

EVIDENCE FOR THE SEXUAL SIDE OF JOSEPH SMITH'S POLYGAMY

Comments by D. Michael Quinn*

for Session #2A

Reconsidering Joseph Smith's Marital Practices

Mormon History Association's Annual Conference

Calgary, Alberta, Canada, 29 June 2012

(expanded-finalized, 31 December 2012; circulated in mid-2013)

Papers:

Lawrence Foster, "Why 'Polyandry' Isn't the Right Term To Describe Joseph Smith's Marriages To Women Who Remained Legally Married To Other Men: Personal Reflections On a Difficult Issue and How It Might Be Resolved."¹

Brian C. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Sexual Polyandry and the Emperor's New Clothes: On Closer Inspection, What Do We Find?"²

* I did not expect to write anything more about Joseph Smith's polygamy than the paragraphs in my volumes on The Mormon Hierarchy in 1994 and 1997. Nonetheless, after receiving the invitation in February 2012 to be the commentator for this session of the Mormon History Association, I decided to carefully reassess the topic. As soon as the endnotes were in reasonable shape, I emailed on 2 August 2012 an "unabbreviated" version (dated "end of July") to the session's participants and to others who had asked for a copy.

While I was waiting to see documents about Utah polyandry (my Note 293, 8th para.-- beginning: "First, Edmund was a member"), Brian Hales sent me an email on 8 September 2012 with his "Response" (dated 25 August 2012) to my "unabbreviated" version. Posted on Hales' Internet website, his "Response" was 93 pages (double-spaced) of text about my 35-page narrative (double-spaced) of "Comments." (my Note 2, 4th para.; Internet URL of www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/bch_response_to_quinn.pdf)

However, due to my computer's total malfunction in mid-November 2012, this document's electronic file (in 26-year-old WordPerfect 4.2) was unavailable to me for access, revisions, copying, or distribution for eight months!! As a semi-Luddite, I was unable to finalize and circulate it until mid-2013. This "expanded-finalized" version (now dated as "31 December 2012") corrects mistakes in my original "Comments," discusses more of Hales' approach, and now increases my source-notes to 305 from the original's 199. Far beyond my expectations in February 2012, these "Comments" have become a monograph.

Nonetheless, this response excludes the three-volume study of polygamy that Brian Hales published in early 2013. I have not read it (and don't plan to), but its readers can decide whether he simply repeated the approaches that I criticize here.

I give full permission for this monograph to be circulated (VERBATIM ONLY) among those interested. If anyone informs me of mistakes in these "expanded-finalized" comments, I will just take permanent responsibility for them. I don't plan to write another version.

I thank MHA's 2012 Program Committee for the opportunity to comment on this session's presentations.

Larry Foster seems persuasive in his argument that "polyandry" (or even "pseudo-polyandry") is the wrong way to describe the fact that Joseph Smith had a ceremonial relationship³ (later often described as "a marriage") with women who were already cohabiting with legally married husbands. However, Foster may be overstating the significance of "traditional" polyandry occurring only in matriarchal societies.⁴

Beyond pacifist Tibet,⁵ it was an honorable relationship in warrior-cultures of Britain,⁶ of Indo-China (now Vietnam),⁷ of Southern India,⁸ of Ceylon (now Sri Lanka),⁹ of North America's Iroquois,¹⁰ of the Inuits near Hudson's Bay, and in the non-warrior fishing communities of the Aleutian Islands¹¹ at the North American continent's other side.¹² Most of those cultures organized families matriarchally but defended them patriarchally, most also allowed non-brothers to share sexual access to the same woman, and each allowed men (whether brothers or non-brothers) to alternate cohabiting with her when one man (or more than one of her men) was absent as warrior or as provider of food.

Some of the already-married women of Nauvoo, Illinois, later described Joseph as "husband" (aside from their legal spouses). Even if we avoid a descriptive term, one of these dozen women (Sylvia Sessions Lyon on her deathbed in 1882) told her daughter that Joseph Smith was actually her father, not Windsor P. Lyon to whom Sylvia had been legally married. Although Josephine Lyon didn't know this until 1882, and didn't make an affidavit to that effect

until three decades later,¹³ Angus M. Cannon (president of the Salt Lake Stake since 1876) told Joseph Smith III that Brigham Young had referred to her in 1877:

That girl, I believe, is living today in Bountiful, north of this city. I heard Prest.

Young, a short time before his death [in August 1877], refer to the report and remark that he had never seen the girl, but he would like to see her for himself, that he might determine if she bore any likeness to your father.¹⁴

A decade after Young's death, a devout Mormon (George H. Brimhall) wrote on 1 January 1888: "... had a talk with Father Hales, who told me that it was said that Joseph Smith had a daughter named Josephine living at Bountiful, Utah."¹⁵

Moreover, an honest apologist (Brian Hales--a descendant of "Father Hales")¹⁶ has somewhat reluctantly discovered that another already-married woman (Esther Dutcher Smith) bore a son she named "Joseph" on 21 September 1844, sometime after she was "sealed to Joseph the Prophet in the days of Nauvoo," before he died. This pre-death relationship was affirmed in a letter by Daniel H. Wells, an ever-faithful counselor to his successor, Brigham Young.¹⁷ Joseph's martyrdom on 27 June 1844 occurred when she was six-months pregnant.¹⁸

In a previous publication, Hales quoted this remarkable letter as saying that Esther "nearly broke his heart by telling him [her legal husband] of it, and expressing her intention of adhering to that relationship" with Joseph Smith.¹⁹ First, this showed that she was sealed at Nauvoo without the knowledge of her legal husband, a faithful Mormon there.²⁰ Second, even though Esther's husband eventually "got to feeling better over it"--seven years after Joseph's death--and "had her sealed to him [Joseph, by proxy], and to himself for time [as her legal, living

husband],²¹ this evidence (which Hales quoted) contradicts his claim that there were "No Complaints from Legal Husbands" (his emphasis) of the Prophet's already-married wives.²²

Third, even though Hales quoted this source in a published essay that attempted to exonerate the Prophet of "sexual polyandry," Esther's "intention of adhering to that relationship" sounds like a reference to a sexual relationship that "nearly broke" her legal husband's heart while Joseph Smith was still alive. To me, it does not sound like "adhering" to a "sealing for eternity only," which the letter itself did not allege. At least, the former is one way to interpret the document's phrasing, a possibility for "sexual polyandry" that Hales doesn't admit.

At this point, it's necessary to explain/remind that marriage for "eternity only" has become the non-sexual category (for earthly living) that Mormons use as the alternative to "marriage for time" and to "marriage for time and eternity" (both of which give the living bride and living groom sexual access to each other during their mortal life on earth). Thus, concerning Joseph Smith in Nauvoo, Apostle John A. Widtsoe wrote a century later: "It is also possible[,] though the Church does not now permit it, to seal two living people for eternity only, with no [sexual] association on earth."²³ In 1995, BYU's Department of Church History and Doctrine likewise published the following statement about the Nauvoo sealing of another living man to a living woman: "it is possible that the sealing was for eternity only and unconsummated."²⁴

Nonetheless, for decades as a Mormon historian, I didn't think that such ceremonies actually occurred during the nineteenth century, even though some polygamously married couples chose not to have sexual relations after they were officially sealed in a ceremony that stated "for time and eternity." Because of this voluntary lack of sex, despite a ceremony allowing

it, the husband's descendants (from a different wife) typically described the childless marriage as "for eternity only."²⁵

Despite my decades-long expectation for those specific words to be in the written records of sealing, Brian Hales has recently persuaded²⁶ me that Joseph Smith was sealed during his lifetime to one already-married woman in a ceremony that she, her non-Mormon husband, and the Prophet all regarded as applying only to the eternities after mortal life.²⁷ This was Ruth Vose Sayers, for whom there was no contemporary record of the ceremony's wording. However, as Hales affirmed today and in his previous articles,²⁸ in addition to a recently discovered narrative about this matter by Andrew Jenson, a document written by one of Joseph's house-girls in late 1843 or early 1844 stated: "Joseph did not pick that woman. She went to see whether she should marry her husband for eternity."²⁹

Furthermore, Hales has persuaded me that I was in error about claiming that on 28 May 1843, "Joseph and Emma Smith were the first couple `sealed' in marriage for eternity," as I published in 1994 and restated in my 2011 email to him.³⁰ For decades, I overlooked the significance of the wording that Joseph Smith provided in a written revelation to Newel K. Whitney for uniting his daughter Sarah Ann to the Prophet as a polygamous wife on 27 July 1842: "You both mutually agree [--] calling them by name [--] to be each others companion so long as you both shall live ... and also through [o]ut all eternity ..."³¹

That last phrase was a crucial addition to the ceremony for marriage as provided by the LDS Church in 1835. In Kirtland, Ohio's newspaper and in its first edition of The Doctrine and Covenants, those instructions by LDS headquarters stated: "... and if there be no legal objections,

he shall say, calling each by their names: `You both mutually agree to be each other's companions, husband and wife ... during your lives.'"⁶² Because polygamous marriage was illegal, the July 1842 revelation dropped the reference to "legal objections," plus added the provision for "all eternity." However, because of published accusations in 1842 that Joseph Smith was teaching and practicing "spiritual wifery," polygamy, and polyandry,³³ Nauvoo's primary newspaper for the LDS Church reprinted the 1835 document "On Marriage," which re-stated in October 1842: "We declare that we believe, that one man should have one wife; and one woman, but one husband, except in case of death ..."⁶⁴ Joseph Smith was editor of the Times and Seasons when it made this denial of everything that he was privately revealing and practicing in 1842 regarding marriage.³⁵

On the other hand, to support his emphasis on pre-1844 polygamous sealings for "eternity only," Hales has cited an easily refutable claim by a Nauvoo Mormon named Justus Morse. Unless Brian Hales is asserting that "eternity only" sealings also applied to a woman who had previously experienced sex with her allegedly "eternity only" husband, Morse's deceptive 1887 affidavit is not a good source for Hales to emphasize.³⁶

Likewise, to demonstrate post-1844 sealings for "eternity only," Hales has alleged that "records written less than two years later [i.e., after 27 June 1844] showed that `eternity only' sealings were performed in the Nauvoo Temple." However, instead of citing and quoting from that temple's records, Hales quoted a secondary source by twentieth-century authors: "On January 24 [in 1846,] John [Smith] was sealed to Aseneth Hubert, Rebecca Smith, and Julia Hills for eternity. All of these women were between fifty and sixty years of age ..."⁶⁷ To demonstrate what

the wording of a temple's document allegedly "showed," it is insufficient to quote authors who were interpreting the kind of celibate marriage that they assumed the elderly John Smith experienced with the elderly women to whom he was sealed. The "best evidence"³⁸ is the original record of sealing, not someone's century-later commentary about it.

That is the kind of verifiable evidence about which I wrote in 1997:

The original records of sealings in the nineteenth century used variations of only two phrases to define each marriage: "for time and eternity," and "for time only," both of which gave the sanction of the church for sexual intercourse between the living persons thus sealed. If the phrase "eternity only" ever appeared in an original record of LDS sealing in the nineteenth century, I have not discovered it while examining thousands of such manuscript entries.³⁹ [with my 1997 emphasis]

In fact, the record for those sealings of three women to John Smith in 1846 did not specify the kind of sealing each received. There was no entry in the "Remarks" column, which was used elsewhere in the record of the Nauvoo Temple's ordinances to specify "time only" or "time and eternity" for other marital sealings of living persons.⁴⁰ If Hales (due to his citing a recent, secondary source to challenge my assessment) is unwilling to examine and cite the nineteenth-century records that are available to him for research,⁴¹ then he should simply maintain the initial "Response" he posted on the Internet: "These observations [by Quinn in 1997] appear to be accurate regarding `original records' of sealings in the nineteenth century in general."⁴²

Concerning John Hyde's anti-Mormon 1857 book that "paired Joseph Smith with Hannah Ann Dubois Smith Dibble in a story based upon hearsay evidence," Hales also wrote in 2010: "I

have found no evidence to corroborate Hyde's assertion⁴³ about this wife of Philo Dibble. Nonetheless, during the Church trial of Benjamin Winchester in May 1843, a typescript of which was provided to Hales years ago by his research-assistant,⁴⁴ Joseph Smith said that Winchester (in statements to Philadelphia's Mormons) had "told one of the most damnable lies about me. [that I] visited Sister Smith--Sister Dibble ... that I was guilty of improper conduct."⁴⁵ To protect himself and the Church,⁴⁶ the Prophet dismissed the "lies" about him and his widowed sister-in-law Agnes Coolbrith Smith in 1843, yet Hales acknowledged that she became Joseph's polygamous wife in January 1842.⁴⁷ Although Benjamin Winchester lived in Philadelphia during most of the 1840s, he was in Nauvoo long enough in 1842 to purchase a small amount of land for which he was assessed that year.⁴⁸ The visit necessary for Winchester to look at Nauvoo's properties and to arrange for the purchase of one parcel of land also gave him opportunity to hear a rumor about Joseph and Agnes, or to observe them together.

If the above linkage of documents written in 1842 and 1843 doesn't persuade Hales as "evidence" about Hannah Dibble, in 1947 the LDS Church's Midwest publishing company printed Benjamin F. Johnson's autobiography, which stated: "At this time [May 1843,] I knew that the Prophet had as his wives ... Sisters Lyon and Dibble," among others that Johnson identified, including two of his own sisters. Hales cited that source in his 2012 article about "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy."⁴⁹ Furthermore, a year after those marital references to Joseph Smith and "Sister Dibble" in 1843, Hannah Dubois Dibble gave birth to a child on 29 May 1844.⁵⁰

Still another of these women (Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner Smith) told an audience of Mormon college students in 1905 that she personally knew three children who claimed Joseph Smith as their actual father, even though these children "go by other names." The three children who claimed Joseph Smith's paternity had to be adults when "they told me,"⁵¹ probably after she was included in a semi-official list of the Prophet's polygamous wives, as published in 1887 by Andrew Jenson.⁵²

That excludes the only children alleged to have been born to Joseph Smith's otherwise-unmarried wives Fanny Alger, Eliza R. Snow, and Olive G. Frost, because each of those alleged children was stillborn or died shortly after birth.⁵³ Moreover, for Mary Lightner's statement to have direct application to the founding Prophet (as the context of her remarks indicated), she was also not referring to children produced by the post-martyrdom marriages of women who were Joseph's wives during his lifetime.

By the logic Brian Hales has himself published, she referred in 1905 to surnames of the men to whom their mothers were legally married before becoming the Prophet's wives. For example, Hales argued in his 2012 publication:

Decades after the martyrdom[,] when RLDS Church missionaries were claiming that Joseph Smith was not a polygamist, Utah Church authorities aggressively combatted their claims. It seems likely that, had they known of any children fathered by the Prophet with his plural wives, they would have publicly acknowledged these children to refute RLDS denials; but [--] except for Angus Cannon's conversation with Joseph III quoted above, such efforts are virtually nonexistent.⁵⁴

Perhaps inadvertently (but certainly without connecting the dots of evidence), Hales provided the reason why LDS leaders failed to publicize those three unnamed children of the Prophet who were living in Utah: "... to openly refer to a polyandrous sexual involvement would be very extraordinary ... [because] the [already-married] women would be essentially declaring themselves to be unchaste."⁵⁵ Likewise, since RLDS opponents of polygamy shared Hales' view about the unchastity of polyandry,⁵⁶ there could be no benefit to Utah's leaders in publicizing Joseph's still-living polygamous children whom Mary Lightner matter-of-factly emphasized privately to a Mormon audience in 1905.

