

Editing William Clayton and the Politics of Mormon History

[Editors' Note: In its summer 1995 issue, Brigham Young University Studies published a review by James B. Allen of An Intimate Chronicle: The Journals of William Clayton, edited by George D. Smith and published in 1991 (cloth) and again in 1995 (paper) by Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates. Smith subsequently submitted a reply to Allen's review which BYU Studies declined to publish, although it had previously printed such responses in past issues. Because of its interest to Dialogue readers and students of Mormon history, we invited George Smith to submit his reply and also asked James Allen for a response. What follows is Allen's original review (slightly edited and reprinted courtesy of James B. Allen and BYU Studies), Smith's response, Allen's reply, and Smith's concluding rejoinder.]

Editing William Clayton

James B. Allen

THE PERSONAL JOURNALS OF WILLIAM CLAYTON poignantly reflect the experiences, concerns, and attitudes of one of the many faithful Latter-day Saints who, though not leaders, were essential to the strength and success of early Mormonism. After 1842, however, Clayton was particularly close to Joseph Smith, and his journals provide some important insight into the life of the founding prophet of the LDS church. They also shed significant light on the history of the church in England, in Nauvoo, during the exodus from Nauvoo to the Great Basin, and during part of the early Utah period.

An Intimate Chronicle: The Journals of William Clayton consists of abridgements of five journals written by William Clayton, the full text of another, and three appendixes. As detailed below, most of the items have

been published before, but two appear here for the first time. The editor, George Smith, has written a fine introduction in which he reviews Clayton's life and accomplishments and adds several miscellaneous facts about Clayton undiscovered by previous writers (including this reviewer). Footnotes provide other important insights into Clayton and his times, and Smith has done a credible job of editing the material available to him. The main value of this publication is that it brings together in one volume significant portions of Clayton's journals, along with some other writings.

Despite its strengths, several problems are inherent in this publication. "Journal 2" is so incomplete that it cannot be relied upon to provide a full or balanced perspective. "Journal 3" is not a William Clayton journal at all, but, rather, a Heber C. Kimball journal. And the abridgements of two previously published Clayton documents, "Journal 1" and "Journal 4," are so severe that the serious student of Mormon history will want to look at the originals anyway.

"Journal 1: England and Emigration, 1840-1842," is an abridgement of the journal Clayton began on 1 January 1840, while serving as a missionary in Manchester, England. The entire journal was previously published—with profuse annotation—in 1974 by this reviewer and Thomas G. Alexander as *Manchester Mormons: The Journal of William Clayton, 1840 to 1842*.¹ It provides important information on the activities of the LDS church in England in 1840, casts light on the emigration process, and illuminates the story of Zarahemla, an LDS settlement in Iowa that ultimately failed. The original journal is housed in the library at Brigham Young University.

Of the 273 daily entries in this journal, Smith eliminated forty-one, or 15 percent. In addition, nineteen entries are incomplete. Though editors have the right to determine what to eliminate, it is unfortunate in this case that some seemingly significant entries were excluded while some relatively insignificant passages were retained. Sunday, 8 March 1840, for example, was a very eventful Sabbath day for Clayton. In the morning he prayed with a Sister Burgess, who had a serious infection on her breast. He also recorded where he had breakfast; who spoke at church meetings during the day and evening; the ordination of certain men to the priesthood; some baptisms and confirmations; visits he made to members of the church; gifts he received of oranges and money (he often recorded such things as a reflection of his gratitude for people who supplied him with food and other needs while he was working without purse or scrip); and, finally, a cryptic comment about using "liberty" toward Alice Hard-

1. James B. Allen and Thomas G. Alexander, eds., *Manchester Mormons: The Journal of William Clayton, 1840-1842* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1974).

man. In his abridgement, however, Smith kept only about one-sixth of the total entry: "Sister Burgess came. Her breast is very bad. I prayed with her. ... Supper at Hardman's. Used great liberty toward Alice Hardman" (33). By including only the somewhat titillating material and leaving out the much more important information about Clayton and what he was doing as a missionary, this "abridgement" does little but distort the day's activity.

The most problematical document in this collection is "Journal 2: Nauvoo, Illinois, 1842-1846." The original three volumes which comprise this journal are owned by the LDS church and cover the period of 27 November 1842 to 30 January 1846. They constitute an immensely valuable source for understanding the life of Joseph Smith as well as the history of the church during its final years in Nauvoo. Clayton made significant observations, for example, on the tender relationship between Joseph and Emma Smith, as well as some of the tensions between them. He also wrote of Joseph's relationship with other people (both friends and enemies), efforts to institute plural marriage, and the recording of the revelation on plural marriage. Clayton kept the accounts related to building the temple, kept other church records, took care of many of Joseph Smith's business transactions, was involved in the prophet's political activities, participated in Nauvoo's cultural life, observed and helped out in the solution of the many problems that followed Joseph Smith's death, and was deeply involved in the preparations for leaving Nauvoo.²

Scholars should be wary of this "abridgement," however, for the editor did not have access to the original journals. Instead, he relied, for the most part, on highly selected excerpts compiled in 1979 by Andrew Ehat as notes for his specific research interests. Unfortunately, and through no direct fault of Ehat's, these excerpts were purloined and copied in an unauthorized way by yet another person, who illicitly shared them with friends. Like the proverbial feathers tossed to the wind, duplicates spread rapidly. The excerpts were eventually published, unapproved and with no editing, in photoduplicate form by Jerald and Sandra Tanner's Modern Microfilm Company of Salt Lake City. Smith's abridgement is based almost entirely on that source, with some additions from a few other sources.

Smith's introduction to this journal leaves some misleading impressions about its full content. He says, for example, that the Ehat excerpts comprise "approximately one-half of the original holograph journal" (lvi, note). Since he never saw the holograph, however, he had no way of

2. These events are all discussed in detail in James B. Allen, *Trials of Discipleship: The Story of William Clayton, a Mormon* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1987), chaps. 4-7.

knowing that there are actually 1,170 daily entries in the three journals. Smith provides a full, or nearly full, reproduction of 102 entries (8.7 percent) and partial reproductions of another 254 (21.7 percent). Considering all the omissions from the partial entries, it is safe to estimate that less than 25 percent of the whole is included in this publication. Scholars should be very cautious when they try to interpret what is there, for 75 percent of the whole is missing.

Moreover, in the case of the Nauvoo journals, George Smith took no real part in the "abridgement." All he had before him were Ehat's excerpts, which were never intended as an abridgement. They were merely verbatim notes to be used in Ehat's writing; they were not meant to be published as a collection. What was finally published by Modern Microfilm, unfortunately, was an agglomeration of unconnected (except as they related to Ehat's studies) and out-of-context excerpts that piqued the interest of the curious because they seemed somewhat sensational.

Smith correctly observes that Clayton's journals were the source for many entries in the documentary *History of the Church*, edited by B. H. Roberts, but he wrongly suggests that most of the 1843-45 entries are present in edited form in that *History* (lvii). Actually, for the period before the death of Joseph Smith, only about twenty-five of the daily *History of the Church* entries are clearly drawn from the Clayton journals. The same is true of the period after the prophet's death. Clayton wrote in his journal almost daily, but only a very small number of entries in volume seven of the *History of the Church* are based on that source. In nearly every instance, moreover, his journals are much more extensive than the excerpts used in the *History*.³

The result, so far as *An Intimate Chronicle* is concerned, is an abridgement that leaves the worst kind of imbalance. It is not a scholarly abridgement based on a consistent rationale concerning what is important enough to include or insignificant enough to leave out. For example, Ehat's excerpts reveal some problems between Joseph and Emma, but the original journals show with equal clarity that the two were very close and very much in love. Clayton saw the problems, but he also saw the prophet and his wife working together for a common cause in a variety of ways. The excerpts largely obscure that fact.

