificial Collection, RLDS Church. This last phrase may (or may not) have been a veiled reference to a possible practice of polygamy on Bishop's part.

458. FGB to Brigham Young, 20 MAR 1864, Incoming Correspondence, Brigham Young Papers, 13.

459. FGB to the Scattered Saints, 12 MAR 1863.

460. This is a guess. He probably could not have travelled during January and February the next year, and he was in Denver by March of 1864. To travel in late fall would have been foolhardy.

461. FGB to BY, 20 MAR 1864, 12.

462. Ibid., 10-11.

463. Ibid.; 3 APR 1864, 1, 22, 24; 29 APR 1864, 4. See chapter 8 for a discussion of Bishop's ideas of representation.

464. FGB to BY, 3 APR 1864, 22.

465. Ibid., 1.

466. FGB to BY, 20 MAR 1864, 11.

467. FGB to BY, 3 APR 1864, 23.

468. FGB to BY, 29 APR 1864, 1.

469. Ibid., 2-3.

470. Brigham Young Financial Records, 1859-1882, Utah State University Special Collections, Logan, Utah; Letterbooks, Brigham Young Papers, LDS Church. I made an examination of the microfilm copies of the latter collection for 1863 through 1865 in the summer of 1987, intent on returning for a thorough search. Unfortunately, before a recheck became out of the question when the Young Papers were withdrawn from patron access. At the date of this writing (DEC 1989) Historical Department personnel claim a reopening of the collection in a year.

Brigham had drawn up two "Covenants" as he directed the flights from Missouri in 1839 and from Nauvoo in 1845. These proposed that the saints "never desert the poor who are worthy." Obviously he did not consider Gladden to be in this number. Bennett,
Ann Maria wrote in her journal that she had "never seen the old folks since we left Macedonia [Illinois]." Whether she meant only her parents or any of the family is unclear. Brim, "Journal," 6.

Deseret News 3(20 JUL 1864):340.

Utah, Salt Lake County, Death Records, microfilm, Family History Library, consecutive death #2269.

Ibid. Each death recorded in the county records includes a burial plot location. The one initially recorded for Bishop matches the location of the Brim plot.

Salt Lake City Cemetery, Sexton's Record Books, v.2, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Early in my research I discovered that little at all was factually known about Bishop, particularly about his demise. Most records indicated that he died some time before 1878. This was most likely inferred from Joseph Young, History of the Organization of the Seventies (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Steam Printing Establishment, 1878), which includes lists of the first two quorums of Seventy. Bishop's name was followed by an asterisk for "deceased," indicating he could not have lived beyond 1878 but giving no concrete information as to place or date of death. A check of the temple ordinance work in the Family History Library's "Temple Index Bureau" (TIB) revealed little else but gave a death date of 1865 submitted by a nephew in 1922. With such a disparity in dates I redoubled my efforts and after several dead-ends stumbled onto a mention of Bishop dying in Salt Lake City in Orson F. Whitney's History of Utah, 4v. (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1898), 2:311. Previous to that time I had no indication of Bishop's final location. Since Whitney is less than unerring in his sparse footnoting, I checked the death records indices to Salt Lake County in the Family History Library and discovered there the name of "F.G. Bishop." From there it was a short trip to the microfilmed manuscript death records, which indeed recorded Bishop's demise and provided a date but unfortunately no cause (not an unusual practice) and a burial location. Penciled below the location code was a similar code, which did not match the one above it. On a subsequent trip to the Salt Lake City Cemetery I stood before the Brim family stone (like most other stones and boards, those marking the graves were gone), which lists on its front the names and dates of those it memorialized. Walking away from the grave I noticed a continuation of names on the reverse, pulled back the branch of an overgrown evergreen bush, and revealed near the bottom the name of "Francis G. Bishop." On a hunch I inquired at the sexton's office, whose records of burial locations matched the second entry on the county death records. Unfortunately, the original survey markers deteriorated long ago and no plans of the original plot...
surveys survive. Though the approximate area is known, Bishop's actual grave remains lost.