Such a claim of paternity would occur only if each child's mother thought that Joseph Smith had impregnated her. DNA testing can disprove assumptions and speculations about paternity,⁵⁷ but cannot disprove the basis of Mary Lightner Smith's 1905 claim: three already-married women (besides herself) had borne a child they each assumed was produced by their literal relationship with the Prophet Joseph Smith, not by their legally recognized husbands with whom they were cohabiting.

I think the most devout member of the LDS Church will acknowledge this as a perplexing situation in Mormon history for even the friendliest non-Mormon to comprehend.⁵⁸ And perhaps also for generational Mormons to understand.⁵⁹ Choosing the "right" descriptive term is the least of its historical challenges.

I have few quarrels with the evidence that Brian Hales has presented to you.⁶⁰ Many of his conclusions are consistent with what you have heard and with what he has previously published.

However, one of my objections is that Hales seems to brush-off the significance of some of the evidence he has cited. I've already referred to the example of Mary Lightner Smith's 1905 speech to BYU's students, which I don't think allows the ambiguity he sees in it.⁶¹ Likewise, one of his charts in today's Power-point presentation cites "Phebe Louisa Holmes Welling" as an "Accuser or Reporter" that "Elvira Cowles Holmes" was "involved" with Joseph Smith. The next chart alleges that "YES"--the statement by Phebe Holmes Welling was "Ambiguous." Toward the end of his presentation, another chart lists fourteen women alleged to be "Joseph Smith's 'Polyandrous' Wives," and Hales says of "Elvira Annie Cowles" (legally married to Jonathan Holmes)⁶² that it was "Probable" (his emphasis) that she had an "Eternity Only Sealing" to the Prophet.⁶³

He thereby makes an assertion that contradicts the only historical evidence I know that addresses whether their relationship was sexual. Shortly before her own death, Phebe Louisa Welling wrote: "I heard my mother [Elvira Ann Cowles Holmes] testify that she was indeed the Prophet Joseph Smith's plural wife in life and lived with him as such during his lifetime."⁶⁴ I see no ambiguity in that statement by a daughter who was twenty years old when her mother died in 1871.⁶⁵ Furthermore, I find it difficult to believe that Elvira's 37-year-old widower-husband Jonathan stopped having sex with her only six months after their civil wedding,⁶⁶ simply to accommodate the Prophet's sexual relations with her (which in June 1843 seemed likely to continue for many years).⁶⁷

In that regard, Lucy Meserve Smith's comment about Joseph Smith's plural wives is very significant. She became the secret wife of his first cousin, Apostle George A. Smith, in

November 1844,⁶⁸ and later she "worked for the Prophet Joseph Smith's wife [and legal widow] Emma Hale Smith [in] Aug. & Sept 1845." In response to Emma's anti-polygamy statements one day during that time-period, Lucy stated:

I told George A. what sister Emma had said. He related to me the circumstance of his calling on Joseph late one evening, and he was just taking a wash [--] and Joseph told him that one of his wives had just been confined [for childbirth] and Emma was the Midwife. He [George A.] told me this to prove to me that the women were married for time, as [i.e., because] Emma had told me that Joseph never taught any such thing [--she said that] they were only sealed for eternity [--] they were not to live with them and have children ...⁶⁹

This statement has been emphasized for thirty-one years in publications that Brian Hales has cited, but his own relevant articles have made no reference to it.⁷⁰

Despite writing decades later, Lucy Meserve Smith provided important clues for learning more about Joseph Smith's polygamy. First, in view of Emma Smith's general hostility toward her husband's other wives, it's impossible to imagine her acting as "the Midwife" for a woman whose relationship to him Emma knew about.⁷¹ Second, it's difficult to imagine that the Church President's wife would give after-the-fact sanction to the pregnancy of an unmarried woman by serving as her midwife. Those two limitations especially applied to legally unmarried Eliza R. Snow and Olive G. Frost, who each allegedly gave birth to one of Joseph's babies that died immediately (possibly as stillborns).⁷²

Therefore, Lucy Meserve Smith's account of what her husband learned directly from the Prophet must refer to a childbearing woman who was another man's legal wife. Unaware that this woman was also Joseph's polygamous wife, Emma would not object to acting as midwife, especially for one of her friends--as many of these already-married women were.

Third, this nighttime conversation with the Prophet had to occur after George A. Smith's return to Nauvoo on 13 July 1841 from a two-year mission, and it had to occur when he was not absent from Nauvoo again on missions. Such absences occurred from late November 1841 to mid-January 1842, from 10 September to 4 November 1842, from 7 July to 22 October 1843, and from 9 May 1844 until after Joseph's death. Between 13 July 1841 and 27 June 1844, George A. Smith was far distant from Nauvoo for a total of more than eight-and-a-half months.⁷³

Thus, Lucy Meserve Smith's narrative allows significant narrowing within the lists of more than a dozen of Joseph Smith's alleged children by polygamous wives.⁷⁴ George A.'s description of a polygamous birth doesn't eliminate as possibilities the children born while he was away from Nauvoo, but it provides a context that increases the probability for one of the other births.

Before listing those children, however, it's necessary to respond to an anachronism that Hales has publicly identified.

Interestingly, Zina [Huntington Jacobs] testified that her sealing to Joseph Smith was performed twice. The first time was on October 27, 1841, by Dimick Huntington, her brother. She also affirmed: "When Brigham Young returned from England, he repeated

the ceremony for time and eternity." The timeline is problematic because Brigham arrived from England in July 1841.⁷⁵

Hales has not recognized that the error was actually the conventional dating of Zina's polygamous marriage as 1841, which was in her 1869 affidavit and its many repetitions thereafter.

Three years earlier, Apostle Wilford Woodruff, as the officially appointed "Church Historian,"⁷⁶ recorded the following in his "Historian's Private Journal":

Joseph Smith & Louisa Beaman were sealed May 1840 by Joseph B. Noble

Joseph Smith & Zina Huntington were sealed Oct. 27, 1840 by Dimick B.

Huntington in Nauvoo

Joseph Smith & Presinda [sic] Huntington were sealed Dec 11, 1840 by Dimick

B. Huntington in Nauvoo[.]⁷⁷

Although his research-assistant had already provided a typescript of this document to Brian Hales,⁷⁸ his 2010 article did not mention Woodruff's notations that corroborated Zina's "problematic" statement about dating her marriage to Joseph.

Woodruff identified no source(s) for this 1866 notation, but Joseph B. Noble also made statements that he performed the Beaman-Smith marriage in 1840.⁷⁹ According to Zina, shortly after Apostle Brigham Young's return to Nauvoo in July 1841, he re-performed her polygamous sealing of 1840 to the Prophet. As President of the Quorum of the Twelve and advocate for the primacy of the apostleship,⁸⁰ Young undoubtedly also re-performed in 1841 the marriages that Louisa and Presendia had previously entered with the Prophet.

In 1869, when Joseph F. Smith (one of the most junior members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles) began seeking affidavits to prove the realities of plural marriage during his uncle Joseph Smith's leadership,⁸¹ the conflicting years for Nauvoo's first polygamous marriages complicated his endeavors. If presented to the public, the repeated sealings of 1841 would require explanation and might raise more questions than answered by affidavits of the participants. Someone obviously decided that the easiest way to avoid confusion was to emphasize the month and day of the original ceremonies performed in 1840 by two rank-and-file Mormons, yet assign them to the year (1841) when the ceremonies were re-solemnized by apostolic authority.⁸² Similar conflation of dates and documents, plus replacing one man's name for another, had been the standard practice in publishing the Prophet's revelations during the 1830s.⁸³

Born in January 1821, 19-year-old Zina Diantha Huntington became Joseph Smith's plural wife more than four months before her civil marriage to Henry Jacobs on 7 March 1841.⁸⁴ This was a sequence of his-secret-plural-marriage-to-a-virgin-followed-by-civil-marriage-of-this-polygamous-wife-to-another-man that the Prophet repeated in 1842 with his 17-year-old wife Sarah Ann Whitney and in 1843 with his 16-year-old wife Flora Ann Woodworth.⁸⁵ Thus, all the children to whom Zina gave birth before March 1845 could be regarded as Joseph's offspring.

Concerning the possibilities provided by this revisionist chronology, George A. Smith was in Nauvoo for the births of four children born to the Prophet's already-married wives. First was Zebulon W. Jacobs on 2 January 1842, then Orson W. Hyde on 9 November 1843, then Josephine R. Lyon on 8 February 1844, and Florentine M. Lightner on 23 March 1844.⁸⁶ Because of premature death, only two of those (Zebulon W. Jacobs and Josephine R. Lyon) could have

been among Joseph Smith's three polygamous children mentioned by Mary Lightner Smith in 1905 ("they told me"). In the 1840s, the publicly identified fathers of the above four were devout Elder Henry Jacobs,⁸⁷ Apostle Orson Hyde,⁸⁸ excommunicated Windsor P. Lyon, and friendly non-Mormon Adam Lightner.⁸⁹ Again, even if DNA analysis shows the biological father to be the legal father, that does not exclude these children from the 1840s assumptions about Joseph's paternity--as restated by various people, including Mary Lightner in 1905.

Hales has repeatedly argued that the sealing-marriage of Sylvia Sessions Lyon to the Prophet was the equivalent of "a religious divorce" between her and legal husband Windsor.⁹⁰ However, no immediate member of the Lyon Family ever made such a claim, nor is there any contemporary evidence or reminiscent assertion that Sylvia and Windsor had separate residences following that sealing. **The only real evidence that Hales can produce is this:**

Josephine Lyon's 1915 statement also implies that the excommunication invalidated her [mother's] marriage to Windsor, allowing her [Sylvia] to be legitimately sealed to Joseph Smith and bare a child with him. Sylvia told Josephine that she was "sealed to the Prophet at the time that her husband Mr. Lyon was out of fellowship with the Church."⁹¹

True, but Sylvia's statement to her daughter was about the legal husband's LDS standing, not about an alleged divorce, nor about an alleged separation of residence, nor about an alleged cessation of sexual intercourse with him. Although Hales provided no historical evidence that Sylvia ever commented on a divorce, residential separation, or an ending of sex with Windsor, Hales asserted: "The sealing nullifies her civil marriage in the eyes of all participants (as seen

with Sylvia Sessions).⁹² That is certainly true for the twenty-first-century eyes of Brian Hales, but no contemporary document nor reminiscence demonstrates that Sylvia perceived that her legal marriage was nullified during 1842-44.

Furthermore, as Hales has specified,⁹³ Lyon was excommunicated on 19 November 1842. Because this was nine months after 8 February 1842 (the date an unsigned affidavit gave for the Prophet's marriage to Sylvia Sessions Lyons), that document contradicts his argument that Windsor's excommunication justified her marrying Joseph and bearing him a child. Thus, Hales challenged this 1842 dating as "suspicious" because a different affidavit (also unsigned) stated the year 1843. He asserted: "Research shows that neither of the documents is more reliable than the other and therefore, should not be treated preferentially."⁹⁴

To the contrary, there is crucial evidence in support of 8 February 1842 as the date when Joseph Smith married Sylvia in polygamy/polyandry. Almost exactly a month later, she served as a witness for the sealing of her already-married mother Patty Bartlett Sessions (age 47) to him. Patty's journal stated: "I was sealed to Joseph Smith by Willard Richards March 9 1842 in Newel K Whitneys chamber [at] Nauvoo, for ^time and all eternity^ Eternity ... Sylvia ^my daughter^ was present when I was sealed to Joseph Smith."⁹⁵ Todd Compton has explained (with his parentheses) that "the superscript, in Patty's hand, was probably written in 1867 (the ink is identical to that of her 1867 proxy marriage/second anointing sealing notation attached to the page) as a clarification (rather than as a correction)."⁹⁶ Sylvia's presence as a witness to the polygamous/polyandrous ceremony uniting her mother to Joseph Smith--while her father David

Sessions still cohabited with her mother⁹⁷--was consistent with Sylvia as the Prophet's polyandrous wife before March 1842.

The above statement by Patty Bartlett Sessions is also one of the first-person sources that required Hales to claim: "It is true that some later reminiscences [by already-married women] state that their sealings [to Joseph Smith] in Nauvoo were for 'time and eternity.' However, to assume that the women were remembering the exact language may not be warranted ... to presuppose that sexual relations were present based solely on a late memoir that declared a Nauvoo marriage ('polyandrous' or not) was for 'time and eternity' would be unjustified by the documents alone").⁹⁸

By significant contrast, Hales accepts without question the memory of elderly persons whenever he agrees with their statements about decades-earlier events. This conveniently shifts his standards of evidentiary analysis in the direction for which Hales is arguing.⁹⁹

As indicated, he has also written and spoken defensively about what Josephine's statement "implies," but he has likewise side-stepped the glaring fact that her written affidavit made no effort to counter the likely assumption by its readers that her mother Sylvia continued to cohabit with Windsor after her marriage to Joseph. That would have been an easy reassurance to express in a few words, but Sylvia apparently did not make such a statement to the daughter she told about Joseph's paternity, nor did that daughter bother to deny the potential for sexual polyandry that her affidavit obviously invited. In contrast to that deafening silence about the matter, Phebe Welling matter-of-factly affirmed (as already cited): "I heard my mother [the

already-married Elvira Ann Cowles Holmes] testify that she was indeed the Prophet Joseph Smith's plural wife in life and lived with him as such during his lifetime."

Hales has often stated that "it is impossible to prove a negative" regarding Joseph Smith's sexual polyandry.¹⁰⁰ However, he hasn't acknowledged how odd it is that the already-married wives and their children didn't bother to categorically and consistently deny this possibility in Utah--even privately.

In 1898, legalistic questioning cornered the initially cooperative Zina D. Huntington Jacobs Smith Young into either affirming or denying that she had sexually cohabited with legal husband Henry Jacobs during the same years she claimed to be Joseph Smith's polygamous wife. Zina exclaimed: "What right have you to ask such questions? I was sealed to Joseph Smith for eternity." Undeterred, her questioner (an apostle in the anti-polygamy Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints) then led her into one trap after another:

Q. "It is a fact then, Mrs. Young, that Joseph was not married to you [literally--but] only in the sense of being sealed for eternity?"

A. "As his wife for time and eternity."

Q. "Mrs. Young, you have answered that question in two ways: for time, and for time and eternity."

A. "I meant for eternity."

After affirming the literalness of her marriage "for time" to Joseph Smith, Zina realized that she had to deny sexual polyandry by re-affirming that (during his lifetime) the Prophet had been her husband "for eternity" only. However, her questioner didn't allow her to escape the contradiction.

Question to Mrs. Young. "Mrs. Young, you have stated that you were married to Joseph Smith for time and eternity. Now, how could you marry Joseph Smith for time when at the same time you were married to Mr. Jacobs[?]"

A. "I do not wish to reply. ..."

Shortly after refusing to cooperate with the ambush into which she had been led, Zina ended the interview by denouncing her RLDS interrogator for prying into "the most sacred experiences of my life ..."¹⁰¹

Even faithful LDS historian Danel W. Bachman (subsequently a professor of religion and "curriculum writer" in the LDS Church Educational System) stated in 1975 that, despite her continued cohabitation with her non-Mormon husband, Mary Elizabeth Lightner "may well have had conjugal relations with Smith."¹⁰² After quoting that statement, Hales (to his credit) acknowledged that Bachman "also suggests that Presendia's seventh child, may have been 'sired' by the Prophet."¹⁰³ Wife of Norman Buell, her child John Hyrum (or "Hiram") was born during one of the previously mentioned times when Apostle Richards was absent from Nauvoo.¹⁰⁴

Never reconciled to her husband's polygamous marriages,¹⁰⁵ Emma Smith was the first to claim that they were all for "eternity only." Apostle George A. Smith reassured his plural wife in 1845 that such a claim was merely an effort to deny the sexual reality of the Prophet's marriages to women other than his legal wife.