3. In another misleading statement, Smith says that the journals contain Joseph Smith's "translation" of ancient characters from the Kinderhook plates (xxiv). This is inaccurate. Clayton simply wrote that he had seen the plates and claimed that Joseph Smith had translated a portion of them and had described their content and author. This report appears to be based on hearsay, and no translation was ever given. See Stanley B. Kimball, "Kinderhook Plates Brought to Joseph Smith Appear to Be a Nineteenth-Century Hoax," *Ensign* 11 (Aug. 1981): 66-74.

For example, an entry in *An Intimate Chronicle* for 30 June 1843 mentions a speech given by Joseph Smith after he was arrested in Dixon, Illinois, then freed on a writ of habeas corpus. Missing, however, are what Clayton must have considered the much more important parts of what he wrote that day. He reported Joseph Smith's dramatic entry into Nauvoo amid throngs of Saints grateful to see him. Part of the story, based on Clayton's journal, is recounted in the *History of the Church*, but Clayton observed some intimate, heartwarming particulars that did not appear in the *History*. Emma was at the prophet's side, and Clayton described in beautiful detail the love that was apparent at the reuniting of Joseph and his family: "Prest J. left the buggy and mounted old Charley he called for sister Emma & his brother Hyrum who when they came up and took him by the hand all wept Prest. took hold of the hand of his partner in sorrow and persecution. Surely it would have moved any thing but the heart of an adamantine." Clayton also commented on the non-Mormons who had accompanied Joseph Smith to Nauvoo, "who all gazed with astonishment & rapture to see the enthusiastic attachment of the Mormon people to their beloved leaders." Entries such as these cast quite a different light on Joseph Smith than do out-of-context excerpts that tend to focus on the tensions.

The excerpts bypass many personal entries that reveal the deeply spiritual nature of Clayton himself. They also say little about Clayton's multitudinous daily activities or about the vibrant social life of Nauvoo, yet the journals are filled with notations regarding business affairs, concerts, plays, parties, and other activities that rounded out the lives of Clayton and his friends. In short, the excerpts provide insights into some aspects of Nauvoo history, but they do not reveal the warm, positive image of the church and of Joseph Smith that pervades the journals themselves. They also distort the real character of William Clayton and fail to provide some very important information about the period after the death of Joseph.

All these issues raise questions about the propriety of republishing the excerpts at all. Working without permission to study the original documents doomed their editor to the production of a manifoldly flawed volume.

"Journal 3: Nauvoo Temple, 1845-1846," in this reviewer's opinion, has no place in a publication of Clayton journals, for it is really the journal of Heber C. Kimball, as George Smith himself recognizes (lvii). The Kimball family deposited it in the church archives in 1903 along with several other Kimball journals. It fits exactly, chronologically, with the other journals in the set and carries a handwritten inscription on the first page indicating that it is the journal of Heber C. Kimball. Smith justifies including it with the Clayton journals simply because the major portion of

this particular volume, from 10 December 1845 to 6 January 1846, is in Clayton's handwriting.

Anyone who has studied the keeping of journals in church history must know that Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and other church leaders often called on their scribes and secretaries to record their journals for them. No responsible historian presumes to publish such journals as part of the papers of the scribes who wrote them. Such journals are the journals of those for whom they were written. Smith correctly observes that when Stanley B. Kimball published the journals of Heber C. Kimball, he left this one out. That still does not legitimize publishing it here. If such a journal could be called a Clayton journal, then so could the journal Clayton wrote for Kimball while crossing the plains in 1847. That journal has been published twice—as a Heber C. Kimball journal. The temple journal is in exactly the same category. If it is to be published at all, it should be published with a Kimball collection, not a Clayton collection.

The occasion for Clayton's involvement in writing this portion of Kimball's journal is found in Clayton's personal journal entry for 10 December 1845. That morning Clayton was in his office but feeling "quite unwell." Nevertheless, he wrote, Brigham Young "said he wanted me up in the Temple and would not take no for an answer." Accordingly, the faithful Clayton quit work and found his way to the attic of the temple, where several of the brethren were assembled. At that point, "Er Kimball requested me to write his private journal to day."⁴ The activities that follow clearly explain why Kimball wanted Clayton (who had performed similar duties for him in England in 1840) to write his journal, for Kimball spent the rest of the day busily preparing the temple for the sacred ordinance work that was about to commence. As a church leader, Kimball was one of the key figures in administering those ordinances to the hundreds of Saints who flocked to the temple, day and night, over the next few weeks. Sometimes working until the early morning hours, he had no time to write in his journal. Clayton, too, was busy, but during all that time he wrote in his own journal as well as Kimball's. He continued the dual journal writing until 6 January, while Kimball was in the temple daily. On many of those days Clayton was also there, but after 21 December he spent most of his days working at the office. Clayton never thought of Kimball's journal as his own.

A significant difference exists between the Clayton journal and the Kimball journal for the days that Clayton was in the temple. In his own

4. Interestingly enough, Smith does not include this entry for 10 December in Clayton's Nauvoo journal although it is among the Ehat "excerpts."

journal Clayton told of the people who received the sacred ordinances, but he gave no details. In Kimball's journal (probably under Kimball's instruction), he gave enough detail that faithful Mormons reading it today might rightly feel uncomfortable, for it too openly reflects things they consider deeply sacred. Clayton saw no need, and perhaps even thought it improper, to place such details in his personal journal.

Nevertheless, the Kimball journal gives a heartwarming perspective on the dedication of the Saints who streamed to the temple during this crucial, hectic period just before the exodus from Nauvoo. The journal shows church leaders working tirelessly day and night, even though they were being hounded by their enemies, to give the Saints the blessing of the temple endowment and to give husbands and wives the blessing of being sealed together for eternity. In addition, church leaders and other high priests met regularly for fervent prayer. If the reader tries to imagine all that was happening to the Saints and all that must have been going through their minds in this time of trouble, the temple story is indeed inspiring. Unfortunately, Smith does little in his commentary to magnify this important theme.

Smith's abridgement, for the most part, eliminates long lists of names of those conducting or participating in the ordinances or of those who took part in the many prayer circles and meetings that were held in the temple during those days. In a few places the abridgement leaves some things unclear. The entry for 30 December, for example, deletes several lists of names. At the same time, however, it deletes a reference to a prayer meeting, which makes it impossible to understand to whom the journal is referring when it says that "they united in prayer, for the preservation of President Brigham Young and his Council" (244).

As in the case of "Journal 2," the Kimball journal is owned by the LDS church, which has not given permission for its publication. Smith may have felt justified in publishing it because an "underground" copy has been circulating for a few years. In 1983 Modern Microfilm printed a photographic reproduction, apparently taken from a microfilm that had been spirited away from the LDS church archives without permission. Apparently Smith worked from this "photographic copy" in making his transcription.

"Journal 4: Pioneer Trek West, 1846-1847," is an abridgement of Clayton's well-known pioneer journal, published by his family in 1921 and republished at least twice since then and readily available. The original manuscript is in the Clayton collection in the church archives. Some differences exist between the text as published by Smith and that published by the family, but they are neither extensive nor serious. In a few instances Smith corrects some errors in the original publication. In his

abridgement, however, he deleted numerous daily entries and condensed many more, resulting in the elimination of close to 50 percent of the original text. On the other hand, Smith provides a few entries at the end that, for some unknown reason, the family did not include in the 1921 publication.