Notes to Chapter 12


480. Launius, Joseph Smith III, 5.

481. This idea is given credence by the constant movement found in the histories of many Midwestern Mormons. The histories in Shields' Divergent Paths of the Restoration give good overviews into the prophetic histories of most Diaspora groups.
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Appendix A

Isaac G. Bishop Family

Isaac Gates BISHOP
b. 29 JUL 1779    Lebanon, Madison County, N.Y.
d. 12 MAR 1845    Springfield, Sangamon County, Ill.
   [Father - Isaac BISHOP (b. 1754)]
   [Mother - Anna HUDSON (b. 1756)]

Mary HYDE
b. 8 JUN 1786

Isaac Hyde BISHOP                      (m. Harriet OSBORN)
b. 1 APR 1804
d. 24 DEC 1854    Springfield, Sangamon County, Ill.

Looicy [Louisa?] BISHOP   (no information)

Henry BISHOP                           (m. Belvedera FISH)
b. 28 OCT 1806               d. 18 AUG 1881

Francis Gladden BISHOP     (m. Irena OVERTON, 16 SEP 1840)
   (m. Phebe M., [1847-1850])
b. 19 JAN 1809    Livonia, Livingston County, N.Y.
d. 30 NOV 1864    Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, Utah

(son) BISHOP
b. 2 JAN 1812               d. 27 AUG 1815     New York

Benjamin H. BISHOP
b. 4 JUN 1817               d. 27 JUL 1817

Anna Maria BISHOP         (m. Alexander BRIM, 25 MAY 1837)
b. 9 MAR 1820    Greece, Monroe County, N.Y.
d. 19 FEB 1886

George BISHOP
b. 7 JUN 1822    Greece, Monroe County, N.Y.
d. 4 JUL 1825    Greece, Monroe County, N.Y.

________________________

\(^1\)Robert Whittle, telephone conversation, 16 SEP 1987.
Amanda BISHOP           (m. James P. WHIMBERLY, Fall 1848)
b. 28 JUN 1825    Greece, Monroe County, N.Y.
d. 28 JUN 1921

Elanor BISHOP                        (m. Benjamin McVEIGH)
b. 14 JUN 1828    Greece, Monroe County, N.Y.
d. 20 OCT 1914
Appendix B

Individuals Known to Have Had A Connection To
Or Association With Francis Gladden Bishop
And His Organizations

Source Abbreviations
(See Works Cited for full citation.)

SH = Saints' Herald.

Ensign = Francis Gladden Bishop, The Ensign. Light of Zion. Shepard
of Israel! and "Book of Remembrance."

ZM = Francis Gladden Bishop, Zion's Messenger.

JH = Journal History of the Church.

HC = Joseph Smith, Jr., History of the Church.

Record = Lyman DePlatt, A Record of Members at Nauvoo 1839-44.

ERM = "Early Reorganization Minutes," RLDS Church.

Mem = Susan Easton Black, Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints.

ECIF = Early Church Information File, Family History Library.

NTER = Nauvoo Temple Endowment Register, Family History Library.

Strong = Ezra Strong to Solomon Strong, 30 SEP 1855, typescript.

CLM = Andrew Jensen, A Chronological List of Missionaries.

Registry = Registry of Names of Persons Residing in the Various Wards
As to Bishop's Reports, G.S.L. City Dec 28th AD 1852,
typescript, Family History Library.
Note: Information in parentheses is questionable or is copied as written in the source.

Name - Source(s) of association information.
   Other information relating to life and activities.

Avis J. Adams - ZM, 75.
   (Mem 1:125)

Minerva Adams - ZM, 75.

Zebulon Adams - ZM, 75.
   Mem 1:244; was a High Priest in Nauvoo, HC 2:174.

Betty Bardsley - ZM, 50.
   ERM; SH 35:304.

Marinda Barker - ZM, 75.

Symonds E. Barker - ZM, 75.

Thomas Billington - Ensign, 41.
   Bureau of the Census, Seventh U.S. Population Census (1850),
   Salt Lake City, Utah, 82 (hereafter cited as Census (1850)).

Francis Gladden Bishop

Irena Overton Bishop - I[saac] H. Bishop to Alexander
   Brim, 6 NOV 1847, LDS Church; Record, 32.

(Henry Bishop) - James Bay to Brigham Young, 7 AUG 1857, Brigham
   Young Papers, Incoming Correspondence, LDS Church.

Phebe M. Bishop - ZM, 52.
   Census (1850), Kirtland Ohio; (A single Phebe Mattison
   [Madison?] listed in Record, 55.).

Curtis Catlin (Callin) - (Strong).

Polly Conklin - JH 13 JAN, 1 AUG 1852; Strong.
b. 18 OCT 1791 - NTER 1 JAN 1846; Census (1850), Salt Lake City, Utah, 95.

