Quintessential Mormonism: Literal-Mindedness as a Way of Life

No single feature of Mormonism strikes many perceptive non-Mormon observers with greater force than Mormon literal-mindedness. For instance, in his monumental and largely sympathetic monograph *The Mormons* published in 1957, Thomas F. O'Dea wrote that "literalism became and largely remained characteristic of the Mormon approach to modern revelation." He also added that Mormonism is "a very literalistic kind of religion, on the whole, basing its claims to divinity and veracity upon the status of its revelations and their literal meaning." [1] Another outside commentator, Ernst W. Benz, professor emeritus of church history at the University of Marburg, observed in 1978 that "in no other Christian doctrine is the idea of man as the image of God so concretely and literally interpreted . . . as in Mormonism." [2]

Similarly, serious Mormon scholars whose secular studies enable them to see the Mormon belief system in a broader historical and ideological perspective become acutely aware of the peculiarly literalistic bent of Mormonism. Sterling M. McMurrin points out that "the intellectual foundations of Mormonism are compatible with its biblical literalism," Richard D. Poll describes the mainstream Mormon as an "Iron Rod member" who finds all the answers in the standard works because "he accepts them as God's word in a . . . literal sense," and Richard Sherlock discusses at length the considerable influence of Joseph Fielding Smith's "defense of an extreme literalism" on the Church's official doctrinal interpretations. [3]

In point of fact, no one from within the Mormon community or without can presume to fathom the peculiar world view of Mormonism without taking into account the literalism of its premises, and I shall attempt to demonstrate in specific ways how and why this is so.

Let me begin with some useful definitions. I use "literalism" and "literal-mindedness" as basically synonymous descriptions of a distinct mind-set which presumes facticity in scriptural accounts, interprets scripture at face value, and by extension, tends to favor one-to-one equivalence over ambiguous multivalence, a reductive simplicity over abstract complexity, the concrete over the

RICHARD J. CUMMINGS, professor of French at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, is also director of its Honors Program and the author of several essays appraising Mormon culture. This essay was first given as a paper at the Sunstone Theological Symposium, 29 August 1982.

speculative, the categorical over the tentative, and finally, the palpably material over the vaguely spiritual.

Moreover, I would like to distinguish four different kinds of literalism. First, there is doctrinal or ideological literalism, or a belief system based on a literalistic interpretation of divine revelations in ancient and modern scripture as well as recent doctrinal pronouncements by Church leaders. Its counterpart, ecclesiastical literalism, is the tendency to perceive rules of conduct and procedural directives as absolutely binding and letter-perfect in their official formulation with minimal latitude for individual interpretation. Another pair is creative literalism—an open, implemental literalism which affords new insights and .challenges old ways of thinking — and defensive literalism which is, by definition, more closed and fearful of untried points of view; it cultivates literalism for its own sake.

The supreme instance of Mormon literalism which is at once the cornerstone of Mormon belief, the *sine qua non* of an orthodox testimony and the prototype if not the fountainhead of the many literal beliefs which were to follow was Joseph Smith's first vision. This experience is accepted literally by most Mormons as "the greatest event that has ever occurred in the world since the resurrection of the Son of God." [4] By his own account, as a puzzled fourteen-year-old, Joseph Smith took literally the words of James 1:5: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." Again, by his own account he concluded that he must "either remain in darkness and confusion" or "do as James directs, that is, ask of God," and the response to his prayer turned out to be one of the most powerful manifestations of deity to be found anywhere. As he relates it, not only did God the Father appear to him but also Jesus Christ, both apparently in glorified physical form as distinct "Personages" (Joseph Smith — History 1:13–26).

The full doctrinal significance of this epiphany was not enunciated by Joseph Smith until the end of his career, notably in the King Follett discourse delivered in April 1844, in which he declared that God is literally an "exalted man" and that men are the literal offspring of God. Surely in the entire Judeo-Christian tradition there has been no more literal interpretation than that of the basic doctrine set forth in Genesis 2:27 that "God created man in his own image."