"Journal 5: Visit to Utah Settlements, 1852," is the first of two documents in this collection that have not been published in some form elsewhere. It is short but interesting. Because of its brevity, Smith has not abridged it at all. Unfortunately, he only briefly explains the significance of the expedition covered by this journal. This was the occasion of Brigham Young's second annual visit to the settlements in southern Utah, but the group's mission also included "exploring the country, ascertaining the situation of the Indians, making roads, building bridges, killing snakes, preaching the gospel, and doing and performing all other acts and things needed to be done, as they may be led by the Good Spirit."⁵ Clayton was assigned to go along as the official scribe. The expedition traveled over 300 miles southward, visiting all the Mormon settlements between Salt Lake City and Parowan. The journal, which begins on 21 April, comments on the Native Americans the group encountered, gives Clayton's impressions of some of the communities themselves, and provides several other interesting insights. The original manuscript is owned by the LDS church.

"Journal 6: Polygamy Mission to England, 1852-1853," also in the Clayton collection and owned by the church, is the other document that has not been published previously. Clayton was one of nearly a hundred missionaries sent out immediately after the special conference in August 1852, in which Orson Pratt made the first public announcement of the doctrine of plural marriage. These new missionaries were not just to preach the gospel as usual, but also to make the new doctrine known to the world. Clayton's journal tells of the trip eastward across the plains; the many doctrinal discussions held around the campfire; his disappointment when, in St. Louis, he saw the doctrine of plural marriage roundly rejected by some of the Saints as well as other people; and his missionary work for the short time he was in England. Misunderstanding and some personal conflicts led to his temporary suspension as a missionary, though he was soon reinstated after an investigation by the mission president. The facts are incomplete in the diary, but on 4 February 1853 Clayton wrote a letter to Thomas Bullock explaining them in detail. The letter is in the Bullock papers in the church archives; unfortunately, Smith did not see fit to either reproduce

5. Andrew Jenson, *Journal History of the Church*, 22 Apr. 1852, archives, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.

or summarize it in a footnote.⁶

Since this journal is brief, Smith did not extensively abridge it. Nevertheless, several ellipses in the text tend to diminish the value of the publication. The entry for Saturday, 25 September 1852, for example, is gone, yet it reveals much about Clayton's faith. It would have taken only a few more pages to reproduce the journal completely.

Smith provides three worthwhile appendixes. The source used for the first, "Extracts from William Clayton's [Private] Book," is a handwritten manuscript located in the papers of L. John Nuttall at Brigham Young University. Nuttall's source was apparently a private journal kept by Clayton in which he recorded excerpts from several sermons of Joseph Smith. The extracts are interesting, but they say nothing specific about Clayton. Moreover, whether Clayton actually heard these sermons or whether he copied them from someone else's transcription is unclear. One short entry, titled "A key by Joseph Smith Dec 1840," deals with the "key" by which someone may determine whether a messenger is a "spirit from God" or from the devil.⁷ On 9 February 1843 Clayton was with the prophet in Nauvoo when he repeated the same instructions, as recorded in Doctrine and Covenants 129:4-9. That passage is actually a word-for-word duplication (except for one minor difference) of Clayton's Nauvoo journal entry for that date. This entry was the source for the official transcription when it was prepared for the Doctrine and Covenants. The editor of *An Intimate Chronicle* could not have known this, since he had access only to the sketchy, highly selected excerpts from the Nauvoo journal.

The second appendix, "An Interesting Journal," is a historical essay, penned by William Clayton, on the building of the Nauvoo temple. The original handwritten manuscript is in the Nauvoo collection in the church archives, but Smith's source was the *Juvenile Instructor*, which published the essay serially in 1886. The editors of the *Instructor* made numerous grammatical and punctuation changes to the original, shortened

6. The reader who is interested in what Clayton had to say should try to see it in the Bullock collection or see the discussion in Allen, *Trials of Discipleship*, 290-92.

7. The key is that if the spirit is from God he will not offer you his hand, but if from the devil he will "either shrink from you or offer his hand, which if he does you will feel nothing, but be deceived" (514). Significantly, the same idea is recorded in Wilford Woodruff's journal under the date 27 June 1839. It was among the instructions Joseph Smith gave to the Twelve before they left on their mission to the British Isles. It is also noted in Willard Richards's "Pocket Companion," a notebook that contains many of those instructions. Since Richards was in England when they were given in June 1839, it is apparent that he got his information from notes shared with him by the apostles when they arrived in 1840. George Smith suggests that Clayton heard the idea from Joseph in Nauvoo in an otherwise unknown December 1840 sermon (514). Others have assumed that Clayton got his note either from Richards or Woodruff and recorded it in his book during the month of December. It is possible that the prophet spoke on the subject on several occasions.

some sentences, and reconstructed others. The changes are not serious in terms of historical understanding, but some scholars would have preferred a faithful reproduction of Clayton's original account. The most disappointing thing about the *Instructor* version is that it does not reproduce the entire original. It stops on page 85 of a 100-page manuscript. Even though the original does not tell the story of the Nauvoo temple through its completion, it would be nice to have the full document published.

The last appendix is William Clayton's account of how he was introduced to the doctrine and practice of plural marriage and his recording of the revelation (Doctrine and Covenants 132) as it was dictated by Joseph Smith. George Smith's source is a version published by Andrew Jenson in 1887.⁸ The original handwritten manuscript is in the Clayton papers in the church archives. There are minor differences in terms of punctuation, but for all practical purposes both published versions are true to the original.

An *Intimate Chronicle* brings together, mostly in abridged fashion and often relying on secondhand sources, several documents produced by William Clayton. Most of the collection has been published elsewhere, but having it available in one volume, even though the abridgement sometimes leaves misleading impressions, provides students of Mormon history with a modest tool for studying some aspects of Clayton and his times. But it must be used with caution.

A Response: The Politics of Mormon History

George D. Smith

AN INTIMATE CHRONICLE: THE JOURNALS OF WILLIAM CLAYTON appeared in 1991 as part of an on-going Significant Mormon Diaries series sponsored

8. "Plural Marriage," *Historical Record* 6 (May 1887): 224-26.

by Signature Books of Salt Lake City.⁹ The volume comprised six journals written by early Mormon convert William Clayton, two of which reflect his eyewitness role as personal secretary to the prophet Joseph Smith. The six journals cover the period from 1840 to 1853 and are accompanied by three appendices, including a sworn affidavit in which Clayton discussed plural marriage. In editing Clayton's diaries for publication, I hoped to provide readers with, what several reviewers subsequently described as, a "panorama of the early Mormon movement," including "the beginnings of plural marriage, the relationship of Joseph and Emma Smith ... the Council of Fifty, and the historical development of the temple endowment." For these and other readers, Clayton's journals clearly contain "a richness of information found nowhere else."¹⁰

Four years after publication of *An Intimate Chronicle* in a limited edition of 500 copies, and coinciding with the trade paperback reprint edition, historian James B. Allen reviewed *An Intimate Chronicle* for *BYU Studies*.¹¹ Though he acknowledged some value in having all of Clayton's journals together, Allen pronounced my abridged presentation inadequate to provide either sufficient balance or scholarship and implied that it would have been better not to have published the book at all. In his words: *An Intimate Chronicle* was "an abridgement that leaves the worst kind of imbalance. It is not a scholarly abridgement based on a consistent rationale concerning what is important enough to include or insignificant enough to leave out"; "significant entries were excluded while some relatively insignificant passages were retained." "All these issues raise questions about the propriety of reproducing the excerpts at all. Working without permission to study the original documents doomed the editor to the production of a manifoldly flawed volume." Regarding this latter criticism, Allen failed to explain that permission to publish previously unpublished documents resides with the writer's heirs, unless literary rights have been formally transferred to another individual or party. In fact, I did obtain the consent of Clayton family members to publish the

9. Publications of Mormon journals were among the first projects undertaken by Signature Books. In 1983 Signature released a limited nine-volume typescript edition of *Wilford Woodruff's Journal*. Recognizing that the diaries of Joseph Smith had not been published in their entirety in the 143 years since his death, Signature initiated, in association with Smith Research Associates, a Significant Mormon Diaries Series with their publication in 1987. Since then Signature has published the diaries and journals of Heber C. Kimball, John Henry Smith, Martha Hughes and Angus M. Cannon (correspondence), Rudger Clawson, William Clayton, and Reed Smoot. *An Intimate Chronicle* is the fifth in the series.