Likewise, "eternity only" polygamy became the fall-back position of Emma's son Joseph Smith III in combatting the nineteenth-century claims of LDS leaders in Utah.¹⁰⁶ "Eternity only" polygamy later became the claim of Utah Mormons who were embarrassed about the already-

married women who were the Prophet's wives during his lifetime,¹⁰⁷ while "eternity only" became the assumption and claim of those women's descendants.¹⁰⁸ Its palatability as an explanation doesn't make it accurate.

Brian Hales has also acknowledged that when Andrew Jenson researched and published the semi-official 1887 list of Joseph Smith's wives, Jenson engaged in apologetical word-play. "He also referred to the relationship as a 'sealing,' rather than a 'marriage,' a pattern he [Jenson] followed when he was aware that the woman was legally married to someone else during Joseph's lifetime."¹⁰⁹ Likewise, Hales has written that Jenson "also misrepresented Fanny [Alger]" by claiming that her marriage to Solomon Custer occurred after Joseph Smith's death in 1844, when her civil marriage was nearly eight years earlier.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, Jenson's 1887 list of the Prophet's wives concealed the fact that "Mary Elizabeth Rollins" had ever been married to Adam Lightner, and Jenson's list included the deception that Joseph's already-married wife "Elvira A. Cowles, [was] afterwards the wife of Jonathan H. Holmes."¹¹¹

By contrast, as another example of Hales as honest apologist, he introduced this MHA audience to a manuscript that claimed Joseph Smith had sexual intercourse with already-married Mary Heron Snyder (Snider). Using a slang vulgarity for sexual intercourse (which Hales explained today),¹¹² her son-in-law Joseph E. Johnson privately told a group of devout Mormons in 1850: "He was familiar with the first frigging that was done in his house with his mother in law by Joseph." Johnson said this during a council meeting¹¹³ that was deciding whether to excommunicate him for impregnating one of Apostle Lorenzo Snow's plural wives whom Johnson now wanted to marry. She loved him, not the apostle. A Church court in Kaneshville,

Iowa, had already decided that "his priesthood was required to be laid down [i.e., he was disfellowshipped] until he came here" to Salt Lake City.¹¹⁴

I cannot take seriously the suggestion by Hales that this Church court's official minutes misquoted Johnson's words.¹¹⁵ First, by any reasonable logic, who would assume that any LDS clerk introduced a crudely sexual term into a non-sexual remark or into a remark that only implied sex? Second, by 1850, the LDS Church's clerks routinely used stenographic shorthand to accurately record such meetings,¹¹⁶ especially when Brigham Young participated (as he did in this one).

Today, Hales also suggested that Johnson's accusation might have been a pure fabrication to justify the adultery for which he was being tried by this priesthood council.¹¹⁷ That sounds reasonable, but is contrary to the manuscript that Hales quoted. Immediately before making his sensational statement about Joseph Smith, Johnson told the Church court: "I never heard any conversation to say it was right to go to bed with a woman if not found out [--] I was aware the thing [with Mrs. Snow] was wrong." After Johnson's comment about the Prophet's "frigging," he added: "I knew at the time I was doing wrong [with Mrs. Snow] I never av [have] taken any body as a[n] excuse [--] I never plighted my faith on Joseph's transactions."¹¹⁸

Of crucial significance is the fact that in 1850 Joseph E. Johnson was not an uninformed novice about Joseph Smith's polygamy a decade earlier. Two of his sisters (Delcena in 1842, then Almera in 1843) married the Prophet, who also performed the polygamous marriage for their brother Benjamin F. Johnson, after which Joseph Smith unsuccessfully asked to marry yet another of the Johnson family's daughters in the spring of 1843 (16-year-old Esther).¹¹⁹

Moreover, the apologetical observation by Hales that "none of the leaders who heard Joseph E. Johnson's 1850 statement seemed concerned"¹²⁰ actually contradicts the manuscript he has quoted. It specified: "J. Kelly--It as [has] taken me by surprise."¹²¹ Most important, as Hales acknowledged in today's Power-point presentation, "Brigham Young [was] presiding" at this Church court, when Joseph E. Johnson crudely accused the Prophet of having sex with another man's wife. If one person could be expected to condemn Johnson for uttering those words (even in a private meeting), it was Brigham Young. He publicly denounced anyone who "dare open his mouth or raise his voice against the Lord's anointed," and he also proclaimed:

Who can justly say aught against Joseph Smith? I was as well acquainted with him, as any man. I do not believe that his father and mother knew him any better than I did.¹²²

And yet this pioneer-defender of Joseph Smith expressed no criticism for what Joseph E. Johnson had said about the Prophet's "frigging." Instead, Brigham merely chastised Johnson for his adulterous conduct, and instructed the Church court to rebaptize him.¹²³ Aside from being temporarily disfellowshipped in Iowa, he received no punishment from the Church court over which Brigham presided in Utah.¹²⁴

Lastly, in view of the candor with which Hales quoted the 1850 document today, I don't understand why he showed a Power-point slide that stated: "Despite intensive research, I have found no additional evidence linking Mary Heron Snider with Joseph Smith."¹²⁵

For example, previous publications by Hales have cited the books by Todd Compton and George D. Smith, who both quoted the following source of relevance to Joseph E. Johnson's

private claim.¹²⁶ Late in life, Mary Isabella Horne (daughter of Stephen Hales and wife of Joseph Horne since 1836) reminisced: "The prophet with Sister Snyder called in his buggy upon Sister Clev[e]land" in Quincy, Illinois.¹²⁷ Semi-officially identified in 1887 as one of Joseph Smith's wives,¹²⁸ Sarah M. Kingsley Cleveland (the devout LDS wife of a non-Mormon) also served as his "intermediary"¹²⁹ in the spring of 1842 for introducing the idea of polygamous marriage to 38-year-old Eliza R. Snow.¹³⁰ Furthermore, Sarah served as witness for the secret ceremony that united Eliza with Joseph Smith.¹³¹ Because historical sources don't mention the year of the marriage/sealing ceremony for already-married Sarah Cleveland to Joseph Smith,¹³² there is no justification for Hales to omit Sister Horne's account from "additional evidence linking Mary Heron Snider with Joseph Smith."

Moreover, it is both a red-herring¹³³ and a fallacy of irrelevant proof¹³⁴ for Hales to comment in today's presentation that "Joseph E. Johnson did not build his house in Ramus (Macedonia), Illinois, until 1843."¹³⁵ First, Johnson did not state in 1850 that Joseph Smith's sexual intercourse with his mother-in-law occurred in Ramus or Macedonia, and there is no justification for Hales to exclude Nauvoo as a possible location for the 1850 document's reference to "his house." Second, tax-assessment rolls show that "Joseph Johnson" was living in Nauvoo in 1841, when he and John Snider both owned real estate/houses there. The 1841 assessments also listed Johnson's brother Joel H. Johnson as a property-owner in Nauvoo.¹³⁶ Third, Nauvoo's 1842 assessment rolls specified if the property-owner was a non-resident, as they did in their entries for Johnson's brother Benjamin F.¹³⁷

Sister Horne's memoir stated that Joseph Smith's visit with "Sister Snyder" occurred during the time when "Bro. Joseph and some of the brethren called upon Gov. [Thomas] Carlin" at this Illinois governor's home in Quincy.¹³⁸ As historical evidence, this is a "fixed point: [where] no doubt is possible" for verifying chronology,¹³⁹ because the Prophet made such a visit only once in his life--on 4 June 1841.¹⁴⁰

Thus, when "Sister Snyder" was observed alone with Joseph Smith while visiting one of his verified wives (also an already-married woman) in June 1841, both Mary Snyder (Snider) and her son-in-law Joseph E. Johnson had separate residences in Nauvoo. In fact, her husband John was one of only two property-owners named Snider/Snyder in Nauvoo's 1841 tax assessments, even though the assessor levied taxes on the city's non-landed residents who had only \$5.00 of personal property.¹⁴¹ Newly married in April 1841, Robert Snider's bride Almeda Melissa Livermore Snider was 25-years-old when Joseph and "Sister Snyder" visited Quincy.¹⁴²

However, it seems more likely that long-married, 52-year-old Sarah M. Cleveland was visiting with long-married, 36-year-old Mary Ann Heron Snider/Snyder and the Prophet in June 1841,¹⁴³ rather than with Robert Snider's new bride who was a generation-younger than Sarah. This likelihood also provides spring-summer of 1841 as the otherwise-unknown date that Mrs. Cleveland became Joseph Smith's wife.

Likewise, Joseph Smith very likely married Mary Heron Snyder (Snider) in the spring-summer of 1841, rather than "1842/43,"¹⁴⁴ as I wrote three years before Todd Compton's 1997 book made me aware of the quote from Sister Horne's memoirs. In December 1841, the Prophet announced a revelation for John Snyder (Snider) to "take a mission to the Eastern continent," and

told Brigham Young in January 1842 to excommunicate him from the Church "if he will not do these things." In March, he departed Nauvoo "for England,"¹⁴⁵ leaving his wife Mary Ann to have other encounters with Joseph Smith. Like the heart-broken husband who did not previously know about Esther Dutcher Smith's "relationship" with the Prophet, John Snyder/Snider in March 1842 might have been unaware of his wife's solitary visits with the Prophet since mid-1841.

Hales regards as evidence against my claim for a polygamous marriage of Mary Heron Snyder (Snider) and Joseph Smith, that he can find no record of their ever being sealed by proxy, before or after her death in Utah in 1852.¹⁴⁶ However, one of the long-publicized wives of Joseph Smith (Ruth Vose Sayers,¹⁴⁷ who died in Utah during 1884) was also not sealed by proxy to him while she lived there, nor until fifteen years after her death. In 1899, the marital sealings of Ruth and ten more of his wives were "repeated in order that a record might exist" because "there is no record thereof" among the ordinances performed in Salt Lake City.¹⁴⁸

Hales also acknowledged that (during the week after her legal marriage to non-Mormon Carlos Gove on 23 August 1843 at the nearby town of Warsaw),¹⁴⁹ Joseph Smith's previously married¹⁵⁰ wife Flora Ann Woodworth met with the Prophet alone at William Clayton's house in Nauvoo on August 28th and 29th, while Clayton was intentionally absent.¹⁵¹ Hales argues in today's presentation that Joseph Smith's private secretary was too discreet to record these encounters if they were for sexual intercourse with this 16-year-old girl (already married to a teenage boy). He also sees significance in the fact that Clayton's journal did not refer to "bed" or "bedroom" for these solitary appointments of the two at Clayton's house.¹⁵²

However, Clayton's journal referred to performing a polygamous marriage for the Prophet, referred to Emma Smith's jealousy about Joseph Smith's polygamous wives Eliza R. Snow, Eliza Partridge, Emily Partridge, and Flora Woodworth, referred to the Prophet's suspicions about "familiarity" between his legal wife Emma and Clayton, referred to the polygamous marriages of Joseph B. Noble, Vinson Knight, Parley P. Pratt, and Brigham Young, referred to the Prophet's performing Clayton's own polygamous marriage, referred to Clayton sexually consummating it three days afterward (with no reference to "bed" or "bedroom"), referred to his own cohabitation-visits with this plural wife (with no reference to "bed" or "bedroom"), admitted that "I had slept with her" (with no reference to "bed" or "bedroom"), referred to her pregnancy, referred to what Joseph said would be the meaningless punishment if they were exposed to public condemnation, and Clayton's journal referred to the birth of his polygamous wife's child, as well as to its death.¹⁵³ There is no basis whatever for Hales to claim that an alleged "discretion" on Clayton's part prevented him from also referring obliquely to Joseph Smith's sexual trysts that were scheduled for Clayton's house.

Flora later said that she "felt condemned for" her "rash" decision "in a reckless moment" to marry this young non-Mormon, a remorse the 16-year-old girl probably experienced the morning after.¹⁵⁴ Two subsequent trysts with the 37-year-old Prophet in Clayton's house on consecutive days showed how much she regretted marrying a younger man earlier in the week.

It strains credulity for Hales to claim in today's presentation that it required those visits--beginning two days after Joseph Smith had already met with her and her mother¹⁵⁵--for him to inform Flora repeatedly that he was ending their own relationship. By contrast with what Hales

asserts about her alleged "DIVORCE,"¹⁵⁶ just weeks prior to those meetings with Flora, Joseph Smith had privately confided that he was not going to give up any of his plural wives. William Clayton's journal stated on 16 August 1843:

This A.M. Joseph told me that sin[c]e E[mma] came back from St. Louis[,] she had resisted the P[rinciple of plural marriage] in toto, and he had to tell her he would relinquish all [his wives] for her sake. ... He however told me he should not [i.e., will not] relinquish anything.¹⁵⁷

It was with this determination that Joseph met his secret wife Flora Woodworth alone in someone else's house on August 28th and 29th, just days after her civil marriage to a much younger groom.

Nonetheless, because of Emma's continued threats to divorce and publicly humiliate him, Joseph actually ended his polygamous marriages with two sisters in October 1843 by abruptly informing them of the fact.¹⁵⁸ He had also previously "roomed" with Emily and Eliza Partridge individually, whom he "slept with," and with whom he had "carnal intercourse."¹⁵⁹ By comparison, Joseph Smith didn't take two consecutive days to tell a wife that their polygamous relationship was finished--especially, if he had already announced that fact to Flora and her mother.

Emily's candor (which was "forced out of her under adversarial questioning," while she was under oath)¹⁶⁰ was as far as middle-class women of Victorian America could go in referring to sexual intercourse. More typical was the published statement of the Prophet's polygamous wife Lucy Walker, who married Apostle Heber C. Kimball after she became a widow.