This initial encounter between Joseph Smith and two very concrete and discrete members of the Godhead set the stage for a series of remarkable events, each as literalistic as the first, which heralded or implemented the founding of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which Joseph Smith declared to be an actual restoration and an exact replica of the original church established by Christ during his earthly ministry. There were other significant and literal events as related by Joseph Smith: the appearance of the angel Moroni who revealed the whereabouts of engraved gold plates and the Urim and Thummim with which Joseph Smith translated them; the appearance of the resurrected John the Baptist who personally conferred the Aaronic Priesthood upon Joseph Smith and his amanuensis, Oliver Cowdery; the appearance of

the resurrected apostles Peter, James, and John who conferred upon Joseph Smith the keys of the Melchizedek Priesthood by a physical laying on of hands; finally, a steady flow of revelations which Joseph Smith received directly from on high and which were presented to the membership and received by them as the literal word of God, all the more so because the vast majority were prefaced by "thus saith the Lord" and were expressed in the deific first-person singular. This unprecedented sequence of events left in its wake a series of starkly literalistic doctrines, some positively electrifying, others mind-boggling in the way in which they seem to defy traditional theological good taste, still others merely quaint, and all logical concomitants of Joseph Smith's first vision.

Probably the most exciting of these literal theological outgrowths of Joseph Smith's seminal encounter with the divine was the doctrine of eternal progression which draws the logical conclusion that since God is an exalted man and the spirits of men were sired by God, then men and women have the potential of evolving literally into gods themselves. It also follows that salvation consists not in seeking the traditional stasis of the beatific vision but rather in achieving a dynamic transformation into divine kings and queens —literally reaching the exalted status of world-peopling gods and goddesses who will function in their celestial kingdoms just as do the divine beings who rule over the world of our experience. Carrying the implications of this doctrine of exaltation one step further along the patriarchal lines which Joseph Smith encountered in the Old Testament led to the doctrine of plural marriage, since procreation on such a cosmic scale could not be limited to a single deified couple but necessitates an array of heavenly wives for each fully evolved god. A noteworthy by-product of this line of theologizing is the belief that Jesus Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost as maintained by traditional Christianity, but, as Elder Bruce R. McConkie puts it, "was begotten by an Immortal Father in the same way that mortal men are begotten by mortal fathers," [5] or in other words, by the literal physical union of God and Mary.

Although I know of no more striking example of Mormon literalism than the anthropocentric sexual implications of the doctrine of eternal progression, I would like to mention two other representative instances of doctrinal literalism before turning to institutional literalism. First, let us examine briefly the tenth Article of Faith. It begins, "We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes." Although the other articles imply literal belief, this is the only one of the thirteen which explicitly includes the term *literal*. It is significant, not only because it suggests that Joseph Smith was himself aware of the extreme literalism of much of what he said, but also because it calls specific attention to the very literal importance which he attached to lineage and more specifically to patriarchal bloodlines. This in turn leads to the fascinating topic of blood literalism, only two aspects of which will be touched upon here: literal adoption into the house of Israel through the process of conversion and literalistic aspects of the doctrine of blood atonement.

Joseph Smith taught that anyone converting to Mormonism, though of completely gentile lineage, was not only adopted into the house of Israel but

also underwent a remarkable change, the effect of which was "to purge out the old blood, and make the convert actually of the seed of Abraham." [6] In other words, not only does the convert experience a spiritual transformation, but he or she also undergoes a miraculous physical change whereby his or her blood is literally transmuted from gentile blood to the blood of Israel.

The doctrine of blood atonement has had a checkered career which by itself could provide a rewarding study of the vagaries of Mormon literalism. Unfortunately, the doctrine appears to be the result of an overly literal interpretation and elaboration of certain scriptures such as Hebrews 9:22 which states that "almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission." Accordingly, the doctrine asserts that those who commit certain grievous sins such as murder and covenant-breaking place themselves beyond the atoning blood of Christ, and their only hope for salvation is to have their own blood shed as an atoning sacrifice. In his writings, Joseph Smith only hinted at the doctrine, Brigham Young successively denied and asserted it, Joseph F. Smith ardently defended it, and in more recent years, Hugh B. Brown repudiated it and Joseph Fielding Smith and Bruce R. McConkie both have vigorously defended it in principle while staunchly denying that the Church has ever put it into actual practice, whereas most other General Authorities have prudently preferred to remain silent on the subject. [7] It should be noted that the whole notion of blood atonement is so obviously linked to the Mormon literal mind-set that it does not seem to admit of a mitigated, symbolic interpretation and is either accepted or rejected outright, depending on one's level of literalistic belief.