10. See, for example, the reviews by Keith J. Clayton, "Clayton journals impress descendant," *Provo Daily Herald*, 30 July 1991; Kenneth J. Godfrey, review in *Journal of Mormon History* 18 (Fall 1992): 222-27; and Kenneth H. Winn, review in *Journal of the Early Republic* 12 (Summer 1992): 282-83.

11. Vol. 35 (Spring 1995), issue 2, pp. 165-75.

journals. (One wonders if Allen also received permission from the family to copy and publish what journal material he has used in his own research.)

Thus Allen dissented from the generally warm welcome the book received from readers, reviewers, historians, libraries, and the public. Even so, his voice commands a serious hearing. For within the Mormon historical community, he is a visible and respected scholar. He is Senior Research Fellow at the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Church History on the BYU campus. He is also a prize-winning Clayton biographer and with Thomas G. Alexander published his own edition of one of Clayton's journals twenty years ago.¹² He may be an expert on Clayton, but I believe a more impartial reviewer would have commented differently. Ultimately, his review reveals more about the contemporary politics of research into Mormon history than it does about my editorial treatment of William Clayton's journals.

Clayton is important. As Allen says: "Clayton was particularly close to Joseph Smith, and his journals provide some important insight into the life of the founding prophet of the LDS Church. They also shed significant light on the history of the church in England, in Nauvoo, during the exodus from Nauvoo to the Great Basin, and during part of the early Utah period." Thus the prospect of making all of Clayton's known journals available was an exciting goal for me.

However, as I noted in the introduction to *An Intimate Chronicle*, I was unable to access the complete text of Clayton's important Nauvoo Journal, a fact that Allen misuses in his attempt to discredit the entire compilation. Moreover, the mass of the other five Clayton journals required a considered decision about what kind of work the collection was to be. I chose to publish an essential one-volume edition of Clayton. In the process I printed an average of 80 percent of all the texts except the Nauvoo Journal. With acknowledgements, introduction, chronology, photographs, maps, three appendices, and index, the resulting compilation amounted to 675 typeset pages. My decisions regarding abridgements were based solely on repetition and relevance: some material was clearly redundant, most notably in Journal Four in which Clayton, while crossing the Great Plains, began many entries with "Morning fine and pleasant." In the case of Journal Three, a record of the Nauvoo, Illinois, temple, the issue was space and reader interest, and this journal appears unabridged, except for deleting the lists of names of temple endowees.

Because of the utility of access to the full texts, complete typescripts or photocopies are now available to interested researchers at the follow-

12. See his *Trials of Discipleship: The Story of William Clayton, a Mormon* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987); and, coedited with Thomas G. Alexander, his *Manchester Mormons: The Journal of William Clayton, 1840-1842* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1974).

ing repositories: Marriott Library, University of Utah: Journals 1, 3 (including the names of those who participated in Nauvoo temple ceremonies), 4, 5, 6; Lee Library, Brigham Young University: Journal 1; and LDS church archives: Journals 4, 5, 6. An abridged typescript of Journal 2 with an accompanying list of the subjects of many of the absent entries is also available at the Marriott Library. Importantly, the typescript of Journal IV, "The Trek West," now available in *An Intimate Chronicle* is more accurate than any previously published version and has been returned to Clayton's own words. The same is true for the never-before-published "Visit to Utah Settlements" and "Polygamy Mission to England" journals, numbers V and VI, and to the "Nauvoo Temple Journal," number III, which had been published as a photocopied holograph but never before transcribed and annotated.

Insofar as Allen questions my specific abridgements, I am happy to discuss them. But his blanket characterization of the entire book as a "modest tool" completely ignores the criteria upon which I based what to include and exclude as well as difficulties necessarily imposed by my limited access to the Nauvoo Journal. In fact, Allen calls Clayton's Nauvoo Journal "the most problematical document in the collection ... so incomplete [it] cannot be relied upon" for "full or balanced perspective." As Allen knows, this journal is indeed a special case.

William Clayton's Nauvoo Journal is composed of three separate handwritten notebooks dating from 27 November 1842 to 30 January 1846. It reflects an important period in the development of the church, including the earliest practice of polygamy, Joseph Smith's death, and preparation for the trek out of the United States to the Great Salt Lake Valley. Sometime after Clayton's death, this journal was deposited in LDS church archives; later it was transferred to the First Presidency's office where it remains to this day. This is the only one of Clayton's journals for which I did not possess at the very minimum a copy of the holograph. From a variety of official and unofficial sources, I managed to compile a manuscript for the Nauvoo Journal; although my composite was incomplete, my research allowed me to identify the specific subjects, by date, of many entries I could not include verbatim. Some of these were silently included in the *History of the Church* in 1902-11. Although Allen feels that Clayton's journal was a minor source for that volume, that "only about twenty-five of the daily *History of the Church* entries are clearly drawn from the Clayton journals" (168), Elder Joseph F. Smith commented at Clayton's funeral about his Nauvoo Journal: "[I]t is to his pen to a very great extent that we are indebted for the history of the Church ... in the days of Nauvoo."¹³

13. *Deseret Evening News*, 9 Dec. 1879.

Although *An Intimate Chronicle* made a vital part of Clayton's Nauvoo Journal available to readers, more than had been published before, the value of the volume would unquestionably have been enhanced had I had access to the entire document or been able to publish other entries that I acquired information about. But Allen's judgment of the book fails to mention pertinent context for this particular journal.

In 1988, early in my work on the journals, I invited Allen to collaborate, because of his own interest in Clayton. In fact, in 1979 Allen, at the time Assistant LDS Church Historian, had been among a handful of researchers permitted to examine Clayton's original Nauvoo Journal, and over a three-week period he and colleague Dean C. Jessee had typed a 300-page, double-spaced typescript of the journal. The next year, when he moved along with other members of the LDS historical department to the BYU campus, he took his typescript with him. But according to his own sworn testimony, Allen had only received official permission to "use" the Nauvoo Journal, not to make his own copy of it.¹⁴ By the time I began work on *An Intimate Chronicle*, the Nauvoo Journal had never been published in its entirety, and Allen was a natural choice to participate. When we first spoke about it just prior to the Mormon History Association meeting in May 1988, he was enthusiastic.

Only one obstacle remained to his involvement, a task that came with his roles as Assistant Church Historian and a member of the BYU faculty: to publish his typescript, he believed he first had to obtain permission from the current Church Historian and managing director of the historical department. Over the next six months Allen's disposition toward the project changed significantly. When I visited him in his BYU office on 5 December of that year, he said he could not talk about Clayton, could not offer any help, asked me not to mention his name in connection with the publication of the diaries, and cautioned me that the meeting we were having "never took place." The next time I saw him, on 21 February 1990, he denied ever having asked for permission to edit the Nauvoo Journal. He then gave some warning advice about the project, and we agreed that since he had provided me with no help there would be no acknowledgment of him in my publication. In *An Intimate Chronicle* I explicitly noted that Allen and Jessee "have not shared this [their typescript] with the editor" (lvi, n126).