I am also able to testify that Emma Smith, the Prophet's first wife, gave her consent to the marriage of at least four other girls to her husband, and that she was well aware that he associated with them as wives within the meaning of all that word implies.¹⁶¹

Her opaque phrase referred to 19-year-old Emily D. Partridge, 22-year-old Eliza M. Partridge, 16-year-old Sarah Lawrence, and 19-year-old Maria Lawrence. Like Lucy Walker, who stated that her own marriage to Joseph involved sex while she was his 17-year-old bride,¹⁶² those four had married him during the spring of 1843. Marrying him in September of that year, Melissa Lott said: "The Prophet ... explained it to her, that it was not for voluptuous love"--yet when asked decades later if she had been his wife "in very deed," Melissa affirmed that she was (as his 19-year-old bride).¹⁶³ Denying that sex was the main reason for a polygamous marriage is completely different from portraying the relationship as sexless. Nonetheless, Hales barely admits: "It seems probable that emotional and physical attraction played a part in some of Joseph's plural relationships."¹⁶⁴

Joseph Smith was apparently virile enough to have sexual intercourse daily (or more than once daily) with one or two of his wives. For example, in July 1842 (shortly before the 36-year-old man's polygamous marriage to 17-year-old Sarah Ann Whitney),¹⁶⁵ Nauvoo's second newspaper The Wasp (edited by his brother William Smith) published the Prophet's phrenological chart, which was a standard "reading" of the bumps on a person's head. The chart's author, phrenologist "A. Crane, M.D." introduced it by saying that Joseph Smith "is perfectly willing to have the chart published," adding: "let the public judge for themselves whether

phrenology proves the reports against him true or false." This chart emphasized that (out of twelve points possible for each of his "Propensities") Joseph scored "Amativeness--11." The chart explained this as his "extreme susceptibility; passionately fond of the other sex."¹⁶⁶

Although the Prophet expressed no "respect" for phrenology, he allowed three different phrenologists to examine his head in 1840, 1842, and 1843.¹⁶⁷

Joseph was willing in July 1842 for readers of Nauvoo's newspaper to perceive him as "passionately fond of the other sex." That was all the more extraordinary because, only one week earlier, the Wasp had published the Prophet's denial that he approved of "promisc[u]ous intercourse between the sexes." Its issue of June 25th printed his letter, which stated in part:

When he [Joseph's assistant counselor John C. Bennett] saw that I would not submit to any such conduct, he went to some of the females in the city, who knew nothing of him but as an honorable man, & began to teach them that promisc[u]ous intercourse between the sexes, was a doctrine believed in by the Latter-Day Saints, and that there was no harm in it; but this failing, he had recourse to a more influential and desperately wicked course; and that was, to persuade them that myself and others of the authorities of the church not only sanctioned, but practiced the same wicked acts ...¹⁶⁸

On the heels of this publicity about Bennett's accusations and the Prophet's denials, it was extraordinarily reckless for the Wasp (with Joseph's permission) to invite "the public [to] judge for themselves whether phrenology proves the reports against him true or false." His phrenological chart's statement that he was "passionately fond of the other sex" invited readers to

conclude that Bennett's accusation was at least based on Joseph Smith's now-publicized sex drive.

More amazing, the Wasp (still with Apostle William Smith as its editor) nonetheless re-emphasized such a linkage on 20 August 1843, when it published a poem which referred to that same portion of the Prophet's phrenological chart. Written by Joseph's secret wife Eliza R. Snow, it began:

Since by chance, the "key bump" has been added to you
 With its proper enlargement of brain,
 Let me hope all thunder bolts malice may strew,
 Will excite in your bosom no pain.¹⁶⁹

Her poetry's well-known literary analyst, Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, has observed:

... addressed though it be to both Joseph and Emma, [this poem] is demonstrably written only to him and responds in its first two lines to the phrenological reading, Joseph's second, which had recently been published (Crane 1842).

It is hard to imagine Eliza Snow publicly noting Joseph's sexual propensities-- certainly there is nothing [else] from her extant about anyone's libido, let alone the Prophet's. However another interpretation of the term ["key bump"] is hard to discover [with reference to his phrenological chart] ... Possibly then, she meant the reference humorously.¹⁷⁰

Beecher seemed unaware that the sexual double entendre in Eliza's verses of 1842 was similar to sexual jokes published that year by both of Nauvoo's LDS newspapers.¹⁷¹ Her poem also appeared three weeks after the Wasp had devoted a special issue to denials of Bennett's accusations that Joseph Smith both approved and practiced "spiritual wifery"/polygamy.¹⁷² Thirty-eight-year-old Eliza R. Snow became Joseph Smith's plural wife on 29 June 1842,¹⁷³ four days after his own published denial of Bennett's accusation and two months before the publication of her poem.

In affirming the intensity of the Prophet's sex drive, I do NOT regard "Joseph Smith's libido as the sole driving force pushing the establishment of plural marriage," as Hales has written about "scores of nineteenth-century writers." Nor am I among what he calls "the overwhelming majority of the authors [who continue to] assume that his libido was the primary motivator" for his polygamous marriages.¹⁷⁴

In my view, Joseph Smith's introduction of plural marriage resulted from his religious commitment to the "restoration of all things"¹⁷⁵ and from his spiritual responsiveness to the revelations he reported. Nonetheless, after marrying his first wife or any subsequent wife who was sexually attractive to him, Joseph's erotic response inevitably influenced his relationship with them. Hales has acknowledged: "The Prophet was virile."¹⁷⁶

Nonetheless, he argues that because Joseph's legal wife Emma gave birth to a child in 1840 and was pregnant when he died in June 1844, "sexual relations in the [other] marriages did not occur often" for the thirty-three polygamous wives that Hales acknowledged the Prophet married between 1841 and 1844.¹⁷⁷ In that regard, his presentation emphasizes "the fact that only

two children have been documented as born from all of his plural unions,"¹⁷⁸ as another reason Hales is confident in asserting that Joseph Smith's "sexual relations with plural wives were uncommon."¹⁷⁹ However, such reasoning imposes on the 1840s a "presentist bias"¹⁸⁰ that is based on medical knowledge long after the 1840s about fertility and conception.

According to the medicine of the 1830s and 1840s, a virile man's ability to father children actually decreased whenever he had frequent intercourse. "The seminal and prostatic secretions are consequently weak ... and become enfeebled by the too frequent discharge of a fluid essentially vital," explained A Dictionary of Practical Medicine, published in Boston in 1834.¹⁸¹ Dr. Michael Ryan's popularized Philosophy of Marriage more fully explained those views in 1837: "... when men abuse the end of marriage, they have no children, because they secrete semen which is not sufficiently elaborated, and which is too feeble; and hence polygamy is much less favourable to population [increase] than monogamy." This British physician concluded that a husband's "abstinence from venereal enjoyment, for a few days or weeks, favors fecundity ..."¹⁸² With London editions in 1837, 1839, and 1843, this popular book was reprinted twice in New York City during 1844 by the title The Secrets of Generation, and one imprint had the subtitle Comprising the Art of Procreating the Sexes at Will.¹⁸³

Therefore, Joseph Smith and his contemporaries had sensible reasons to believe that the more often he had sexual intercourse, the less likely he was to impregnate a female of any age. Thus, his frequent intercourse with dozens of wives would (in his culture's view) make it very UNlikely that an otherwise-unmarried female would attract unwanted attention in Nauvoo by

becoming pregnant. As Hales acknowledged, "having children was not the primary reason for plurality in his theology."¹⁸⁴

The Prophet's marriage to at least six menopausal women was one means of polygamous birth-control from 1840 to 1844,¹⁸⁵ but marrying dozens of additional wives who were of childbearing age was also a form of contraception according to the medical views during his lifetime. As the 1837 medical book proclaimed concerning male polygamists: "polygamy is much less favourable to population [increase] than monogamy," another 1830s-1840s misconception that subsequent ethnography, anthropology, and demography disproved. Nonetheless, it was the view of Joseph Smith's contemporaries concerning male physiology and fecundity.

Concerning female fecundity, the evidence of the 1840s is even more obvious for polygamous contraception. As Hales has observed, "opportunities to spend intimate time with his plural wives would have been limited by many factors" of the Prophet's civil, ecclesiastical, and social life in Nauvoo.¹⁸⁶ As Compton noted in 1997:

A recent [medical] study has concluded that there are only six days in a woman's menstrual month when she can become pregnant. ... If a couple has intercourse once a week, there is only a 10 percent chance of pregnancy in a typical month.¹⁸⁷

Nonetheless, it was virtually impossible for Joseph Smith to cohabit with all of his dozens of plural wives during a single week,¹⁸⁸ yet frequent cohabitation was likely with each newly married bride. Weekly intimacy might also have been his experience with favored wives during some months, as it was with 16-year-old Flora Woodworth. Generally, though, this de facto abstinence on the part of his wives for weeks-in-a-row or months-in-a-row made it extremely

unlikely that an individual wife was ovulating (and able to be impregnated) when she had sexual intercourse with Joseph. Thus, having dozens of wives was a practical method of polygamous contraception in 1842-44, and remains medically demonstrable today.

Nonetheless, with dozens of his wives living in or near Nauvoo by 1843, it would have been easy for Joseph Smith to spend an hour every day with one of them in someone else's house, as he did on two consecutive days with Flora Woodworth in Clayton's house. Just as there were dozens of wives, such a daytime rendezvous could occur discreetly in scores of houses. For example, in the bedrooms of each wife's devout parents who (like the Kimballs, Whitneys, and Lotts¹⁸⁹) gave advance approval for Joseph to marry their daughters, or of her siblings (like Benjamin F. Johnson,¹⁹⁰ who testified of such visits), or of Joseph's already-married wives who also served as "an intermediary"¹⁹¹ for his polygamous proposals (such as Mrs. Cleveland, Mrs. Durfee, and Mrs. Sessions¹⁹²), or of other polygamists (like Joseph B. Noble since 1840/41 and William Clayton after May 1843--whose journal described such visits), or of strictly loyal Mormons who were monogamists before June 1844 (like John Benbow¹⁹³). This crucially decreased what Hales has called "the limiting factor" of Joseph's "ability to safely schedule an intimate rendezvous."¹⁹⁴

Even a nighttime tryst was not improbable, despite Emma Smith's reasonable expectation that her husband would spend the evenings with her and their children, as well as her jealous expectation that nights of intimacy should be with her alone. To the contrary, Joseph often had nighttime meetings of various kinds away from home, which meetings he could leave an hour or two before he finally went to bed with Emma. For example, in requesting a nighttime rendezvous

with his recently married, 17-year-old wife Sarah Ann Whitney, Joseph Smith's letter to her parents and to her ("Brother and Sister, Whitney, and &c.") in his own handwriting stated:

... my feelings are so strong for you since what has passed [sic] lately between us that the time of my absence from you seems so long and dreary, that it seems as if I could not live long in this way: and <if you> three would come and see me in this my lonely retreat, it would afford me great relief, of mind ... I have a room intirely [sic] by myself, the whole matter can be attended to with most perfect safty [sic] ... the only thing to be careful of, is to find out when Emma comes [here,] then you cannot be safe, but when she is not here, there is the most perfect safty [sic] ... pardon me for my earnestness on <this subject> when you consider how lonesome I must be ... I think Emma wont [sic] come to night [--] if she dont [sic,] dont [sic] fail to come to night.¹⁹⁵

Written to his new bride three weeks after their wedding, there was a subtext of sex in his letter's use of "lonely," and "great relief, of mind" (with its unnecessary comma), and of "lonesome."¹⁹⁶

On the other hand, Hales (as a practicing physician) has insisted today: "Physiologically, adding a second sperm donor does not enhance a woman's fertility."¹⁹⁷ However, he ignores the very obvious exception--when a woman of childbearing age has not conceived a child for years by her legally married husband. To his credit, Hales has publicized Joseph Smith's sealing during his lifetime to Esther Dutcher Smith, but he has not acknowledged that by 1843 (the probable year of her marriage to the Prophet) she had not given birth to a child of her legal husband for ten years.¹⁹⁸ The marriage of this still-fertile woman to the virile Joseph Smith would therefore increase the likelihood of her bearing another child, as the birth of "Joseph Albert Smith"

demonstrated in 1844.¹⁹⁹ Whether DNA testing ultimately proves this child to have been fathered by her legal husband Albert or by the Prophet, the latter's addition as a sperm-donor logically increased Esther's chances of pregnancy.

Likewise for Lucinda Pendleton Morgan Harris, named by Andrew Jenson's semi-official list as "one of the first women sealed to the Prophet." He placed her immediately after Joseph Smith's first polygamist wife during the mid-1830s, Fanny Alger.²⁰⁰ Andrew Jenson's research notes stated in early 1887 that Brigham Young's widow "Harriet Cook Young is positive that [Lucinda] was married to Joseph in Missouri."²⁰¹

Lucinda bore two children to her first husband, the anti-Masonic martyr William Morgan.²⁰² Although Todd Compton, Gary James Bergera, George D. Smith, and I have suggested that her polygamous marriage to the Prophet occurred on an unknown date between 1838 and 1842,²⁰³ Hales emphasized "the first half of the year 1837" in one publication--a year after he published a contrary statement that "the most likely time and place appear to be in 1842."²⁰⁴

All of us, however, ignored the 1985 analysis by John E. Thompson. He pointed out that Lucinda's marriage most likely occurred during Joseph Smith's visit (without his legal wife) to Far West, Missouri in November 1837, rather than in 1838 when he and Emma Smith stayed with Lucinda and her second husband there.²⁰⁵ That November was the seventh anniversary of her marriage to George W. Harris (57-years-old that month), to whom 36-year-old Lucinda had borne no children by that date.²⁰⁶

Oddly, Hales argued in 2010 that it "was a geographic impossibility" for the Prophet to begin a relationship with Lucinda in Missouri during 1837,²⁰⁷ even though Susan Easton Black had published in 1997 that "by 1836, he [her husband George W. Harris and she] had moved to Far West, Missouri ..."²⁰⁸ Moreover, George's printed testimony in mid-1838 began: "I asked Oliver Cowdery last fall when Joseph Smith was in the Far West, if the report was true ..." Lucinda's husband was referring to rumors about the Prophet's relationship with Fanny Alger.²⁰⁹ Contrary to the assertion by Brian Hales, Joseph and Lucinda were in the same town during November 1837, when her legal husband George W. Harris (who had no children) was inquiring at Far West about rumors of latter-day polygamy. Five years later, she had dinner with Joseph Smith, his recently married wife Agnes Coolbrith Smith, and Apostle Willard Richards.²¹⁰

Depending on one's point of view (or bias), George Harris and Joseph Smith also participated during 1838 in an event that provided additional support for the Prophet's sexual polyandry, or that simply involved multiple coincidences. At issue was the effort of local LDS leader Aaron C. Lyon to marry the wife of a living Mormon. According to their analysis of the extensive documentation that survives for his trial by LDS authorities in Far West, Michael S. Riggs and John E. Thompson observed in 2006 that Joseph side-stepped or actually violated some of his own instructions and revelations, in order to arrange for George Harris and the Prophet to speak on behalf of the accused at this trial.²¹¹ The latter's "Scriptory Book" journal for 28 April 1838 described "President J[oseph] Smith Jr, & Geo W. Harris who, with profound elequence[,] with /a/ deep & sublime thought, with clemency of feeling, spoke in faivour [sic] of the defendant ..."²¹² Aside from (1) the semi-official identification of already-married Lucinda

Harris "one of the first women sealed to the Prophet," plus (2) Smith and Harris installing themselves as defenders in a trial for which they had no technical role, there was a third reason that the modern researchers regarded the circumstances of this 1838 incident as a precursor for Nauvoo's polyandry. Aaron Lyon was the father of Windsor P. Lyon, whose wife became Joseph Smith's plural wife there within four years.²¹³

However, Thompson's earlier analysis seemed persuasive that Joseph's marriage to Mrs. Lucinda Harris occurred in November 1837 at Far West.²¹⁴ If that was the chronology, then the joint participation of her two husbands in defending Aaron Lyon derived from Joseph's and George's participation in sexual polyandry that autumn and again after the Prophet's return to Far West in March 1838, when Joseph "and his very pregnant wife Emma" stayed in the home of George and Lucinda for two months.²¹⁵

Although Lucinda Harris gave birth to no known children after 1837, having the Prophet as an extra sperm-donor increased her chances (and her legal husband's) of being honored with a child. This is undoubtedly why George W. Harris stood as proxy for Lucinda's sealing to Joseph Smith at the first opportunity to do so, eighteen months after his martyrdom in June 1844.²¹⁶

Now I want to examine documentary evidence for sexual polyandry that Brian Hales has not mentioned in today's presentation (nor in his previous publications and presentations about these matters). Until today, I have not discussed three of the following diary-references with anyone during the forty-one years since I discovered them in 1971.²¹⁷ I regarded these documents as so sensational, that they required a significant context and detailed overview before I would even consider talking about them. Today's papers by Larry Foster and Brian Hales provide as

good a context as I think is possible, particularly in view of the detailed studies of Nauvoo polygamy that have been available to the public in a master's thesis since 1975 and in four books published from 1981 to 2008.²¹⁸ Thus, I am now ending my untypical silence and self-censorship about one particular controversy in Mormon history.²¹⁹

Brian Hales not only accepts, but emphasizes that before January 1842,²²⁰ Joseph Smith was ceremonially united with two already-married women, Zina Huntington Jacobs and her sister Presendia Huntington Buell (both of whom had a young son by that date). Willard Richards, the Prophet's private secretary at this time,²²¹ recorded a dream that must be included within the evidence for any interpretation alleging that marriages of this type were devoid of sexuality.