The main point of these allusions to the role of blood in Mormon doctrine is the total absence of any *figurative* level of meaning: blood literally changes in the veins of the truly faithful, and the blood of the despicably unfaithful must literally be shed on their own behalf.

Such instances of literal-mindedness are far from unique. Though limited in number, this range of examples does, I hope, amply demonstrate the quintessential role of literalism in Mormon thought and belief. I am convinced that the strongly literal imprint which Joseph Smith left on Mormonism was basically positive, all the more so because the facility with which it enabled him to resolve timeworn theological controversies provided welcome relief from the tired efforts of generations of contending churchmen to rationalize doctrinal inconsistencies with elaborate arguments and figures of speech. Regrettably, in religious circles there has always been a tendency to "out-pope the pope," and in the framework of Mormonism no more striking example of this can be found than the way in which so many of Joseph Smith's followers have sought to outdo the Prophet himself in the pursuit of literalism, a trend which has led to many doctrinal distortions and ecclesiastical abuses.

One of the most poignant examples of ecclesiastical literalism occurred in 1857, and because it led to one of the greatest tragedies in the history of the Church and can also be regarded as a further example of blood literalism and as a paradigmatic instance of institutional literalism, I would like to relate it in some detail. It concerns William H. Dame, a thirty-five-year-old, kindly, mild-

mannered Latter-day Saint living in southern Utah who had been appointed colonel of the Iron County militia by Brigham Young. In 1854 he had received his patriarchal blessing from Elisha Groves of Parowan, the concluding paragraph of which read as follows: "Thou shalt be called to act at the head of a portion of thy brethren and of the Lamanites in the redemption of Zion and the avenging of the blood of the prophets. . . . The Angel of Vengeance shall be with thee, shall nerve and strengthen thee. Like unto Moroni, no power shall be able to stand before thee until thou hast accomplished thy work." [8] Colonel Dame found himself in an awkward position in late August 1857 because of the strong antagonism which the Mormon community felt at the outset of the Utah war toward a group of emigrants camped thirty-five miles southwest of Cedar City on the California Trail. The party was made up of several families from Arkansas and a band of horsemen known as the "Missouri Wildcats," some of whom had boasted openly of having participated in the murder of Joseph and Hyrum Smith at Carthage thirteen years earlier. Dame was caught in a crossfire of demands from local Indians to join in a raid on the emigrants, from local Mormon settlers who demanded revenge, and from still others who strove to keep matters from getting out of hand. Worst of all, there was not time enough to obtain guidance from secular and ecclesiastical headquarters in Salt Lake City. So, under pressure from the local ecclesiastical authority, stake president Isaac Haight, who demanded official orders, and eager to prevent any further friction between the Indians and the Mormons, Colonel Dame clearly fell back on a literal interpretation of his patriarchal blessing, especially with respect to the "avenging of the blood of the Prophets" and the assurance that the "Angel of Vengeance shall . . . nerve and strengthen thee" in issuing the order to John D. Lee which, through a chain of literal-minded obedience to literally conceived orders, led directly to the Mountain Meadows Massacre in which some 120 emigrants, including men, women, and older children, were brutally murdered by a combined force of Indians and Mormon militiamen. William Dame had ample opportunity to reap the whirlwind of his literalism. According to John D. Lee, Dame rode to the site of the massacre and contemplated with horror the contorted bodies of the dead. He then said to Isaac Haight, "I did not think there were so many of them, or I would not have had anything to do with it." Haight replied, "That makes no difference . . . , you ordered me to do it, and you have got to stand by your orders." [9]

I have deliberately chosen a rather lurid example of institutional literalism. Representative of the genre, it embodies literalism of intent and a very literal interpretation and implementation. Even more strikingly, it exemplifies the kind of extremism which so often characterizes literal-mindedness and constitutes, in my opinion, the most serious danger implicit in excessive literalism. I am concerned about this phenomenon not merely as a historical fact but as a contemporary reality. The marked swing toward political and ideological conservativism which has characterized the Church since the early seventies has created a climate which is almost as favorable to institutional literalism as was the garrison mentality of the Church during much of the latter half of the

nineteenth century when political opposition and national unpopularity justified such a mentality. Recent pronouncements by Church leaders such as Elaine Cannon's statement in 1978 that "when the prophet speaks . . . , the debate is over," and President Ezra Taft Benson's declaration in 1979 that the living prophet's utterances take precedence over those of his deceased predecessors and should be regarded by the membership as literal marching orders would indicate that institutional literalism is indeed alive and well in the Church today.[10] In this connection, it is significant that as recently as 1980, a perspicacious non-Mormon scholar, Edwin S. Gaustad, professor of religious studies at the University of California at Riverside, warned of the devastating effects on Mormon historiography if "obscurantism and mindless literalism assume control." [11]