I continued to gather the journal material into a draft document and consulted with other scholars as I completed the manuscript for publication. Piece by piece I acquired a broad grasp of the contents of the Nauvoo Journal and thus was able to describe missing sections (see lvi-vlii).

14. See Allen's testimony in *Ehat v. Tanner*, Brief of Appellee to 10th Circuit, January 10, 1985, and Decision from U.S. Court of Appeals, 10th Circuit, December 30, 1985, photocopies in my possession.

In fact, the portion published in *An Intimate Chronicle* comprises significantly more of the original holographic text than the 25 percent Allen erroneously asserted in his review. Allen both undercounted the published Nauvoo Journal entries and ignored my description of omitted entries. His calculations were based on the number of entries printed compared to the total entries in the journal (the latter would include numerous repetitious or relatively uninformative passages and thus was not a particularly meaningful measure). Though Allen objected to it as "misleading," I stand by my estimate based on a comparative page count adjusted for spacing that "approximately half" of the text of the Nauvoo Journal appears in *An Intimate Chronicle*. Now that the way has been paved, hopefully Allen (or others) will soon publish a complete copy of the Nauvoo Journal.

Underlying the barriers to my examination of all the original Clayton manuscripts is the fact that LDS church leaders continue to refuse unrestricted access to selected sources of our common history. Such policies make Allen's debate over scholarly handling meaningless: church leaders choose who has access and how they use the information they get. And for all his assertions regarding my lack of scholarly responsibility, Allen strategically failed to inform readers that his own typescript copy of the Nauvoo Journal was not "authorized," since he did not receive permission to use the handwritten journal left with him in his office and there make a full verbatim typescript of it.¹⁵ Ironically, Allen's own unauthorized typescript became the source of a portion of the "unofficial" copy he now criticizes me for having used. From this unauthorized typescript and other sources, a BYU graduate student prepared 88 pages of extracts, reproduced by Modern Microfilm Company in 1982 and later declared legally uncopyrightable by court judgement.¹⁶

Unauthorized personal use such as Allen himself has made of Clayton's Nauvoo Journal is but one manifestation of the clandestine and arbitrary process imposed by restricted access; but it does not even contribute to the scholarly responsibility Allen calls for. Furthermore, what is there to hide? By most accounts, the most "explosive" material in the Nauvoo Journal had already been published.

For Allen to question whether I should have abridged all of the journals into a single volume raises a legitimate issue. The same cannot be said for his charge that I intentionally selected sensational passages at the expense of those expressing spiritual dedication or chronicling daily life in the Mormon communities: "[T]he excerpts bypass many personal entries that reveal the deeply spiritual nature of Clayton himself. They also

15. See Testimony of James Brown Allen, *Ehat v. Tanner* Trial Record, March 21, 1984, 236-37, photocopy in my possession.

16. See *Ehat v. Tanner*, Trial Record.

say little about Clayton's multitudinous daily activities or about the vibrant social life of Nauvoo." These assertions are clearly false.

In one example Allen implied that I excised devotional passages and important details of Clayton's missionary life to make room for passages Allen considered "titillating." He referred to the 8 March 1840 entry as an example of my editorial imbalance and he complained that I kept "only one-sixth of the total entry." The references I deleted included: "Went to Prince's for breakfast. Brother John Moon spake a while then I spoke a while in P.M. I opened meeting. Brother John spoke a little." What did Allen find "important" about the repetitive passages I left out? And why did he not consider in his analysis the many devotional passages I included? Allen disregarded passages such as the 23 May 1847 entry: After treating Nathaniel Fairbanks's snakebite, Clayton records

the Camp were called together for a meeting, and after singing and prayer addressed by Erastus Snow. Followed by President Young. The latter said there was many items of doctrine which he often felt like teaching to the brethren, but as to administering sealing ordinances &c. this is no time nor place for them, they belong to the house of God, and when we get located we shall have opportunity to build a house &c ... If all the knowledge in this camp were put together and brother Joseph was here in our midst, he could comprehend the whole of it and wind it around his little finger, say nothing of the knowledge of Angels, and above that, the knowledge of Gods (321).

The Nauvoo Journal does contain material some readers might consider sensational; and Allen pointed to unpublished passages he knew the journal contained to make the point that I intentionally left out Clayton's accounts of daily life. But Allen ignored the many memorable accounts of Mormons at work, play, rest, and prayer in *An Intimate Chronicle*. In fact, some of the richest descriptions are included in the journal Allen said should not have been included in the first place: "Journal 3: Nauvoo Temple ... has no place in a publication of Clayton journals, for it is really the journal of Heber C. Kimball, as George Smith himself recognizes (lvii)." Clayton wrote the so-called "Nauvoo Temple Journal" for Heber C. Kimball from 10 December 1845 to 7 January 1846. Not only is the document in Clayton's handwriting, but his observations are recorded in his distinctive style, which differs from the journals Kimball wrote himself. In fact, Stanley B. Kimball, the editor of Kimball's journals,¹⁷ decided not to include it in his edition of Heber's journals because "it is not a Kimball diary [but] should more properly be classified as a William Clayton diary, or, perhaps, as a kind of Nauvoo Temple record."¹⁸

17. See his *On the Potter's Wheel: The Diaries of Heber C. Kimball* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates, 1987).

18. *Ibid.*, xiv.

Allen suggested that I included it simply because it was in Clayton's handwriting and that in my eagerness to publish sensational material I overlooked the fact known to "anyone who has studied the keeping of journals in Church history" that "Church leaders often called on their scribes and secretaries to record their journals for them. No responsible historian presumes to publish such journals as part of the papers of the scribes who wrote for them." Though he cloaked his objection in the vocabulary of professionalism, Allen nonetheless communicated the posture of those who simply did not want the journal to be published. The same general authority who denied Allen permission to work on the Nauvoo Journal asked me in October 1990 not to include the Nauvoo Temple Journal either. Apparently, three entries provoked concern: On pages 205-206 Clayton describes how the "main room" of the temple was "divided into apartments for the ceremonies of the endowment." Then he provides measurements of rooms, "alleys," partitions, arches and their divisions, portraits, mirrors, paintings, tables, sofas, and carpets, and how different spaces represent different afterlife kingdoms, and he speaks briefly of what he refers to as charges, tokens, and key words.¹⁹ Finally, on 16 December 1845 he describes two sisters "overseeing the washings and anointings in the female department, and instructing the Sisters in cutting and making robes and garments," some of which is explained in a footnote.

Parts of Clayton's Temple Journal reflect sexist or patriarchal attitudes inherent in the Nauvoo theocracy. For example, women are given second-class status in this male-dominant society; they are told that "the man must love his God and the woman must love her husband," and that "woman will never get back [to God] unless she follows the man back" (238-41). In addition, Clayton records frivolous activities in the temple. On 26 December 1845 he reports that some men were doing "things that ought not to be done ... Some three or four men and perhaps more, had introduced women into the Temple, not their wives, and were living in the side rooms ... and toying with their women." Some readers might find this "sensational," but it is what Clayton wrote, part of the overall Mormon story in Nauvoo. The Temple Journal holds social and religious portent. Its account of the Mormon temple and acceleration of plural marriages in Nauvoo before the Saints crossed the Mississippi River in early 1846 is an important part of Mormon and American history. If sexism or sensation is there, what do we do? Rewrite history to achieve some "politically" expedient interpretation that men and women were treated equally? Bury it because it is embarrassing? Or, in the role of apol-

19. Yet compare the published description of the Nauvoo temple ordinance rooms in *History of the Church*, 7:541-42.

ogist rather than historian, find a reason why the journal should not be published?