This is how Apostle Richards described the dream on 21 January 1842: "Joseph & woman sitting in a chair pulling off[f] her stocking. Little boy in the old wives-lap."²²² It is not overstating the evidence to say that his private secretary described a dream which placed the Prophet in an erotic situation with an "old" wife who was young enough to have a "little boy." Within the marital context that Hales affirms, this could refer to the nearly two-year-old Oliver Norman Buell, or to the two-week-old Zebulon William Jacobs.²²³

However, Apostle Richards was actually referring to his own wife's dream that envisaged the Prophet in this compromising situation with the mother of a young child. Their only living son was fifteen months old at this time.²²⁴ On January 21st and 22nd, Willard's diary noted: "interp[re]ted dream ... mailed a letter to Jennetta,"²²⁵ who (due to ill health) was absent from Nauvoo and living with his relatives in Massachusetts.²²⁶

His subsequently undated letter (in March 1842) to Jennetta was an anxious reply to her letter (written in February) in which she reacted negatively to what he wrote about her dream.

My Dearest Jennetta, I am sorry you did not understand the Interpretation [in my letter on January 22nd] of your dream. the statement was [that] you would be tempted, not that you would give way & wrong me or break your vow. No! and instead of my believing you guilty of any criminal act, I never had a jealous thought of you [--] God knows. ... the interpretation was from God, as a warning to beware of Temptation [--] therefore set your heart at rest about my fears of you. ...²²⁷

Those references to "temptation" and "criminal act" show that he interpreted her dream in sexual terms, even adulterous terms. Equally significant, Willard Richards excluded Joseph Smith from its sexual meaning, even though his wife's dream had emphasized the Prophet as physically involved with the "guilty" wife/mother.

Living a thousand miles away, the apostle's wife certainly possessed no knowledge that Joseph Smith had been united to already-married women, but Jennetta's dream showed that she suspected it (or intuited it). Despite the fact that her own son was eligible to be the dream's "little boy," Jennetta's negative reaction to Willard's interpretation showed that she had not seen herself as the dream's wife/mother.

It was her husband's January letter that identified her as one of the dream's sexual participants. Having never met Joseph Smith, nor visited Nauvoo by January 1842, Jennetta Richards dreamed/imagined/intuited that one of the city's young mothers was undressing while "sitting in a chair" with the Prophet. His wife had an uncanny, disturbing insight that Willard

Richards tried his best to deflect away from Joseph, even to the extent of writing that she was the one who was vulnerable to sexual "Temptation"--a thousand miles from her husband and from the Prophet about whom Jennetta had dreamed her dream.

According to evidence that Brian Hales also accepts,²²⁸ as early as February 1842, Senior Apostle Brigham Young began performing ceremonies that united Joseph Smith in some way with women who were already married to other men.²²⁹ Then, on 2 November 1843, Joseph united Brigham with already-married Augusta Adams Cobb,²³⁰ who had abandoned "her husband and five of her children in Boston" to travel with Brigham to Nauvoo.²³¹ Thus, this apostle had direct knowledge of whether sexual intercourse was authorized by the secret ceremony uniting an already-married man with a woman who was already married to another husband.²³²

Exactly a month later, Brigham recorded his dream in which he, his legal wife, and the Prophet were traveling in a covered carriage: "Br Joseph Smith sat on the Back seat with my wife [--] he whisper[e]d to hir [her--] Sead [said] it was wright [right] if she was a mind to [--] nothing more past [passed] betwen [sic] them." Then, in the dream, she disappears and is next seen in a hearse.²³³

Brigham's troublesome dream on 2 December 1843 was not simply expressing a generalized feeling of jealousy about the Prophet's interest in his wife Mary Ann Angell Young. During a meeting of Church President Wilford Woodruff with the apostles in the Salt Lake Temple on 25 June 1896, there was a discussion about "certain trials or tests to which Prests. B. Young and Jno. Taylor were put by Prest. Joseph the Prophet in Nauvoo, as the plurality &

Eternity of the M. [Marriage] covenant was being revealed. Also what Emma was commanded to abstain from, and O. Hyde's trial also.²³⁴

As Brian Hales has acknowledged,²³⁵ Orson Hyde's trial was the discovery that (while he was on a mission to Europe and Palestine in 1842) Joseph Smith had polygamously married his wife Marinda Nancy Johnson Hyde. After Orson returned to Nauvoo, he learned that fact, accepted it, received plural wives of his own beginning in February 1843,²³⁶ and he assented to the re-performance of Marinda's marriage to the Prophet as a sealing for "time and eternity" in May 1843.²³⁷

This mirrored the sequence of ceremonies that united Vinson Knight's wife Martha McBride Knight with Joseph Smith in 1842. Apostle Franklin D. Richards recorded their daughter's statement: "Her mother was sealed to the Prophet Joseph. Her father [Vinson Knight] received another wife--widow Merrick whose husband was martyred at Haun's Mill."²³⁸ Martha's 1869 affidavit gave only a vague date for her plural marriage to the Prophet as "sometime in the summer of the year 1842."²³⁹ Apparently unaware of the above entry from the Richards journal, a 1995 family history provided more clarification: "Sometime during the summer of 1842 (one source states this was before the death of Vinson Knight), Martha McBride Knight was married polygamously to Joseph Smith, Jr. by Heber C. Kimball" (emphasis added).²⁴⁰ As with Apostle Hyde in 1843, Bishop Knight in 1842 seemed to receive a plural wife in exchange for allowing his legal wife to become Joseph's polygamous wife, and those two separate transactions paralleled the 1833 arrangement by which Joseph Smith performed a marriage for Levi W. Hancock in exchange for Hancock's uniting his niece Fanny Alger to the Prophet.²⁴¹ Whether we

call this "polyandry" or "proxy husband,"²⁴² or "exchange of women,"²⁴³ Knight died on 31 July 1842--shortly after these ceremonies. Therefore, it is not stretching the evidence, but contextualizing it, to conclude that Young's dream in December 1843 referred to the Prophet's "test" of asking for Brigham's wife to become Joseph's.

But what about John Taylor and his legal wife Leonora Cannon Taylor? Nearly six years before discussing this in the Temple, President Woodruff told Salt Lake City's 14th Ward:

... the Prophet went to the home of President Taylor, and said to him, "Brother John, I want Leonora["] ... it is said [that] John Taylor never answered the prophet, turned away and walked the floor all night, but the next morning, went to the home of the Prophet's [sic] and said to him, ["]Brother Joseph, if God wants Leonora[,] He can have her.["] That was all the prophet was after ... and said to him, ["]Brother Taylor, I don't want your wife, I just wanted to know where you stood.["]

Although intended as a faith-promoting story of "how President Taylor was tried as Abraham of old by the Prophet Joseph Smith just after the revelation on Plurality of wives was received," this sermon was notably silent about Leonora Cannon Taylor's reaction.²⁴⁴

Eighteen years after her death, the anti-Mormon book Mormon Portraits reported:

Mrs. Leonora Taylor ... told ladies who still reside in this city, that all the wives of the twelve were, in fact, consecrated to the Lord, that is to his servant, Joseph, and that Joseph's demands, and her husband's compliance[,] so exasperated her as to cause her "the loss of a finger and of a baby." ... The latter she lost by a premature delivery, being at

the time in a delicate condition, and in her fury for help [after Joseph's proposal], having thrust her clenched fist through a window-pane, lost one of her fingers.²⁴⁵

This was consistent with Woodruff's later statement that her husband John Taylor acquiesced, but is there any contemporary evidence to support the rest of this hostile report?

Yes, Leonora Cannon Taylor wrote a brief "diary"-memoir (with its last date as 28 January 1845) in which she repeated those circumstances and affirmed her negative reaction. In her own handwriting, she recorded this concerning the death of her daughter Agnes in 1843:

1st of May [--] cut my finger with Glass [--] it got very bad [--] my dear Child took sick, my sweet baby died on the 9th of Sep [1843,] buried on the 10th²⁴⁶ and [on] the 14th I had the middle finger of my left hand taken off [i.e., amputated], and buried with my Baby, [--] I had many tryals about this time but I am yet alive.²⁴⁷

Leonora Cannon Taylor was initially discreet²⁴⁸ in associating these "tryals" with the "trial" of a polygamous proposal later described by Mormon Portraits and by Wilford Woodruff.

However, after next referring to the 1844 martyrdom and after leaving one page blank following her above statements, she wrote the following version of her reaction to Joseph Smith's proposal of marriage. Written large, these words filled one full page in the small book she used for her pre-1845 memoirs:

Come Joseph[,]

Don't be filling that up with boltheads[.]²⁴⁹

How is your garden this year[?]

I'll show you some Summer Apples[,] my Lady[.]

O Dear[!]²⁵⁰

Without going into specifics,²⁵¹ this passage's central three lines contain four phrases or words with sexual meanings, meanings that were well-established in the English language before 35-year-old Leonora Cannon left Britain for the New World.²⁵² Like Brigham Young's dream several months later, Sister Taylor in the summer of 1843 clearly regarded Joseph Smith's proposal as sexual in nature, not as spiritual ("eternity only").²⁵³

Nonetheless, Mormons today might insist that devout members of the LDS Church in the 1840s would not recognize sexual puns, double entendre, or sexual plays-on-words, and would certainly not write them--even privately. To the contrary, on 15 March 1842 the Church's official newspaper Times and Seasons formally apologized for a sexual joke that had appeared within a wedding announcement the previous month. Blaming "the boys" who had previously been compositor and typesetter, this apology insisted that Joseph Smith (the newspaper's editor) had never written "a single indecent or unbecoming word or sentence" in his life.²⁵⁴ Referring to the bride and groom, the newspaper's offending word-play had stated: "... and they find a peaceful abode in the `narrow house,' may the many outs and ins they have made, leave to the world an abundant posterity to celebrate their glorious example" (emphasis in original).²⁵⁵

Despite this apology in Times and Seasons, Joseph Smith's brother William published a sexual double entendre six weeks later. After announcing the marriage of "Mr. Wm. Warren, to Mrs. Catharine Fuller, both of this city," Nauvoo's Wasp next quoted these lines of poetry:

Till Hymen brought his life delighted hour,

There dwelt no peace in Eaden's [Eden's] rosy bower.²⁵⁶

Nauvoo's adults knew that the Wasp's editor intended this as wedding-poetry with mildly sexual overtones, but only those acquainted with Thomas Campbell's poem recognized that the original stated "love-delighted hour" and "dwelt no joy." Aside from those changes, poetry-aficionados knew that the original poem's stanza just before the quoted lines declared: "No pledge is sacred, and no home is sweet!"²⁵⁷ However, only a few recognized that those somber words and Apostle Smith's substitution of "dwelt no peace in ... [her] rosy bower" were his cruel joke on newly wedded Catherine Fuller Warren.

Those few were the men who had been participating for a year with the First Presidency's assistant counselor John C. Bennett in persuading Catherine and other women to have sexual intercourse with anyone Bennett sent to them. For example, Sarah Miller later told Nauvoo's high council that Chauncey Higbee (also spelled "Chancy Higby") visited her "soon after the special conference" in April 1842, and "began his seducing insinuations by saying it was no harm to have sexual intercourse with women if they would keep it to themselves." She added that "when he come again, William Smith come with him & told me that the doctrine which Chancy Higby had taught me was true." Apostle Smith's double entendre in Nauvoo's second newspaper was publicly exploiting his knowledge of Mrs. Warren's similar activities. In May 1842 she told the high council that "nearly a year ago" (i.e., in the summer of 1841, almost a year before Sarah Miller's seduction), Catherine Fuller began having sexual intercourse with Bennett,²⁵⁸ and "not only with him[,] but with Chauncy Higbee and the prophet's younger brother, Apostle William Smith."²⁵⁹

Someone tried to eradicate William's name from the manuscript of testimony that he also visited these two women for sexual intercourse during 1841-42.²⁶⁰ His first cousin, Apostle George A. Smith, later complained about "Wm Smith Commit[t]ing iniquity & we have to sustain him against our feelings."²⁶¹

Thus, both of Nauvoo's Church-owned newspapers showed that Mormons of the early 1840s were able to use and recognize sexual plays-on-words. As the new editor of Nauvoo's Wasp, Apostle John Taylor reprinted a strictly academic comment in January 1843: "There seems to be a double entendre in the word concession ..." ²⁶² The sexual play-on-words in his wife's subsequent diary-memoir was not unusual among early Mormons, even though Leonora Cannon Taylor's use of it as a negative portrayal of the Prophet was extraordinary for one of his devout followers. Like cutting her "finger with Glass," Sister Taylor's written dialogue of double entendre indicated the emotional upheaval she experienced after Joseph Smith asked to marry her as one of his plural wives.

A notation in the Salt Lake Endowment House records of marital sealings also indicated that, while he was alive, Joseph Smith married the wife of Simeon Dagget(t) Carter in Nauvoo. Lydia Kenyon Carter was listed as "Lydia Smith [--] wd of Joseph Smith (Prophet)," when she was sealed to James Goff on 8 June 1851. Born in 1799, she was 44-years-old (menopausal) when she became one of the Prophet's polygamous widows, after which Reynolds Cahoon sealed her as a polygamous wife to Heber C. Kimball on the same day the apostle sealed Cahoon to his first polygamous wife. The latter two had also married before the Prophet's death.²⁶³

The use of "wd" or "widow" in the records of proxy sealings was reserved for women who had married Joseph Smith during his lifetime.²⁶⁴ Nonetheless, legally married to Simeon D. Carter since 1818, Lydia (mother of their three children) resided with him in Nauvoo and Utah²⁶⁵ - despite her marriages to Smith, Kimball, and Goff. Who was the "proxy husband" in her case?