I have already indicated that Joseph Smith realized how literal his teachings were. He also seemed to foresee the dangers inherent in the potential abuses of institutional literalism, for he made periodic statements warning against such abuses, notably when in 1834 he defended the notion that "all men have the privilege of thinking for themselves," and again in 1839 when he warned that all men are disposed "as soon as they get a little authority" to "begin to exercise unrighteous dominion." [12] Probably the greatest single benefit derived from the exercise of institutional literalism is efficiency, and even the Church's most vitriolic detractors grudgingly admit that the Church is a paragon of administrative virtue. But even in one's zeal to follow orders as literally as possible, some attention should be paid to the broader context into which literal-minded obedience fits, for nothing could have been more efficient — or more horrifying — than the Mountain Meadows Massacre in which, as Juanita Brooks relates, "everything went according to the plan, and all accounts agree that it was quickly over." [13]

Occasionally intellectuals, men of some learning like Orson Pratt, were converted to Mormonism or else, like B. H. Roberts, James E. Talmage, and John A. Widtsoe, they developed in a Mormon setting. Such individuals seem to have caught a vision of the implications of Mormon belief beyond the limited literalism of the rank and file. These learned latitudinarians, who could see the scientific and philosophical implications of Mormon doctrine, provided a healthy counterbalance to those who, even at the highest levels of leadership, were more comfortable limiting their religious beliefs and activities to narrower, more literally oriented, and more immediately productive channels. Since the passing of John A. Widtsoe in 1952 and even more emphatically, since the demise of Hugh B. Brown in 1978, Mormon officialdom has come full circle from the naive, open literalism of the fourteen-year-old Joseph Smith to the Church's present-day homogenous and homogenizing official literal-mindedness which fosters blind obedience by discouraging independent thought and all forms of criticism, however honest or constructive.

It is significant that until his death in 1952, Elder Widtsoe, who, before being called to the Council of the Twelve had been a university president and a renowned scholar in his own right, occupied the position of *de facto* theologian for the Church because of his widely acclaimed series of articles, "Evi-

dences and Reconciliations," in which he provided balanced, carefully reasoned answers to probing queries about the gospel. It is equally significant that, whether by default or design, his successor was Joseph Fielding Smith who renamed the series "Answers to Gospel Questions" and proceeded to provide literal replies in which the citing of scriptures and categorical pronouncements took the place of the more scholarly reasoning of Dr. Widtsoe. Finally, it would appear that, more by default than by design, Elder Smith's son-in-law, Elder Bruce R. McConkie, who published in 1966 an alphabetized catalogue of doctrinal statements entitled *Mormon Doctrine*, has succeeded to the unofficial office of resident Mormon theologian.