What Allen did not indict in *An Intimate Chronicle* for being left out or wrongfully included, he dismissed as being nothing new. Indeed, before Signature Books published Clayton, some of his journals had already been printed. Allen implied repeatedly that *An Intimate Chronicle* was therefore redundant: "The entire journal [1] was previously published [by himself and a colleague]." He overlooked the incremental contribution of accuracy in each of the six journals collected. In preparing my edition, I corrected textual errors in the earlier publications. Even my re-editing of the "complete" and "profusely annotated" England journal, as Allen characterized his own work, *Manchester Mormons*, was based on the task of scrutinizing Clayton's hard-to-read holographic pencil diary. During the time I spent with that diary at the Lee Library, I discovered in Allen's own edition numerous changes introduced to Clayton's original words. Missing illegible words were occasionally not noted, such as at the end of the entry dated 10 January 1840. Even legible words were silently omitted: "He has heard about some work [about] 17 miles from Manchester" (24 Jan. 1840). In other cases, Clayton's sentences were disjoined by adding a period in mid-sentence: "Conversed a good deal on the order of the church [period inserted] after I returned home" (13 Feb. 1840); "She also saw in a dream [period inserted] Brother Richards and Robert Williams and one of Hardmans sons and old Richard Hardman sitting in a room together" (6 Mar. 1840). Allen substituted his own, sometimes less appropriate, words for Clayton's language. Whereas Clayton had written: "She had the same feeling with them but *fully* stronger," Allen used *full* instead (25 Jan. 1840). Speaking of the Burgess brothers in Manchester, Clayton wrote: "Wm. [Burgess] rejected our testimony. The other would seek *after* it." Allen replaced *after* with *upon* (15 Feb. 1840). Even more misleadingly, Allen altered Clayton's reference to Brother *Moon*, probably Clayton's father-in-law, to Brother *Moore* (21 Jan. 1840). In misspelling Clayton's words, such as using *greaved* for *grieved* (31 Jan. 1840), Allen made Clayton appear less educated than he was (Allen spells the word correctly later in the entry). Where Clayton articulated a specific past perfect action, "Sister Walmsley *had* told lies," Allen omitted the helping verb *had*, blunting Clayton's meaning (8 Feb. 1840). The entry date 4 March 1840 is missing in Allen's edition and he included the text for that date in the previous day's journal. Corrections now available in *An Intimate Chronicle* to such misinterpretations bring Clayton's language and ideas into sharper focus.

Despite Allen's criticisms, I abridged very little from the England and Emigration Journal in *An Intimate Chronicle*, mostly redundant passages and a few illegible lines such as the following: (23 Mar. 1840) "At

home all day. [.....]ing dogs &c.”; (21 May 1840) “Went to Preston in the P.M. Water at Sister Morgan”; (16 June 1840) “To Sister Booths at Newton. Sarah and Rebecca with”; and (23 June 1840) “Had a good meeting at night.” The abridgement of these entries has little to do with Allen’s issue of “balance” and, in fact, tends to highlight the more meaningful sections.

While Allen’s edition was competent, I believed it was possible and valuable to enhance its clarity in textual interpretation, to annotate neglected subjects within the narrative, and to place it in the context of the rest of Clayton’s journals. For instance, some of the introduction and annotative material in *An Intimate Chronicle* contributed aspects to Clayton’s early life that had never been published before. Charnock Moss, the place where Clayton was born and raised, was not described in Allen’s biography of Clayton nor in his annotations to the England journal: Clayton’s only mention of his early home is found in his 1852-53 journal of a return to England. Charnock Moss was a hundred-acre farmland drained from a peat bog in rural England and in Clayton’s day was a square mile in area, about a third of Clayton’s resident township, Penwortham. Further research also led to Clayton’s marriage certificate, which told a small story in itself, with its X marks for the signatures of his first wife and later sister-wife, Ruth and Margaret Moon, alongside Clayton’s signature.

Clayton’s previously unpublished final journal, which describes his return to England to explain polygamy in 1852-53, contributes to the context of the entire collection. Even here Allen looked for omissions rather than for the value of making the previously unpublished journal available. He complained that an important letter from Clayton to Thomas Bullock, dated 5 February 1853, which explained Clayton’s difficulty preaching polygamy to the British, was missing: “Smith did not see fit to either reproduce or summarize it in a footnote.” Allen had featured the letter prominently in his biography of Clayton but he overlooked its presence in my edition. On page 490 of *An Intimate Chronicle*, footnote 44 excerpts and cites the letter in which Clayton explains that a “scoundrel to be revenged on the doctrine of plurality, made use of arguments which I used to show him that it was scriptural, as though I had more wives than one, and has trumped up a malisious set of lies [that Clayton was an adulterer] and told them to some of the brethren in Manchester.” For attentive readers, the full story is there in the journal and in the annotations.

Clearly I am disappointed with what I see as Allen’s lack of scholarly balance. In fact, I believe he managed to accomplish what he accused *An Intimate Chronicle* of doing: he wasted an opportunity to provide a useful research document. He reflected the attitude of those church officials and historians who call for the restriction of important historical materials. After refusing to contribute to the publication of these important histori-

cal journals, and then actively discouraging the process, he turned judgments about historical standards to political ends. He raised issues—some legitimate, some spurious—of sources and balance rather than addressing underlying problems of restricted access which have borne upon his own career as well as the publication of William Clayton's journals. In assuming this role, Allen failed to take advantage of an opportunity to speak out against the policies which weaken the practice of good scholarship among Mormons.

A Reply

James B. Allen

I APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND to George Smith's critique of my review of *An Intimate Chronicle: The Journals of William Clayton*. I am also pleased that, in fairness to *Dialogue* readers, the editors saw fit to publish my original review along with Smith's critique. This makes it easier for readers to evaluate both perspectives.

Even though I questioned the propriety of publishing two of the items reproduced by Smith, I agree that the publication of all the Clayton journals under one cover, even in abridged form, was worthwhile. I said as much in the review, and I also emphasized the value of the three important appendixes included in the book. I further believe, as I said in the review, that Smith did a credible job of editing the material available to him. I should probably underscore that point more strongly, for in my comparison of the texts in *An Intimate Chronicle* with the original texts available to Smith, I found remarkably few errors of transcription. I also agree that, for the most part, Smith's abridgements were responsible, though I pointed to a few passages that illustrate problems often inherent in abridgements. My major concern was with what Smith identified as "Journal 2: Nauvoo, Illinois, 1842-1846." It was *only* the excerpts from this journal that I described as "an abridgement that leaves the worst kind of imbalance." Contrary to the inference in Smith's critique, I did not intend

this statement to characterize *An Intimate Chronicle* as a whole, but only "Journal 2." I am sorry if it was misstated or misread, but I believe that readers who examine my review carefully will see that the statement is in the section dealing with "Journal 2" and applies only to that journal.