In Utah's special 1856 census, Lydia was listed as residing with Goff in Provo and also living near Simeon Carter in Box Elder County (but not in the same household with Carter).²⁶⁶ That evidence of co-residence would seem to fulfill Larry Foster's strict, academic definition of polyandry.²⁶⁷ Like polygamous men with their co-wives, Lydia Kenyon Carter Smith Kimball Goff obviously did not spend quality time with her respective co-husbands at exactly the same hour, day, or week in Nauvoo and in Utah. However, polyandrous cohabitation seemed to be the reality for her husbands, as it was for Joseph Smith with most of his already-married wives.²⁶⁸

Furthermore, evidence cited by Brian Hales today and in previous publications actually challenges his claim that "Joseph Smith did not marry any additional plural wives during the remaining eight months of his life" and that "all of Joseph Smith's Nauvoo sealings occurred during a thirty-month period. Such marriages ended in November of 1843 ..."²⁶⁹ First, Hales acknowledged that the 1869 affidavit of already-married Ruth Vose Sayers that her sealing to Joseph Smith occurred in "February 1843 ... is problematic because she stated that Hyrum Smith performed the sealing, and he did not accept plural marriage until the following May."²⁷⁰ As I have previously written, "there is a commonsense presumption of accuracy when women state a specific date for their marriage."²⁷¹ Nonetheless, decades later, it is easier for everyone to accurately remember a season or month than it is to accurately remember the year any event

occurred. For example, in the previously cited case of Lydia Kenyon Carter Smith--only six years after her polygamous marriage to Heber C. Kimball, she reported that their sealing occurred in 1844, rather than its correct date a year later.²⁷² Because Hyrum Smith's absolute opposition to polygamy until May 1843 is another "fixed point: [where] no doubt is possible" for verifying chronology,²⁷³ his performing a ceremony uniting Ruth Sayers and Joseph Smith actually occurred in February 1844.²⁷⁴

Moreover, Hales even provides evidence that refutes his claim that the Prophet allegedly stopped marrying new wives after November 1843 because he was allegedly honoring "an arrangement negotiated between Joseph and Emma."²⁷⁵ Hales emphasizes that two women, 20-year-old Cordelia Morley and 23-year-old Rachel Ivins, each declined Joseph Smith's efforts to propose marriage to them in the spring of 1844.²⁷⁶

The specific year is unknown for at least six of Joseph Smith's polygamous marriages.²⁷⁷ Therefore, due to the uncontested evidence that he was unsuccessfully proposing to young women in the spring of 1844, it is possible that some of his undated marriages actually occurred during the last three months of his life.

Finally, I want to discuss the revelatory basis on which Joseph Smith believed that all his polygamous proposals, ceremonies, and sexual cohabitations were righteous, not sinful. Hales has claimed that the 1843 revelation (Doctrine and Covenants 132) did not authorize "sexual polyandry" and so the ceremonies the Prophet entered with already-married women since 1840/41 were ipso facto not sexual.

First, Hales ignores the fact that the 1843 revelation withheld crucial details. As the most obvious example, what did God command Joseph to "offer" (D&C 132: 51) as a choice for his wife Emma? It was an undescribed test ("to prove you all") that this revelation withdrew.

As indication of the concealments involved within the text of the July 1843 revelation, Apostle Erastus Snow publicly stated in 1883 (without naming verse 51) that it actually referred to a threat by the Prophet's legal wife:

Emma used her womanly nature to teas[e] and annoy Joseph and went so far as to threaten Joseph that she would leave Him and cohabit with another man and the Lord forbade her in the Revelation.²⁷⁸

Erastus Snow was one of his polygamous confidants: "Among other things[,] the Prophet Joseph Smith personally taught him the principle of celestial and plural marriage."²⁷⁹ In fact, William Clayton's 1843 journal verifies Snow's reminiscence, plus shows that Emma's threat occurred less than three weeks before the revelation of 12 July 1843: "he [Joseph] knew she was disposed to be revenged on him for some things. She thought that if he would indulge himself [in plural marriage,] she would too."²⁸⁰

William Law was the Prophet's still-devoted counselor in the summer of 1843,²⁸¹ and reminisced in 1887:

Joseph offered to furnish his wife Emma with a substitute for him by way of compensation for his neglect of her, on condition that she would forever stop her opposition to polygamy and permit him [Joseph] to enjoy his young wives in peace and keep some of them in his house and to be well treated etc.²⁸²

Excommunicated in April 1844 for his by-then-adamant opposition to plural marriage and residing continuously in Wisconsin since 1866,²⁸³ William Law obviously had no knowledge of Apostle Snow's unpublished sermon in Utah three years before Law's reminiscence.

Because the D&C 132 revelation said that Joseph Smith actually made an "offer" to Emma, the historical context (both contemporary and reminiscent) shows that he countered her threat in June 1843 by giving his permission for her to choose a man with whom she "would indulge." As indicated in my following analysis, verse 51 was not the first instance in which the July 12th 1843 revelation made a veiled reference to polyandry.

Second, and most important, the revelation also repeatedly conferred divine immunity upon Joseph Smith for any "sin" or "transgression" he had committed in the past regarding other women.²⁸⁴ The document simply mentioned them as "all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph" (D&C 132: 52), but repeatedly introduced these unnamed women within the context of "wives and concubines" (D&C 132: 1, 37, 38, 39).²⁸⁵ The revelation also conferred divine immunity from sin, transgression, or earthly condemnation for anything Joseph Smith might do with other women after July 12th 1843. God's words specifically stated that there were no earthly limits to this immunity.

I will now quote parts of verses from D&C, Section 132, which you can consult to verify my accuracy and the context:

--Verses 19-20: " ... if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my law ... and commit no murder ... then shall they be gods ..."

NOTE: Because the only exception was murder, these verses included adultery in their provision for spiritual immunity.

--Verse 26: "... if a man marry a wife according to my word, and they are sealed by the holy Spirit of promise, according to mine appointment ... [they can] commit any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever ... yet they shall enter into their exaltation"

NOTE: Because the only exceptions in this verse were "murder" and "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," adultery was once again included in its provision for immunity.²⁸⁶

--Verse 40: "... I gave unto thee, my servant Joseph, an appointment, and [to] restore all things. Ask what ye will, and it shall be given unto you according to my word."

NOTE: The above verse was the revelatory basis upon which Joseph Smith answered his private secretary's inquiry a month later about marrying plural wives: "you have a right to get all you can."²⁸⁷ Likewise, Brigham Young later told the apostles: "My opinion is [-] any thing that you do in righteousness, there is no harm in it. if a man is faithful & can get a wife without injuring the cause[,] all is right."²⁸⁸

--Verse 41: "And as ye have asked concerning adultery, verily I say unto you, if a man receiveth a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, and if she be with another man, and I have not appointed [this other man] unto her by the holy anointing, she hath committed adultery ..."

NOTE: First, the woman's adulterous violation of "the new and everlasting covenant" was included in the immunity described in verse 26: "any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever ... yet they shall enter into their exaltation."

NOTE: Second, the revelation did not discuss the circumstance this verse only implied--when God APPOINTS another man unto a woman who is already married. Consistent with the above verse, there would be NO ADULTERY on the part of the woman or on the part of this other man whom God has "appointed" to be with her sexually.²⁸⁹

--Verse 46: "... and whosoever sins you remit on earth shall be remitted in the heavens ..."

NOTE: The above verse allowed Joseph Smith to "remit" his own sins.

--Verse 48: "... whatever you give on earth, and to whomsoever you give any one [i.e., any wife] on earth, by my word and according to my law, it shall be visited with blessings and not cursings ..."²⁹⁰

NOTE: After the revelation absolved Joseph Smith of adultery (which would have particular application to his previous marriages to already-married women), the above verse authorized him to perform such marriages for anyone he might choose. Thus, soon after July 1843, the Prophet performed more ceremonies to unite already-married women as polygamous wives of trusted men (such as legally undivorced Julia Hills Johnson to John Smith--his uncle, legally undivorced Augusta Adams Cobb to Apostle Brigham Young, and legally undivorced Louisa Gordon Rising to rank-and-file Edwin D. Woolley).²⁹¹

--Verse 50: "Behold, I have seen all your sacrifice and will forgive all your sins: I have seen your sacrifices in obedience to that which I have told you ..."

NOTE--The above verse absolved Joseph Smith of any mistakes ("sins") he may have already committed concerning the revelation's main topic of "plural wives and concubines".

--Verse 59: "Verily, if a man be called of my Father ... if he do anything in my name, and according to my law and by my word, he will not commit sin and I will justify him."

NOTE--The above verse absolved Joseph Smith of any mistake or "sin" he might commit in future concerning the revelation's main topic of "plural wives and concubines."²⁹² Its wording likewise conferred divine immunity upon any man who might in future "be called of my Father" as Joseph Smith's successor.²⁹³

NOTE--Verses 19-20, 26, 40-41, 46, 48, 50, 59 each expanded one provision in the revelation of 27 July 1842 (a document in Joseph Smith's own handwriting). While providing the wording of the ceremony to unite Joseph Smith with 17-year-old Sarah Ann Whitney, God's words stated that this polygamous wife and her husband should "be each others companion so long as you both shall live [--] preser[v]ing yourselv[es] for each other and from all others and also through [o]ut all eternity [--] reserving only those rights which have been given to my servant Joseph by revelation and commandment and by legal Authority in times passed [i.e., past]."²⁹⁴ The emphasized phrase indicated that only Sarah Ann was required to preserve her affections and her body "from all others," because God had already given revelation, commandment, and "Authority" for Joseph Smith to sexually cohabit with other women as his wives prior to 27 July 1842.²⁹⁵ As established by multiple sources, most of those previous ceremonies were with already-married women.

No matter what term(s) Larry Foster, or Brian Hales, or I use for describing Joseph Smith's relationships with women besides his legal wife Emma, God's words in 1843 said that

none of those acts were sinful. The Lord warned everyone (including Emma) not to condemn Joseph. And I do not.²⁹⁶

God is not hostage to the ethics of any human being, and His prophets have sometimes manifested "theocratic ethics" that were in opposition to conventional ethics.²⁹⁷ Many people might dislike those manifestations of antinomianism,²⁹⁸ but that's the way things were.

Brian Hales does not want to believe (or admit to others) that Joseph Smith experienced sexual polyandry with even one man's wife, because that would be "adultery."²⁹⁹ Nonetheless, in his Sunday sermon on 7 November 1841 (by which time Joseph was maritally united with several already-married women), he told Nauvoo's Mormons: "What many people call sin is not sin; I do many things to break down superstition, and I will break it down."³⁰⁰ A decade afterward, Seventy's President Jedediah M. Grant (whose Utah wife Rachel Ivins had declined Joseph Smith's proposal of marriage in Nauvoo) said to a Salt Lake City congregation: "Did the Prophet Joseph want every man's wife he asked for? He did not. ..."³⁰¹ Seven weeks later, Brigham Young ordained Grant an apostle and made him his counselor.³⁰²

Two years after President Grant publicly introduced the subject of possible polyandry to Utah's Mormons, President Young told a Salt Lake City congregation on 9 November 1856 what Brigham had said to a Mormon critic decades earlier:

The doctrine he [Joseph Smith] teaches is all I know about the matter, bring anything against that if you can. As to anything else[,] I do not care. If he acts like a devil, he has brought forth a doctrine that will save us if we will abide it. He may get drunk every day of his life, sleep with his neighbor's wife every night, run horses and gamble, I

do not care anything about that, for I never embrace any man in my faith. But the doctrine he has produced will save you and me, and the whole world; and if you can find fault with that, find it.³⁰³

For his apostolic successor, the possibility of the founding Prophet's "sleep[ing] with his neighbor's wife" (or "sexual polyandry," as Brian Hales has termed it) in the 1830s onward was irrelevant to the spiritual truth of Mormonism.

As a historian, I regard the evidence for Joseph Smith's sexual polyandry to be diverse, widespread, and convincing when viewed as an interconnected (though fragmentary) mosaic. As a Mormon believer, I regard Brigham's 1856 testimony to be compelling. However, not everyone has his kind of "faith."³⁰⁴

Be that as it may, the Prophet's recent biographer Richard Lyman Bushman (a profound believer in Mormonism) has written in the Journal of Mormon History: "We want to know Joseph Smith as he really was in the historical record and not as idealized in our historical imaginations. We are confident the real Joseph Smith can stand up for himself. Our period [of time in writing Mormon history] is ruled by an ethic of full disclosure. We do not need to conceal our history. We believe it will be more convincing, more engaging, and more true if we tell it as it is."³⁰⁵

Thank you.

1. Expansion of Lawrence Foster, Religion and Sexuality: Three American Communal Experiments of the Nineteenth Century (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 165; also Foster, "Sex and Prophetic Power: A Comparison of John Humphrey Noyes, Founder of the Oneida Community, with Joseph Smith Jr., the Mormon Prophet," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 31 (Winter 1998): 77.

2. Power-point version on screen for this MHA session, which Brian C. Hales read aloud (plus making off-the-cuff comments), as contained in my print-out (totaling 127 unnumbered pages of charts, illustrations, and pre-printed statements) from the electronic attachment emailed to me by Hales on 23 June 2012.

His presentation today restated many sections from Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" in Newell G. Bringhurst and Craig L. Foster, eds., The Persistence of Polygamy: Joseph Smith and the Origins of Mormon Polygamy (Independence, MO: John Whitmer Books/John Whitmer Historical Association, 2010), [99]-151, and it repeated limited sections from Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," Journal of Mormon History 38 (Spring 2012): 163-228. Where applicable to my comments here, I cite and quote from those earlier articles.

Although it will not be obvious to those with access only to these comments, Larry Foster's MHA paper was shorter than Hales' audio-visual presentation. Moreover, despite time constraints, Hales presented dozens of sub-topics to the MHA session as compared with Foster's highly focused remarks. Therefore, 95 percent of my "Comments" at MHA concerned what Hales said on 29 June 2012 and what he had published beforehand.

Regarding the balance of these "expanded-finalized" comments, I debated with myself about whether to anachronistically depart from this MHA format of June by adding references to Hales' "Response" (dated 25 August 2012). I do so now only because he posted his "Response" on the Internet for the general public. (see my previous Footnote *, 2nd para.)

In most cases, I've limited post-August revisions to these endnotes. In other instances, I've anachronistically introduced into the June narrative some perspectives from the August "Response" by Hales. As a consequence of this apparent necessity for me to introduce anachronisms into the format of the MHA session, these "expanded-finalized" comments also cite other sources available to me after June 2012.

The one post-2012 source I have completely excluded from these "expanded-finalized" comments is the session titled "AUTHOR MEETS CRITICS: BRIAN HALES' THREE-VOLUME JOSEPH SMITH'S POLYGAMY: HISTORY AND THEOLOGY," in the "2013 Salt Lake Sunstone Symposium" on 2 August 2013. I did not attend that session, nor listen to its electronic recording, nor read any of the prepared texts by its participants, nor learn about any of its verbal expressions by presenters or attenders, nor discuss it with others (aside from acknowledging its occurrence). See my previous Footnote *, 4th para.

For personal reasons, I do not want to change this MHA format in order to write a different kind of monograph. To those readers who prefer that I do so, I apologize for not deferring to what might be your better judgment.

3. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 100, called this "ceremonial polyandry" as distinct from "Sexual Polyandry" (his emphasis in both quotes).

4. For example, [Edmund Tilney], A briefe [sic] and pleasant discourse of duties in Marriage, called the Flower of Friendship (London: Henrie Denham, 1577), unpaginated ("In the Isles of Canaria [i.e., Canary Islands], there were contrarywise so manye [many] men, and so fewe [few] women, that every wife might have seauen [seven] husbandes [sic], and coulde [could] not take lesse [less] than five [five]").

I didn't find the above or the following cross-national perspectives while preparing for this MHA session. They are among the four megabytes of computer-notes I amassed as a Senior Fellow of the Beinecke Library at Yale University in 2002-03. However, to write the book-length British-American intellectual history about minority expressions of marriage and sexuality that I began researching there, I need to spend a year examining the pre-1850 imprints at the British Library's facility in London. After unsuccessfully applying for the highly competitive fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies, the British Library, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, it seems impossible for me to complete that project. Thus, I'm pleased that this MHA session allows me to use some of my Yale research of 2002-03 in an academic setting.

By the way, publications by Brian Hales have cited now-obsolete accession-numbers and box-numbers from my Research Files in the Beinecke Library, where they have been open to the public since the year 2000. As of 2012, the library has re-numbered those boxes and re-assigned them to its only collection of my papers, now cataloged as "Western Americana MSS S-2692."