I cite this threefold succession because it says much about the current role of literalism in the Church, as we can readily see by quoting from their positions on the theory of organic evolution. Elder Widtsoe, who was both a scientist and a General Authority, took eight pages to answer the question, "To what extent should the doctrine of evolution be accepted?" In the course of his discussion, he quotes extensively from scientists and philosophers, as well as mentioning pertinent scriptures, and he concludes as follows: "The law of evolution or change may be accepted fully. . . . It is nothing more or less than the gospel law of progress or its opposite. . . . The theory of evolution which may contain practical truth, should be looked upon as one of the changing hypotheses of science, man's explanation of a multitude of observed facts. It would be folly to make it the foundation of a life's philosophy." [14] Elder Widtsoe thus clearly saw some practical value in the theory of evolution, sought to reconcile Mormonism and science as much as possible, but ultimately made it clear that revealed truth must take precedence over the theories of men. In marked contrast, Joseph Fielding Smith, who once observed that "broad-mindedness leads to apostasy since *Satan is very broad-minded*," [15] adopted a literalistic stance in dismissing the theory of evolution: "The idea that everything commenced from a small beginning . . . and has gradually developed until all forms of life . . . have all sprung from that one source is falsehood absolutely. *There is no truth in it*, for God has given us his word by which we may know . . . the truth of these things." [16] Elsewhere he said: "Naturally, since I believe in modern revelation, I cannot accept these so-called scientific teachings, for I believe them to be in conflict with the simple and direct word of the Lord that has come to us by divine revelation." [17] Finally, Elder McConkie, in the 1979 second edition of his *Mormon Doctrine*, in a ten-page entry entitled "Evolution," uncompromisingly condemns every aspect of the theory of organic evolution, quotes extensively from his father-in-law's *Man: His Origin and Destiny*, and summarizes by stating: "How weak and puerile the intellectuality which knowing that the Lord's plan takes all forms of life from a pre-existent spirit state through mortality, and on to an ultimate resurrected state of immortality, yet finds comfort in the theoretical postulates that mortal life began in the scum of the sea, as it were, and has through eons of time evolved to its present varieties and state!" He then concludes with the italicized pronouncement that *"there is no harmony between the truths of revealed religion and the theories of organic evolution."* [18]

This resurgence of defensive literalism clashes jarringly with the basic Mormon precept that "the glory of God is intelligence" (D&C 93:36) and with the admonition set forth in Doctrine and Covenants 88:118 urging the faithful to seek "out of the best books words of wisdom; seek learning even by study and also by faith." It puts a tremendous strain on well-educated Latter-day Saints who seek to reconcile the "words of wisdom" they have found studying "the best books" with the injunction to interpret and practice their religion as literally as possible. This strain often becomes especially intense during fast and testimony meetings when members may try to outdo each other in the degree of literalism which their powers of belief have attained.

Perhaps the greatest disservice which defensive literalism can do to the Church is to foster the illusion that the entire Mormon enterprise is a kind of divinely sanctioned seamless whole — that, for instance, the Book of Mormon was originally translated so perfectly that not one change has been made in it or that all utterances of all Church leaders are divinely inspired or that all the doctrines of the Church are perfectly understandable and consistent with each other and that there is no room for the slightest controversy. This is generally the very illusion which officially correlated materials — especially manuals of religious instruction — tend to produce, and the impact on thinking members can be devastating. Ultimately, this trend leads to a dichotomy of extremism characterized on the one hand by a kind of "neo-Tertullianism" with those remaining in the fold professing a literalistic *"credo quia absurdum est* (I believe because it is absurd)," and on the other hand, by a disillusioned form of "Tannerism" — the temptation to follow the example of Jerald and Sandra Tanner's single-minded career of systematic denunciation of alleged inconsistencies in the Church. If the breath-taking directness of certain creatively literal doctrines such as man's literal potential to become a god accounts in large measure for the dramatic proselyting successes of the Church, then, conversely, it is because of the stiflingly defensive literal-mindedness of much of the leadership that so many well-educated second- or third-generation Mormons find it difficult to remain within the fold of contemporary orthodoxy in good conscience.

I would like to emphasize that literalism of the most creative sort is an exciting and a very positive part of our Mormon heritage, especially as it relates to the mainstream of Mormon history. Here, for example, are a few of the highlights. We have already noted that Joseph Smith began his religious career as an unschooled youth in 1820 in the most naively literal-minded terms which in retrospect proved to be an incredibly creative literalism, considering the refreshing novelty of his religious views and the irresistible attraction which his message had for many converts. The basic literalism of his teachings tended to appeal in very literal terms to the relatively uneducated. Then as he studied and reflected on the implications of all that his spiritual sources revealed to him, he saw things in ever-broadening perspectives and sought to bring them into more meaningful alignment with each other through the use of increasingly figurative language and such metaphorical allusions as the image of the ladder of progression and the ring of eternal existence in the King Follett dis-

course. Those converted at any particular time tended to focus on the main points of doctrine which had been emphasized up to that point. Those who seized too readily on literal fundamentals without catching the broader vistas and higher meanings which Joseph Smith himself sought out and valued so much tended to become disaffected or break off into splinter groups.