Levi Cook - ZM, 75.

Sarah M. Cook - ZM, 75.

Luther Cranmer (Crenmer) - (Strong)
Census (1850), Salt Lake City, Utah, 73.

Betsy Cranmer - (by association with husband Luther)
Census (1850), Salt Lake City, Utah, 73.

Andrew J. Downing - ZM, 75.

Mary M. Downing - ZM, 75.

John A. Forgues - Joseph Smith III to Charles Derry, 22 NOV 1866,
Letterbook, 1856-1870, Joseph Smith III Papers, RLDS Church.
b. 5 FEB 1809, Coventry Twp., Chester, PA., ECIF; Record, 77;
Millennial Star, suppl., DEC 1845; Nauvoo Property Transactions
1842, 1844; ERM; Mem 16:774; CLM 1843:254; Patriarchal Blessing
Records, 4:97, LDS Church.

Rosanna Forgues - (by association with husband John)
b. 1 APR 1805, Unchlben Twp., Chester, PA, ECIF; Partiarchal
Blessing Records, LDS Church, 4:162; Record, 77; ERM; Mem
16:722.

John Gallop Jr.- JH 31 DEC 1851, 1 AUG 1852; "Fragments of
Experience," Faith Promoting Series, vol. 6 (Salt Lake
City: George Q. Cannon and Sons, 1882), 88.
b. 25 MAR 1815, Middlefield, NY, ECIF; Rebaptized 9 NOV 1851, Salt
Lake City 7th ward, ECIF; SH 24:39, 30:556, 31:4,152, 50:342-3;
ERM.

(Wife of John) Gallop - (by association with husband John)

J [man] Grey - Strong
Martin Harris - Proclamation; Journal of Discourses 2:215.

David Heron - JH 1 AUG 1852.
b. 3 AUG 1828, Scotland, ECIF; Patriarchal Blessing Records, LDS Church, 11:294, n.656.

Eli B. Hewitt - ZM, 56.
   Mem 22:532; Daniel Tyler, A Concise History of the Mormon Battalion in the Mexican War, 1846-1847 (n.p., 1881).

Harriet P. Hewitt - ZM, 56.

[man] Lattimer - Strong.

Thomas Lewins (Lewen) - Ensign, 41; (Strong).
   Registry, Salt Lake City 12th Ward; ECIF.

Every Marter - Strong. [Could be a misspelling of "Avery" or "martyr"]


Reuben Parkhurst - ZM, 75.
   CLM 1843:263; B.C. Flint, An Outline History of the Church of Christ (Temple Lot) (Independence, Mo.: Board of Publication of the Church of Christ (Temple Lot)), 99; Truth Teller 1(1861):31; Record, 109; Mem 33:848.

John Rogers - Strong.
   Census (1850), Pottawattamie, Iowa, 183; Mem 37:526?.

Joel Shearer - ZM, 56.
   Record, 5; Mem 38:910.

Leonard Shockley - Ensign, 38.

Lydia F. Shockley - ZM, 56; Mem 39:174?.

Otis Shumway - (by association with wife Sally; also identified as a follower of Bishop by great-grandson Richard Wildermuth of Plano, Illinois.).
b. 21 JUL 1793, ECIF; ERM; Messenger and Advocate 1(APR 1835):101 (from Orangeville and Java branch, Genesee County, New York);
Sally Witherell Shumway - Gospel Herald (Voree) 20 APR 1848.

Calvin Wesley Siddell (Siddall) - (Strong)

Alfred Alexander Smith - JH 1 AUG 1852; Strong.
b. 6 DEC 1816, Bedford, Bedfordshire, Eng.; NTER, 30 DEC 1845;
Rebaptized Salt Lake City 7th ward, 26 OCT 1851, ECIF; Mem
39:665-666.

Ann Austin Smith - JH 1 AUG 1852.
b. 20 AUG 1813, Ely, Cambridgeshire, Eng.
NTER 30 DEC 1845; Rebaptized 26 OCT 1851 Salt Lake City 7th
Ward, ECIF.

Richard Stephens - ZM, 50, 51; Ensign, 10, 38; R Stephens to James
b. 4 AUG 1791, Morris Co., NJ, ECIF; Patriarchal Blessing Records,
LDS Church, 9:305 n.913.

Henry Suits - ZM, 56.

Phebe Ann Suits - ZM, 56.

Lucy Swett - (by association with husband William)
b. 28 DEC 1810; endowed 3 FEB 1846, NTER.