Smith's response to my concerns over "Journal 2" points to some essential differences in perspective between the two of us. He raises the question of permission to publish the excerpts, correctly emphasizing the fact that he obtained the consent of Clayton heirs who, he explains, retain the literary rights. My own feeling is that since these journals are owned by the church, it is inappropriate to publish them (or any other manuscripts in the church archives) without church permission, regardless of the legal technicalities relating to the heirs. My comment in the review, however, was not about *literary* rights. Rather, it concerned the fact that Smith did not have "permission to *study the original documents*," and therefore had no basis for determining the accuracy of the material available to him. For the most part, all he had were excerpts from the Clayton journals, taken as research notes by Andrew Ehat. (Smith also drew from a few other sources, but the Ehat notes provided the overwhelming bulk of the entries in "Journal 2.") These verbatim notes reflected Ehat's particular research interest, but were never intended as an "abridgement" of the Nauvoo journals. My own analysis of the Ehat excerpts shows that they are reasonably accurate transcriptions of the original. Smith's reproduction, moreover, was generally faithful to the Ehat material. Nevertheless, the excerpts are highly selective, they usually include only a portion of the daily entry, and they do not constitute more than about 25 percent of the whole.²⁰ For these reasons I felt it important to warn prospective readers that "Journal 2" is not a real "abridgement" based on the same consistent rationale that governed Smith's abridgement of the other journals in *An Intimate Chronicle*. Rather, it is an often misleading "agglomeration of unconnected ... and out-of-context excerpts." This is not a criticism of Smith's editing, for he did a good job with what he had before him. It is simply part of my concern over whether this journal should have been published at all in that form.

Smith cites other reviews of *An Intimate Chronicle*, including one by

20. Smith claims that the excerpts constitute around 50 percent of the whole, based on a "comparative page count adjusted for spacing." He discounts my estimate by saying that the total entries in the journal "would include numerous repetitious or relatively uninformative passages and thus was not a particularly meaningful measure." Such passages, nevertheless, help make up the whole, and there are really far fewer of them than this statement implies. Please refer to my review for my own explanation of how I arrived at my estimate. I simply do not understand how Smith could make his count or reach the conclusion he did without also having direct access to the whole.

Kenneth W. Godfrey, that praised the book more highly than I did. His point is well taken, but it should be noted that Godfrey also had misgivings about the publication of both "Journal 2" and "Journal 3" (the Nauvoo temple journal). His position with regard to "Journal 2," in fact, was essentially the same as mine. In his words: "Compelled to publish an abridgement and being unable to verify the printed manuscript against all the holographs would cause many, if not most, historians, including me, not to publish this uncheckable text and thus to fault Smith's decision to do so. Only through close scrutiny of the originals can a documentary editor produce a manuscript with some confidence that it is error free."²¹

The question of how much of Joseph Smith's *History of the Church* was drawn from William Clayton is an interesting one.²² I hold that a comparison of Clayton's Nauvoo journals with the *History* will show that only a small portion of the entries are drawn directly from that source.²³ On the other hand, Smith cites Joseph F. Smith's statement that we are greatly indebted to Clayton's pen for the history of the church in Nauvoo. Ironically, both statements are correct, for Clayton's handwriting appears in many records, other than his personal journals, used to compile the *History*. These include "The Book of the Law of the Lord," described by Dean Jessee as "a large leather-bound letterbook-diary-account book containing copies of letters, revelations, and other documents of historical importance intermixed with Joseph Smith's diary entries and a record of donations to the Church during the Prophet's Nauvoo years. It is the original source for portions of Joseph Smith's *History of the Church*."²⁴ Beyond whatever came directly from his personal journal, Clayton's recording of revelations, letters, and other things clearly made a substantial contribution to Joseph Smith's *History*.

Smith also comments on various conversations between the two of us regarding the possible publication of the Nauvoo journals. It is to be expected that our respective notes and memories should result in somewhat different perspectives, but, for the record, here is my reconstruction of those conversations. According to my notes, early in 1988 Signature Books asked me if I would be interested in editing all of William Clayton's journals for publication. My response to that early contact was

21. Kenneth W. Godfrey review, *Journal of Mormon History* 18 (Fall 1992): 225.

22. Those who compiled the *History* drew from many sources. See Dean C. Jessee, "The Writing of Joseph Smith's History," *BYU Studies* 11 (Spring 1971): 439-73.

23. I made such a comparison when I was writing the original review, and I made it again in preparing this commentary. The second time around I found about five more entries that were possibly drawn from Clayton (mostly very short—two or three lines), but not enough to make a difference in the point.

24. Dean C. Jessee, comp. and ed., *The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1984), 691.

"yes," but only if Signature Books could get approval from the church to publish the Nauvoo journals. Later, on 11 November, George Smith telephoned me, affirming Signature Books's plans to publish all the Clayton journals. It is not clear from my notes that he specifically invited me to collaborate, but my memory says that this is what happened. I also remember that I expressed some "excitement" at the possibility of getting the Nauvoo diaries published, for I thought they would make a valuable contribution to scholarship. I make a point of this because of Smith's comment that my disposition had "changed significantly" by 5 December. I made it clear from the beginning that I would love to see the journals published but that I did not want to participate in such a venture without church permission. Later in November I had a conversation about the Clayton journals with Elder John K. Carmack (Assistant Executive Director of the LDS historical department). It was clear from that conversation, however, that it would not be possible to obtain permission at that time, so I dropped the matter. On 5 December George Smith came to see me in my office, and we also had lunch together. I told him, again, that I did not want to be involved, for I thought it was improper to publish the Nauvoo journals without church permission. Although I certainly showed less enthusiasm in December than I did in May, my basic position did not change. I also told Smith, according to my notes, that "he would get criticism from the scholarly community, including myself, for publishing things [the Nauvoo journals] in such incomplete form, and out of context." Smith claims that on 5 December I said I "could not talk about Clayton" and that the meeting we were having "never took place." There is nothing of that nature in my notes, but if I said anything like that it must have been in connection with another item that *is* in my notes. After we finished discussing my feelings about the propriety of publishing the Nauvoo journals, I gave him some suggestions (probably unsolicited) on what I thought would be good editorial procedure, since he had obviously decided to publish. He seemed to appreciate the suggestions, I wrote in my notes, though he probably did not need them. I am confident that this is the part of the conversation I did not want reported for, as he rightly says (and my notes indicate), I did not want my name associated with the publication. I had no reason to want the rest of the conversation kept confidential.

The thing that surprised me most in Smith's critique was his discussion of what he calls my "unauthorized personal use" of the Nauvoo journals. This is a distortion. The reality is that I was fully authorized to use the journals in connection with my then-forthcoming biography of William Clayton. Since access time was limited, and it was essential to get the material in as accurate a form as possible, I assumed it was not inappropriate to take whatever notes would serve the project best, including

verbatim notes. *This is the same assumption that every scholar makes when using any manuscript material.* Given all this, it is highly misleading to say that however I took notes or used them was “unauthorized.” What was not authorized was the distribution of excerpts by someone who had obtained them in an unauthorized fashion, and then the publication of those excerpts. Smith believes that the permission of some Clayton descendants provides enough legal authorization for the publication of the excerpts. I continue to question the academic propriety of doing so, however, not only because he did not have church permission but also because, without access to the originals, he had no way at all of checking his transcription and thus assuring either its completeness or its accuracy.