Brigham Young took literally Joseph Smith's prediction that the Saints would relocate in the Rocky Mountains and, in bringing that prophecy to pass, became the Moses of the new world, at the head of a monumental exodus. We proudly extol its fruits, all the more so because it could not have been accomplished without the dedicated personal sacrifice of our pioneer forebears who were willing to obey their leaders to the letter. Heber J. Grant took literally Brigham Young's preaching on the need for Zion to achieve economic self-sufficiency and thereby saved the Church from financial disaster in the Panic of 1893 and, with admirable skill and dedication, continued to consolidate and augment the Church's assets during his presidency.[10] David O. McKay took literally the Savior's injunction to love our neighbor as ourselves and as president of the Church ushered in an era of unprecedented good will in promoting family love and in fostering friendly relations with other churches and with a wide range of non-members. Harold B. Lee took literally Christ's admonition to care for the needy and afflicted when he developed the Church Welfare Plan. And, more recently, President Spencer W. Kimball took literally the precept of Joseph Smith that salvation and even exaltation are ultimately available to *all* men when in 1978 he sought and received a revelation authorizing the granting of the priesthood to blacks.

However, even though the intrinsic literalism of the Mormon religion has for the most part been channeled in positive, creative ways, we have clearly seen that there are many dangers lurking in the natural inclination to exaggerate or misuse that same literalism along narrowly defensive and even manipulative lines. In the Lord's prayer we are enjoined to ask the Lord *not* to lead us into temptation. If for Catholics that temptation lies in excessive reliance on tradition and for Protestants it takes the form of overemphasizing the role of individual conscience, then for Mormons, it seems to me that the great temptation which every faithful Latter-day Saint, and especially those in positions of authority, should resist with every fiber of his or her being is to carry to absurd and damaging extremes the literalism which lies at the core of the Mormon belief system. If Mormonism is the most literal-minded of religions, then Paul's words in 2 Corinthians 3 : 5–6 have very special meaning and a strong note of warning for all Latter-day Saints: "Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

NOTES

1. Thomas F. O'Dea, *The Mormons* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 225–26.

2. Ernst W. Benz, "Imago Dei: Man in the Image of God," in *Reflections on Mormonism*, ed. by Truman G. Madsen (Provo, Ut.: Religious Studies Center at Brigham Young University, 1978), p. 215.

3. Sterling M. McMurrin, *The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965), p. ix; Richard D. Poll, "What the Church Means to People Like Me," DIALOGUE 2 (Winter 1967): 10; Richard Sherlock, " 'We Can See No Advantage to a Continuation of the Discussion': The Roberts/Smith/Talmage Affair," DIALOGUE 13 (Fall 1980): 63–78.

4. Joseph F. Smith, *Gospel Doctrine* (Salt Lake City, Ut.: Deseret Book Company, 1919), pp. 495–96.

5. Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City, Ut.: Bookcraft, 1979), p. 547.

6. Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1977), p. 150.

7. See Joseph Fielding Smith, *Blood Atonement and the Origin of Plural Marriage* (Salt Lake City, Ut.: Deseret News Press, n.d.), pp. 14–16, 22–25. See also McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, pp. 92–93.

8. Cited in Juanita Brooks, *John Doyle Lee: Zealot-Pioneer-Builder-Scapegoat* (Glendale, Calif.: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1964), p. 209.

9. Ibid., p. 219.

10. Elaine Cannon, "If We Want to Go Up, We Have to Get On," *Ensign* 8 (1978): 108; Ezra Taft Benson, "Fourteen Fundamentals on Following the Prophets," Devotional Address delivered 26 Feb. 1980, Brigham Young University, Provo, Ut.

11. Edwin S. Gaustad, "History and Theology: The Mormon Connection," *Sunstone* 5 (Nov.–Dec. 1980), p. 50.

12. Joseph Fielding Smith, *Teachings*, p. 142.

13. Brooks, *John Doyle Lee*, p. 215.

14. John A. Widtsoe, *Evidences and Reconciliations* (Salt Lake City, Ut.: Bookcraft, 1943), p. 156.

15. Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation*, 3 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1954), 3:298.

16. Ibid., 1:140.

17. Joseph Fielding Smith, *Answers to Gospel Questions*, 5 vols. (Salt Lake City, Ut.: Deseret Book Company, 1979), 5:112.

18. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, p. 256.

19. Ronald W. Walker, "Crisis in Zion: Heber J. Grant and the Panic of 1893," *Sunstone* 5 (Jan.–Feb. 1980), pp. 26–34.