5. Jean-Baptiste Du Halde, The General History of China, trans. Richard Brookes, 4 vols. (London: John Watts, 1736), 3: 444 ("a Woman may have several husbands; most commonly of the same Family, nay, Brothers; the Children are dispos'd of [i.e., apportioned] among them after this manner; the First-born belongs to the eldest [brother-husband], and those which are born afterwards belong to the younger [brother-husbands]; when the Lamas are tax'd [i.e., accused] with this shameful piece of Lewdness, they offer in excuse the scarcity of Women which are in Thibet [Tibet], as well as in Tartary, where in reality in every Family there are more Males than Females"), with variant translation in Jean-Baptiste Grosier (Abbe), A General Description of China ..., 2nd ed., 2 vols. (London: G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1745), 1: 321-22; also William Winterbotham, An Historical, Geographical and Philosophical View of the Chinese Empire ... To Which Is Added a Copious Account of Lord Macartney's Embassy, 2 vols., 1st U.S. ed. (Philadelphia: Richard Lee, 1796), 1: 214 (briefer version of the 1736 narrative).

6. Henry Bolingbroke, The Works Of the Late Right Honourable Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke, 5 vols. (London: David Mallet, 1754), 5: 161 ("and CAESAR reports that there were in our [ancient] Britain certain amicable societies of both sexes, wherein every woman was the wife of ten or twelve men").

7. Vincent le Blanc, The World Surveyed: Or, The Famous Voyages & Travails of Vincent le Blanc, or White, of Marseilles: Who from the Age of Fourteen years, to Threescore and Eighteen, Travelled through most parts of the World, trans. Francis Brooke (London: John Starkey, 1660), 62, concerning the "kingdom of Cochin"--now Vietnam ("Their wives are in common; and the Natives lend them one another; when they enter any house, they leave their swords and bucklers

at the dore [door], and no man dare enter while another is within").

8. John Lockman, ed., Travels of the Jesuits Into Various Parts of the World ..., 2nd ed., 2 vols. ([London]: T. Piety, 1762), 2: 382 (30 January 1709), letter from Father de La Lane concerning India (a "Custom which prevails in Malleamen [sic, Malabar]. The Women of this Country are allow'd to marry as many Husbands as they please, and oblige each of 'em to furnish the several Things they want; the one supplying 'em with Clothes, another with Rice, &c."); Awnsham Churchill, A Collection of Voyages and Travels, Some Now first Printed from Original Manuscripts, Others Now first Published in English, 6 vols. (London: Awnsham and John Churchill, 1732), 2: 236, concerning "inhabitants of the coast of Malabar," south of Goa, India ("One Nayros [sic, Naires or Nayres] is not allow'd more than one Wife at a time, but the women in this point have got the start of the men, they being permitted to have three husbands at once; except that a woman of the sect of the Brahmans [sic, Brahmins] that is married to a Nyros [sic, Naires or Nayres] is not allow'd more than one. Each of these three husbands contribute their share towards the maintenance of this woman and her children, without the least contest or jealousy. As often as any of them comes to visit her, he leaves his arms [i.e., weapons] at the door, a sign that neither of the other two must come in, for fear of disturbing the first"); Charles Louis Montesquieu, The Spirit of the Laws, 2 vols. (London: J. Nourse and P. Vaillant, 1750), 1: 362 ("The Naires are the tribe of nobles, who are the soldiers of all those nations. ... in Malabar [Southern India], where the climate requires greater indulgence, they are satisfied with rendering marriage as little burthensome [burdensome] as possible; they give a wife amongst many men, which consequently diminishes the attachments to a family, and the cares of housekeeping, and leaves them in the free possession of a military spirit").

9. Robert Knox, An Historical Relation Of the Island Ceylon, in the East-Indies: Together With an Account of the Detaining in Captivity [of] the Author and divers other Englishmen now Living there, and of the Author's Miraculous Escape (London: Richard Chiswell, 1681), 94 ("In this Countrey [sic] each Man, even the greatest, hath but one Wife; but a Woman often has two Husbands. For it is lawful and common with them for two Brothers to keep house together with one Wife, and the Children do acknowledge and call both Fathers").

10. Thomas Jefferys, The Natural and Civil History of the French Dominions in North and South America ..., 2 parts in 1 vol. (London: Thomas Jefferys, 1760), 1: 71 ("But there is a much greater disorder still which prevails in the Iroquois canton of Tsonnonthouan, who allow of a plurality of husbands"), repeated with inversion of the first two phrases in Pierre Charlevoix (Father), A Voyage To North-America ..., 2 vols. (Dublin: John Exshaw and James Potts, 1766), 2: 36.

11. William Coxe, Account of the Russian Discoveries Between Asia and America ..., 4th ed., enl. (London: Cadell and Davies, 1803), 258 (concerning the Fox Islands, "Nor is it unusual for the men to exchange their wives"), 300 (concerning "the [Aleutian] islands lying near the American coast, and stretching from Kuktak to the east and north east," in part: "sometimes two or even three men live with one wife, without suspicion or jealousy"); Georg H. von Langsdorff

("Aulic Counsellor To His Majesty the Emperor of Russia"), Voyages and Travels in Various Parts of the World, During the Years 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, and 1807 (Carlisle, PA: George Phillips, 1817), 344-45, concerning the natives of Oonalashka in the Aleutian Islands:

"Sometimes the same woman lives with two husbands, who agree among themselves upon the conditions on which they are to share her; and it is not uncommon for men to make an exchange of wives").

12. Seizure of the Ship Industry, By a Conspiracy, And the consequent Sufferings of Capt. James Fox and his Companions; Their Captivity Among the Esquimaux Indians of North America ... (London: Thomas Tegg, [1810]), 13 ("There are certain seasons of the moon when these men do not visit their wives. Jealousy enters so faintly into their breasts, that many find no difficulty in lending their wives to their friends").

13. Quoted in Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 111, 111n32, 112; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 196, 196n116; Todd Compton, In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1997), 183, 681nVII; George D. Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy: "But We Called It Celestial Marriage" (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2008), 100-01.

Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 111-12, examined the rationalizations that LDS apologists might make for interpreting Josephine's affidavit (and the meaning of what her mother told her) as applying to the Prophet as only a "spiritual" father. The alternative, Hales acknowledged, is that Sylvia and her mother both understood (and intended their words to be understood) that a "genetic connection existed between Josephine and Joseph Smith." To his great credit as an apologist for Joseph Smith's integrity and reputation, Hales rather emphatically concluded that content-analysis of her affidavit and "several historical documents support a genetic relationship between the Prophet and Josephine ..." (113, 2nd para.).

Nonetheless, his next section (113-18) interpreted the relationship of her mother Sylvia Sessions Lyon and Joseph Smith as non-polyandrous because Sylvia allegedly stopped cohabiting with her legal husband Windsor P. Lyon and obtained a "religious divorce" by Smith's authority alone. For longer presentation of this argument and interpretation, see Hales, "The Joseph Smith-Sylvia Sessions Plural Sealing: Polyandry or Polygyny?," Mormon Historical Studies 9 (Spring 2008): 41-57. See also my narrative discussion for my Notes 90-99.

14. Quoted in Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 113, for which he cited (113n37): "Angus Munn Cannon, `Statement of an interview with Joseph Smith, III, 1905,' regarding conversation on October 12, 1904, MS 3166, LDS Church Archives"); also Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 196; Andrew Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret News/Andrew Jenson History, 1901-36), 1: 292 ("Cannon, Angus Munn, president of the Salt Lake Stake of Zion since 1876").

15. George H. Brimhall diary, 1 January 1888, Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, with typescript at LDS Church History Library, Salt Lake City, Utah. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 113n36, first cited as

"Jennie H. Groberg, ed., Diary of George H. Brimhall, vol. 1, Bound typescript, undated, no publisher, copy in Harold B. Lee Library, Special Collections, 2 volumes." See Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 3: 325 (for Brimhall).

Hales, "Puzzlement," 112, wrongly stated that Brimhall recorded this "In 1886," but his source-note on 113n36 correctly identified it as "George H. Brimhall Journal, Jan. 1, 1888 ..."

Brimhall was not referring to "Father" Stephen Hales, a former resident of Nauvoo, who died in Bountiful during 1881. See Janice P. Dawson, "An Economic Kaleidoscope: The Stephen Hales Family of Bountiful," Utah Historical Quarterly 61 (Winter 1993): 63-78; see my Note 16.

16. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 113n36, "The most likely identity of `Father Hales' is Charles Henry Hales (1817-1889), Brian C. Hales' great-great-grandfather."

17. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 130 (for quote beginning: "sealed to Joseph the Prophet"), and Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 213n171 (for his more detailed citation to "Daniel H. Wells, Letter to Joseph F. Smith, June 25, 1888, MS 1325, Box 16, fld. 9, LDS Church History Library, in Turley, Selected Collections, Vol. 1, DVD #29"); also Hales, "Puzzlement," 130n95 ("I am indebted to Michael Marquardt for bringing this to my attention. It constitutes a new plural wife [Esther Dutcher Smith] on my list of Joseph Smith's polygamous marriages, previously unreported by any researcher").

For the birth of Esther's fourth child "Joseph," see Susan Ward Easton Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 50 vols. (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1984-88), 39: 654-55. For Wells as counselor to Brigham Young from 1857 to 1877 and as counselor to the Quorum of the Twelve from 1877 to his own death in 1891, see Daniel H. Ludlow, ed., Encyclopedia of Mormonism: The History, Doctrine, and Procedure of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 5 vols. (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1992), 4: 1649.

18. Hales' Power-point presentation today for pre-printed statement: "Esther delivered a son, Joseph Albert Smith, on September 21, 1844" (emphasis by Hales).

19. Daniel H. Wells to Joseph F. Smith, 25 June 1888, as quoted in Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 130.

20. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 213, quoted a family-biography that Albert Smith was "taking an active part in building up the city [Nauvoo] and also being called upon, he went on a mission back East."

21. Daniel H. Wells to Joseph F. Smith, 25 June 1888.

Compare with "... Albert Smith acting for JOSEPH SMITH THE PROPHET ... [and] ESTHER DUTCHER, born 25 Feb 1811 at Cherry Valley, New York ... Sealing Date: 10 Oct 1851 at 3 1/2 P.M. by B Young," in Thomas Milton Tinney, The Royal Family of the Prophet Joseph Smith Jr. (Salt Lake City: Tinney-Greene Family Organization, 1973), 13, as Tinney's extract (adding all-CAPS) from the records of the Salt Lake Endowment House (Film 183,393--

not available to the general public), LDS Family History Library, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Also, Allen Claire Rozsa, "Temple Ordinances," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 4: 1445 ("PROXY ORDINANCES. All temple ordinances, beginning with baptism, may be performed by proxy for persons who died not having the opportunity to receive them for themselves"); compare with narrative quote for my Note 148 (and for comments within the note itself) for another example of Joseph Smith's polygamous marriages being "repeated in order that a record might exist" because "there is no record thereof."

22. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 130 (for the quotes about the reactions by Esther Dutcher's husband), 106 (for the article's bold, italicized heading), followed by two-page chart (on pages 108-09) for twelve husbands who expressed no "Complaints about polyandry" (his emphasis, a list from which Hales significantly excluded the broken-hearted reaction of Esther Dutcher Smith's husband, a quote Hales did not introduce to his readers for twenty-one more pages). Likewise, Hales insisted (110): "... they all seem to have reacted to the relationship with the exact same response: nothing" (emphasis by Hales), followed by his statement: "To date, no gripes from any of these legal husbands have been identified in the historical documents," as if there was no hint of a complaint or gripe in Hales' later quote about Esther's husband saying she "nearly broke his heart by telling him of it, and expressing her intention of adhering to that relationship."

In response to my comments in the narrative for this note and within this note itself (as stated above), Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 7, claimed that his "statement, `No complaints from legal husbands' was in reference to complaints against Joseph Smith. Albert was understandably disheartened ... [but] none of these men blamed the Prophet for allowing the sealings or complained against him ..." (emphasis by Hales).

To me, belatedly specifying such a restrictive meaning for his previously unqualified remarks is a contradiction of what Hales stated in his 2010 "Puzzlement" article about "no gripes" by the legal husbands, which article affirmed that their "response" was "nothing" (his emphasis). The last assertion, a generality Hales often restated in print and that he repeated claimed in his Powerpoint presentation of June 2012, was clearly contradicted by the broken-hearted response of a legal husband.

Over time, we can all legitimately reassess our own interpretations and conscientiously change them (as I have in the narrative for my Notes 25-31 and within Notes 26-27 themselves), but Hales seemed to claim in August 2012 that he had never expressed a view about this topic different from his "Response."

For other examples when Hales has seemed to contradict or misrepresent the documents that he himself has cited, see my Note 29; see my Note 71 (last para.); see my Note 101 (2nd para.); see the narrative for my Notes 117-118; see the narrative for my Notes 120-121; see my Note 204 (3rd para., beginning: "First"). With regard to my making such a stark assessment about Brian C. Hales, I have praised him throughout this "expanded-finalized" monograph as "an honest apologist" whenever I can, but I cannot remain silent about the perplexing gaffes in his use of evidence. (also see my Note 64, 4th para., beginning: "Worse"--within the context of my effort to exonerate Hales of intentional misrepresentation in my Note 31, last sentence)

23. John A. Widtsoe, "Evidences and Reconciliations: cx. Did Joseph Smith Introduce Plural Marriage?," Improvement Era 49 (November 1946): 721.

24. D. Kelly Ogden, "Two from Judah Ministering to Joseph," in H. Dean Garrett, ed., Regional Studies in Latter-day Saint History: Illinois (Provo, UT: Department of Church History and Doctrine, Brigham Young University, 1995), 227.

25. For an example of twentieth-century scholars who made such assumptions, see narrative for my Note 37 and the note itself.

26. Hales' analysis of those documents, which I had read in the print-outs of his Power-point presentation before I read his previous publications, caused me to change some of my views expressed to him in an email on 17 May 2011. My email acknowledged that I was depending on my decades-old memory of the documents I previously examined about Nauvoo polygamy, documents whose typescripts had been in my Research Papers at Yale's Beinecke Library since February 1999.

Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 16, 17, 18-19, 26, 74, quite rightly faulted me for not specifically acknowledging this evidence in the "unabbreviated" comments I had emailed to him on August 2nd. I admit that was a mistake, and do my best to correct it in the "expanded-finalized" narrative at this point.

27. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 129; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 220-[221]; Power-point version on screen for this MHA session, as contained in my print-out (totaling 127 unnumbered pages of charts, illustrations, and pre-printed statements) from the electronic attachment emailed to me by Hales on 23 June 2012.

I had not previously read any of those three sources until preparing in June for my "Comments" at MHA in Calgary, Canada. Nonetheless, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 17-18, 26, 74, quite rightly faulted me for not specifying this aspect of the Sayers sealing in my "unabbreviated" version (dated "end of July" 2012). I correct that error in these "expanded-finalized" comments.

28. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 129, which his 2010 source-note (129n93) described: "Recorded by D. Michael Quinn. See D. Michael Quinn Papers, Yale University ..."; also his 2012 "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 220-[221], whose source-note (220n195) stated: "typescript excerpt in Quinn Papers."

29. Regrettably, in his publications about this matter, Hales has misrepresented the fact that my transcription gave the woman's name as "Sagers" (with a "g," NOT Sayers). In his 2012 publication, he even pretended that my typescript spelled the surname as "Sayers" (with a "y"). Acknowledging (with brackets) that he made only one change to my transcript, Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 220, stated: "Another document apparently dating to 1843 ... [stated:] 'What motive has [S]ayers in it-- it is the desire of his heart,'" and Hales claimed on the same page that this 1843 document "names Sayers explicitly." Also see my Note 4 (last para.)