Smith raises an important issue when he comments on a few mistakes in transcription that appeared in *Manchester Mormons*, the journal edited by Thomas G. Alexander and me, and later published in abridged form as “Journal 1” in *An Intimate Chronicle*. This is a perfect illustration of the fact that before any of us publishes any transcription we should be extra careful to check and double-check that transcription against the original holograph. Clayton’s Manchester journal is particularly difficult to transcribe, for it is written in tiny script, in pencil, and much of it is faded or, in places, smudged. I remember spending days, with the help of a research assistant, poring over it with a magnifying glass, trying to get a correct transcription even of the faded parts, and then checking over it again. After reading Smith’s critique I went back to it, again with magnifying glass in hand. I found that, with one possible exception, Smith’s examples were correct, and I was particularly embarrassed at having transcribed the word “Moon” as “Moore.” I also found, however, that Smith himself made a few mistakes in *An Intimate Chronicle*, though they were mostly mistakes of omission. The last sentence in the entry for 16 January 1840, for example, reads “Bought cloth for trousers[.]” Smith uses brackets to “indicate words that are missing or illegible.” In this case, the financial expression 18/6 (meaning 18 schillings 6 pence) is clearly visible in the original. In the next day’s entry, Smith’s transcription reads “Went to see Brother [.]Heath.” Again the brackets should not be there because even under a magnifying glass there is no illegible word between “Brother” and “Heath.” At the end of the same entry is another set of brackets, but in this case the words “a great excitement” can be made out in the original. In the entry for 21 January 1840, Smith indicates, in brackets, that there are six illegible lines, whereas in *Manchester Mormons* we indicate at the same place that there are only two unclear lines. On reexamination, with my magnifying glass, I could still make out the other four lines, which are, I was happy to discover, correctly transcribed in *Manchester Mormons*. There are other examples, but the fact that neither the Allen/Alexander transcription nor the Smith transcrip-

tion is perfect only serves to emphasize the more important point that has been made by Godfrey, Dean Jesse, and others: the necessity of comparing a transcription with the original holograph several times before publication. This is something Smith was unable to do in the case of Clayton's Nauvoo journals.

Some of Smith's comments clearly highlight how easy it is for scholars to have differing perspectives on what is or is not important, especially when it comes to deciding what to delete in an abridgement. My observations on this issue were intended to suggest some of the problems that could be involved in any kind of abridgement, and to demonstrate why research scholars eventually must consult either the original manuscript or a full (and hopefully accurate) transcription anyway. Smith had to cut somewhere, and I respect both his need to do so and the generally judicious nature of his abridgements. I am surprised, however, that he would accuse me of making a false assertion when I noted that the excerpts left out much of the spiritual and daily life of Clayton as well as the social life of Nauvoo. This comment was aimed *only* at the transcription of "Journal 2," and it is accurate, based on my personal knowledge of what the rest of the journal contains. I did not accuse Smith of "intentionally" making omissions in "Journal 2" for, as I observed, Smith himself was not responsible for those excerpts. At the same time, as Smith says, his abridgement of the other journals retained much of that kind of material, and I did not deny that in my review.

With respect to the Manchester diary, I chose one example of an entry in which I thought something especially important was left out: the entry for Sunday, 8 March 1840. Smith asks, legitimately, "What did Allen find 'important' about the repetitive passages I left out?" The answer is very subjective, but we could also ask, "What did Smith find 'important' about the passages he left in?" Such decisions usually reflect either the editor's research interests or the editor's considered judgement on what would contribute to the most balanced overall view. Smith's abridgement simply reads: "Sister Burgess came. Her breast is very bad. I prayed with her ... Supper at Hardman's. Used great liberty toward Alice Hardman." The full entry, however, reads as follows²⁵:

Sister Burgess came. Her breast is very bad. I prayed with her. Went to Prince's to Breakfast. Brother John Moon spoke²⁶ a while then I spoke a while in P.M. I ordained Isaac Royle and Charles Miller Priests, Brother John Gill

25. Here I have followed the editorial conventions adopted in *Manchester Mormons* of providing punctuation and spelling out abbreviated words.

26. In *Manchester Mormons* we transcribed this word as "spake," but in my recent re-checking it appeared that we should have used the word "spoke," though the difference between an "a" and an "o" is sometimes difficult to discern.

and James Johnson Teachers. 3 confirmed, 3 baptized by Charles Miller. Went to Kenworthy's to tea. At night Brother Moon preached on faith &c. Prayed with many sick. Sister Battersby gave me some grapes. William Whitehead gave me 1/-. After meeting went to Brother Bateman's to see Sister Street. Sarah and Rebecca went with me. Sarah gave me 2 oranges. Brother Bewsher gave me a stick of sealing Wax. Supper at Hardman's. Used great liberty toward Alice Hardman.

I thought this entire passage was important to understanding the nature of the Mormon experience in Manchester and that the deleted lines were more important than those reproduced by Smith, for they provided a dramatic illustration of the great variety of activities engaged in by a missionary on a very busy Sabbath day. This is also another illustration of the fact that, despite the obvious value of abridgements such as *An Intimate Chronicle*, serious scholars must eventually turn to the original sources.

With respect to "Journal 3: Nauvoo Temple, 1845-1846," Smith had access to a photographic reproduction of the original, and did a good job of both transcription and abridgement. Our disagreement is over the question of whether it should properly be considered a William Clayton journal or a Heber C. Kimball journal. My reasons for considering it to be a Kimball journal are clear in the review, and Smith's reasons are clear in his introduction to *An Intimate Chronicle* as well as in his critique. However, on 8 March 1997, I talked with Stanley B. Kimball in order to gain some clarification on the question of why he did not publish the Nauvoo Temple journal in *On the Potter's Wheel: The Diaries of Heber C. Kimball*. According to Kimball, the main reason he did not publish either that one or the 1847 pioneer journal was that neither of them were Heber C. Kimball *holographs* (that is, they were not in his own handwriting). He did not consider the 1847 journal to be a Clayton journal, however, for he knew that Clayton kept it for Kimball, at Kimball's request. He did not know at the time that Kimball had also specifically asked Clayton to write the Nauvoo journal for him, beginning on 10 December 1845, for he did not have access to Clayton's personal journal, where that becomes clear. That is why he wrote in his introduction that even though the first part of the volume is in Heber C. Kimball's handwriting, "the latter section should more properly be classified as a William Clayton diary, or, perhaps, as a kind of Nauvoo Temple Record."²⁷ In other words, he simply was not sure how to classify it. Had he known that Clayton kept it for Kimball, at Kimball's request, he said, he probably would have considered it to be in the same category as he did the pioneer journal.²⁸ To be consistent with

27. Stanley B. Kimball, ed., *On the Potter's Wheel: The Diaries of Heber C. Kimball* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates, 1987), xiii-xiv.

28. Telephone conversation with Stanley B. Kimball, 8 Mar. 1997.

his own view, however, Smith should have published the 1847 Kimball journal also, since that, too, was in Clayton's handwriting.

In summary, then, I appreciate George Smith's meticulous work in ferreting out considerable new information about William Clayton, and I recognize that some parts of *An Intimate Chronicle* deserve more praise than I gave. At the same time I feel that his publication of the Nauvoo journal was professionally irresponsible, and I still question whether the Nauvoo "Temple Journal" may legitimately be considered a Clayton journal at all. I hope this response to Smith's critique has shed additional useful light on our differences, and I thank the editors of *Dialogue* for this opportunity.

A Rejoinder

George D. Smith

JAMES ALLEN HAS DONE AN EXTRAORDINARY job of placing William Clayton before the Mormon community. That is why I wanted to involve him in helping to prepare the journals for publication. But even with that accomplishment, the question arises: What should one say to an historian, however well-meaning, who advocates depriving a community of its history? We should not be diverted by Allen's specious arguments about whether Clayton's valuable Nauvoo temple record should have been published somewhere else (it would not have been), and whether one should await the reluctant acquiescence from a church repository when one has permission to publish from family members who hold the literary rights to the manuscript. I suspect Allen is speaking on behalf of the silent but incessant voice of those church authorities who did not want this important document published.

The community is ill-served by an elitist system which allows one historian to hold a document and, with feigned impartiality, then issue judgements which fault others for not having the same access. I am glad Allen made a personal copy of Clayton's Nauvoo journals, even if he did

so without the formality of official permission. I hope he will now redeem his role as a highly qualified historian by encouraging and cooperating with efforts to make the entire journal available. Any goal less than full access to the historical record is ultimately unacceptable. I hope the six Clayton journals abridged and collected in *An Intimate Chronicle* will further the process of an open Mormon history.