William Swett - Zion's Harbinger 4, 9(SEP 1854).
b. 7 JUL 1805, Kinsbury, Essex, MA; NTER 3 FEB 1846; was a Seventy
Partiarchal Blessing Records, LDS Church, 14:108, n.133;
Census (1850), Salt Lake City, Utah, 112; Mem 42:375.

Elisha [ ] - Ensign, 37.
George [ ] - Ensign, 37.
Orsen [ ] - Ensign, 37.

[Hired man of Ezra Strong] - Strong.
Appendix C

Gladdenist Organizations and Their Members

NOTE: This list only identifies those individuals whose names are known. It most cases it is clear that Bishop led a larger following than these lists reveal. It is also true that not all individuals were associated with him for the duration of the group's existence, but came and went. Names in parentheses are implied by association.

Those known to have been at Nauvoo with LDS Church - 1839-1846 (* = endowed in Nauvoo Temple)

Zebulon Adams
(Minerva Adams)
Francis G. Bishop
Irena O. Bishop
Polly Conklin *
John A. Forgues
Rosanna Forgues
Reuben Parkhurst
Otis Shumway
Sally Shumway
Alfred A. Smith *
Ann Smith *
Ann Strong *
Ezra Strong *
Lucy Swett *
William Swett *

Nauvoo, Illinois - 1842

Francis G. Bishop
(Irena O. Bishop)

Voree, Wisconsin - 1848

Francis G. Bishop
Otis Shumway
Sally Shumway

Kirtland, Ohio - 1850-51

Francis G. Bishop
Phebe M. Bishop
(Henry Bishop)
Martin Harris

Salt Lake City, Utah - prior to 1852

Thomas Billington
Polly Conklin
John Gallop
wife of John Gallop

Salt Lake City, Utah - 1850-54

Thomas Billington
Curtis Catlin
Polly Conklin *
Luther Cranmer
(Betsey Cranmer)
John Gallop
wife of John Gallop
J [man] Grey
David Heron
[man] Lattimer
Thomas Lewins
John Rogers
Calvin W. Siddell
Alfred A. Smith *
Ann A. Smith *
Ann Strong *
Ezra Strong *
(Lucy Swett) *
William Swett *
father of Ann Strong
mother of Ann Strong
hired man of Ezra Strong
Kanesville (Council Bluffs), Iowa - 1851-56

Avis J. Adams
Minerva Adams
Zebulon Adams
Betty Bardsley
Marinda Barker
Symonds E. Barker
(Thomas Billington)
Francis G. Bishop
(Council Bluffs, 1851-56, con't)

Phebe M. Bishop
[man] Bullock
Levi Cook
Sarah M. Cook
Andrew J. Downing
Mary M. Downing
(John A. Forgues)
(Rosanna Forgues)
Eli B. Hewitt
Harriet P. Hewitt
(Thomas Lewins)
Reuben Parkhurst
Joel Shearer
Alfred A. Smith *
(Ann Smith) *
Richard Stephens
Ann Strong *
Ezra Strong *
Henry Suits
Phebe Ann Suits
(Lucy Swett) *
William Swett *
[woman] Wild

?, Illinois - ?-1854-?

None known by name (At least five members. ZM, 33)
Cincinnati, Ohio - 1855-?

None known by name.

Little Souix, Iowa - 1860

John A. Forgues
(Rosanna Forguess)

Springville, Nebraska - 1862-64

Francis G. Bishop
(Phebe M. Bishop)
Appendix D

Gladdenism's Doctrinal Works

NOTE: The bibliographic citation is followed location information and any necessary explanation.

[Bishop, Francis Gladden]. A Voice of Warning and Proclamation to All. Voree, Wis., 1848.
LDS Church

_____ . A Proclamation to the Sons and Daughters of Zion Scattered Throughout All the Earth. Kirtland, Ohio, 1851.
LDS Church

_____ . An Address to the Sons and Daughters of God, Scattered Abroad, Through All the Earth. Kirtland, Ohio, 1851.
LDS Church

Pierce Collection, Utah State University; LDS Church
This is the only Gladdenite publication to exist in more than a unique copy.

No copy located
This six page division was published and about a third was reprinted in Zion's Messenger the following year.

Pierce Collection, Utah State University

Shearer, Joel and William Swett. Comments on the Kingdom of God and the Gospel. Council Bluffs, Iowa, [1854].
LDS Church