To the contrary, the surname that Hales allegedly quoted and allegedly paraphrased in 2012 was NOT Sayers (with a "y") in my transcript, as explained midway into my citation to this document in D. Michael Quinn, The Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power (Salt Lake City: Signature Books/Smith Research Associates, 1994), 348n39, as follows:

"Phebe Wheeler Olney statement, written between November 1843 and April 1844 on the back of Susan McKee Culbertson's application for membership in the Nauvoo Relief Society, 21 [July] 1843, uncataloged manuscripts, Western Americana, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Nauvoo's 1842 census showed 'Phoebe' Wheeler as the first of the six girls residing as house servants with the Joseph Smith family. Despite her marriage to Oliver Olney on 19 October 1843, performed by Patriarch Hyrum Smith, Phebe apparently continued as a servant in the Smith home until 1844. Its unrelated [i.e., unrelated to Origins of Power's emphasis on the document's mentioning Robert D. Foster] reference to 'Mrs Sagers' indicates that this entry dates from November 1843 to April 1844, when the marital complaints of Mrs. [William Henry] Harrison Sagers involved the high council. The more likely time period for discussion of the Harrison [Sagers] case in the Smith household was November 1843, the only time Smith's manuscript diary referred to the complaint against Harrison. ..." Likewise, Gary James Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists, 1841-44," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 38 (Fall 2005): 3n4 ("Sagers was linked sexually to his sister-in-law, Phebe Madison, in late 1843, but she married civilly shortly before he was tried for adultery and forgiven"). Therefore, since discovering the Olney document in the early 1970s, I regarded the "eternity" reference in the original manuscript as a restatement of William Henry Harrison Sager's excuse for adultery, and I didn't realize it applied to a different already-married woman seeking to be sealed to Joseph Smith.

The index of Origins of Power (page 675) also had this entry: "Olney, Phebe Wheeler, 113, 348n39." Hales cited this book in his 2010 "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 114n39.

She had Culbertson's application in her possession because (from 1842 to 1844) Phebe Wheeler was the assistant secretary of Nauvoo's Relief Society. See Jill Mulvay Derr, Janath Russell Cannon, and Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, Women of Covenant: The Story of Relief Society (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992), 433. However, historians have disagreed about this assistant secretary's middle initial and marital status: "Miss Phebe M. Wheeler" in Andrew Jenson, Encyclopedic History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Publishing, 1941), 696, contrasted with "Phebe J. Wheeler, a widow" in Derr, Cannon, and Beecher, Women of Covenant, 30. If the latter is accurate, then Phebe Wheeler Olney was probably a daughter of the Relief Society's assistant secretary. However, the LDS Family History Library's electronic website of familysearch.org has no entries in its Ancestral File or Records Search for "Phebe J. Wheeler" at Nauvoo, while it shows that "Phebe M. Wheeler" married Oliver Olney there in October 1843.

With the exception of some minor differences in phrasing (plus giving the document's recently assigned Yale catalog number as MSS S-1644/F349), this same description appeared in the citation to the Olney manuscript in D. Michael Quinn, "National Culture, Personality, and Theocracy in the Early Mormon Culture of Violence," John Whitmer Historical Association 2002

Nauvoo Conference Special Edition ([Independence, MO]: John Whitmer Historical Association, 2002), 183n131.

Due to the citations by Hales from Andrew Jenson's research-notes that Ruth Vose Sayers requested to be sealed "for eternity" to Joseph Smith and that her husband Edward Sayers agreed, I now realize that my original transcription of the surname was probably in error. The 1843-44 manuscript's handwriting could as easily be read "Sayers" (with a "y"), instead of being read as "Sagers" (with a "g"--the way I transcribed it the 1970s).

However, neither Hales nor his research-assistant Don Bradley (see my Note 44, 2nd para.) consulted the original manuscript at the Beinecke Library. Hales indicated this in his "Puzzlement," 129n93 ("I have been unable to identify the primary document to verify this quotation"), with identical statement in Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 220n195. Therefore, Brian Hales had an academic obligation to tell his readers in 2010 and 2012 that my typescript of the surname did NOT match the way he was allegedly quoting my typescript, but Hales did not make such an admission.

Even though Hales should have consulted the original manuscript in the Beinecke Library, his analysis that the document refers to Ruth Vose Sayers (which I now accept) also provides more precise dating for its entries about the polygamous marriages of Joseph Smith and of his brother Hyrum. By my analysis (see the narrative for my Note 274 and within that note itself), those entries were written no earlier than February 1844. That was when Hyrum Smith performed the sealing ceremony for Ruth and his brother Joseph), but also written before the martyrdom of the two brothers on 27 June 1844 (because the document's entries about polygamy referred to them in the present tense--i.e., while the Smith brothers were still living).

30. Quinn, Origins of Power, 638; also Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 16, 16n23, criticizing this part of my email to him on 17 May 2011.

31. H. Michael Marquardt, ed., The Joseph Smith Revelations: Text and Commentary (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1999), 315; also Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 127, with his variant transcription: "throughout."

Oddly, in his 2012 "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 180, Hales ended his quote at "so long as you both shall live," and that article's various citations to the 1842 document made no reference to its provision for "through [o]ut all eternity." See narrative and source-notes for his citations on his pages 167n23, 180n63, 207n153, 210n160, 222n197. His oversight in not quoting that latter phrase from the 1842 letter during Hales' two-page discussion of the "eternity" marriage of Ruth Vose Sayers (220-22) makes me feel a little better about my decades-long oversight. This also suggests that other of Hales' evidentiary oversights might have been equally unintentional on his part.

32. Joseph Smith, Jr., et al., History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Period I: History of the Joseph Smith, the Prophet and ... Period II: From the Manuscript History of Brigham Young and Other Original Documents, ed. B.H. Roberts, 7 vols., 2nd ed. rev. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1978), 2: 247; "GENERAL ASSEMBLY," Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate 1 (August 1835): 162; Doctrine and Covenants of The Church of the Latter Day Saints

... (Kirtland, OH: F.G. Williams & Co., 1835), Section 101:2, an "Article on Marriage" which was deleted in the 1876 edition. See Roy W. Doxey, "Doctrine and Covenants," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 1:406. This 1830s Messenger and Advocate is available in electronic format in New Mormon Studies CD-ROM: A Comprehensive Resource Library ([San Francisco:] Smith Research Associates, 1998) and in GospeLink 2001: Deseret Book's Master Reference Library, 2 CD-ROMs, Version 2.0 (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2000).

For "Church of the Latter Day Saints" as the official name in the mid-1830s for the subsequently-named Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, see Richard Lloyd Anderson, "What Changes Have Been Made in the Name of the Church?," Ensign 9 (January 1979): 13-14; Bruce Douglas Porter, "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," and Susan Easton Black, "Name of the Church," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 1:276, 3:979.

33. Sangamo Journal (Springfield, IL), 8 July 1842, [2], 15 July 1842, [2], 23 July 1842, [2], 19 August 1842, [2], 2 September 1842, [2]; reprinted and expanded in John C. Bennett, The History of the Saints ... (Boston: Leland and Whiting, 1842); also Daniel Bachman and Ronald K. Esplin, "Plural Marriage," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 3:1093; Gary James Bergera, "John C. Bennett, Joseph Smith, and the Beginnings of Mormon Plural Marriage in Nauvoo," Journal of the John Whitmer Historical Association 25 (2005): 52-92.

34. "ON MARRIAGE," Times and Seasons 3 (1 October 1842): 939; available in electronic format in GospeLink and in New Mormon Studies CD-ROM.

35. For Joseph Smith as sole editor at this time, see Times and Seasons 3 (1 October 1842): 942. Concerning his frequent denials that he taught, approved, or lived polygamy, see the narrative for my Notes 45-47, see my Note 46 (2nd para.-3rd para.), see my Note 155 (2nd para., last sentence), and see the narrative's quote for my Note 168. For the Prophet's revelation in July 1842 regarding his polygamous marriage to 17-year-old Sarah Ann Whitney, see the narrative for my Notes 31-33 and within the notes.

36. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 128, quoted Justus Morse's 1887 affidavit as follows:

In the year 1842, at Nauvoo, Illinois, Elder Amasa Lyman, taught me the doctrine of sealing, or marrying for eternity, called spiritual wifery, and that within one year from that date [i.e., subsequently in 1843,] my own wife and another woman were sealed to me for eternity in Macedonia, by father John Smith, uncle to the Prophet. This woman was the wife of another man, but was to be mine in eternity ... [emphasis in Hales]

However, Morse's claim is undermined by two sources that Hales had previously cited.

His "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 115n45 and 117n49 cited Fred C. Collier, The Nauvoo High Council Minute Books of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Hanna, UT: Collier's Publishing, 2005), 74 and 80, but that book's page 59 reported the Church trial of Morse on 28 May 1842 "for unchaste and unvirtuous conduct with the daughter of the Widow Neyman &c &c." Likewise, his "Puzzlement," 128n89, disputed a statement about Morse from page 74 of Gary James Bergera, "Illicit Intercourse', Plural Marriage, and the

Nauvoo Stake High Council, 1840-1844," John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 23 (2009), yet (on that same page 74) Bergera quoted those identical words from the high council's trial of Morse in 1842.

There is no question that Morse's "unvirtuous conduct with the daughter of the Widow Neyman" in 1842 actually involved "the wife of another man" whom Morse claimed to have married "for eternity" in 1843. First, Edward W. Tullidge, The Women of Mormondom (New York: Tullidge and Crandall, 1877), 432-33 ("Jane Neyman ... in Nauvoo, in which later place her husband died. Her daughter, Mary Ann Nickerson ..."). Second, Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4: 691 (for Levi S. Nickerson marrying Mary Ann "Neymon" [sic, Neyman] in June 1840), which marriage is among those oddly absent from the municipal sources used for Lyndon W. Cook, comp., Nauvoo Deaths and Marriages, 1839-1845 (Orem, UT: Grandin Books, 1994. For similar gaps in Nauvoo's records of civil marriage, see my Note 45, 2nd para. (last sentence), and see my Note 142.

To bolster his argument, Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 128, quoted a son of Morse that "His word was as good as his note [i.e., legal contract for a loan] any place we lived." Despite this family-tradition, Justus Morse obviously included significant deceptions in his 1887 affidavit.

37. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 24, quoting from Irene M. Bates and E. Gary Smith, Lost Legacy: The Mormon Office of Presiding Patriarch (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 114.

38. "Because some evidence is stronger than other evidence, scholars prefer explanations that are not only consistent with the best evidence, but also leave the fewest puzzles unsolved"--Noel B. Reynolds, "The Logical Structure of the Authorship Debate," in Reynolds, ed., Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1997), Part Two. For "best evidence" as a legal term for establishing the truth of events, see The Guide to American Law: Everyone's Legal Encyclopedia, 12 vols. (St. Paul, MN: Vest Publishing, 1983-85), 2: 76.

39. D. Michael Quinn, The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power (Salt Lake City: Signature Books/Smith Research Associates, 1997), 183-84.

40. Film 183,374 (Salt Lake Endowment House's record of the Nauvoo Temple's ordinances--not available to the general public), pages 489-90, LDS Family History Library.

41. Although the LDS Family History Library's microfilms of marital sealings are available only to those Mormons with a "temple recommend" (Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 4: 1446-48), Brian C. Hales possesses such a recommend and has examined some of those records of sealing. He verbally volunteered that information to me in mid-August 2012, when we happened to see each other at the LDS Church History Library.

42. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 15, compared with his already-cited assertion (his page 24) derived from the narrative by Bates-Smith. Even his "in general" qualifier is a vacuous red-herring when Hales does not quote a single exception from the "original records" about which he writes. For red-herring as an argumentative fallacy, see my Note 133.

43. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 106 (first quote), 106n25 (second quote).

44. My email to Brian C. Hales on 17 May 2011; Don Bradley email to D. Michael Quinn on 18 July 2012.

For indirect references in print by Hales to historically trained Bradley as his research-assistant, see Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 220n190, [221, last two lines], 227n211; Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 136n107 (last two lines); Hales, Modern Polygamy and Mormon Fundamentalism: The Generation after the Manifesto (Salt Lake City: Kofford Books, 2006), xv; Hales, Setting the Record Straight: Mormon Fundamentalism (Orem, UT: Millennial Press, 2008), ix; Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," Journal of Mormon History 35 (Fall 2009): 112n, 143n80, 144, 145n83; Hales, "Encouraging Joseph Smith to Practice Plural Marriage: The Accounts of the Angel with a Drawn Sword," Mormon Historical Studies 11 (Fall 2010): 59, 63n20.

45. Minutes for meeting of Joseph Smith, Hyrum Smith, James Adams, Newel K. Whitney, et al., 27 May 1843, Miscellaneous Minutes, Brigham Young Papers, LDS Church History Library (where it is currently restricted), with transcript available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library. Compare with "FROM THE ELDERS ABROAD," Times and Seasons 1 (December 1839): 26 (for Winchester's letter of 21 October 1839 about his performing baptisms in Philadelphia); Smith, et al., History of The Church, 5: 409-10, also 4: 54 (for Winchester performing baptisms in Philadelphia about 6 January 1840), 4: 332 (for Winchester becoming president of the Philadelphia Branch in April 1841).

Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 8-9, faulted me for not acknowledging that before her marriage to Philo Dibble at Nauvoo in February 1841, Hannah Dubois was known as "Sister Smith" due to her first marriage. For example, "PHILO DIBBLE'S NARRATIVE" in Early Scenes in Church History (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1881), 92-93, stated: "On the 11th of February, 1841, I married a second wife--a Widow Smith of Philadelphia, who was living in the family of the Prophet [at Nauvoo by late-1840]. He performed the ceremony at his house." Oddly, like two other monogamous marriages relevant to these comments (see my Note 36, next-to-last para., and my Note 142), this marriage was absent from the municipal sources used for Cook, Nauvoo Deaths and Marriages.

As Hales notes, the 1843 minutes can reasonably be understood as giving Hannah's post-1841 surname first, followed by her pre-1841 surname. While I admit that is a possibility, Winchester's accusations in early 1843 were two years after Hannah became Dibble's wife and a year after Winchester visited Nauvoo long enough to purchase land there (see the narrative's discussion for my Note 48). Therefore, I think it is far more likely that the minutes for this 1843 trial in Nauvoo referred to Hannah by the only name its participants had known her there for two years. Thus, the

"Sister Smith" notation meant someone else--Agnes Smith (even better-known to the trial's participants).

46. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 121, admitted that "the Prophet carefully denied the practice of plural marriage several times publicly," but Hales did not acknowledge Smith's private denials to priesthood leaders: "... Dan Vogel and other writers seem willing to assume that since Joseph Smith was not strictly abiding his public declarations on polygamy, his public declarations and private teachings need not be taken too seriously." Likewise, on page 123, Hales asserted: "Joseph Smith may have publicly feigned obedience to the laws of the land while privately disobeying them. However, assuming that he also publicly feigned obedience to God's laws while privately disobeying them is not justified. The processes are very dissimilar." However, not to Joseph Smith. (see the narrative for my Notes 34-35; see my Note 155, 2nd para., last sentence; and see the narrative's quote for my Note 292)

As Hales should know, on at least one other occasion in 1843, the Prophet privately and emphatically denied the plural marriages he was privately teaching, privately performing, and privately living. This time, Joseph made the denial to Apostle Willard Richards, who certainly knew the private truth and who was writing all the entries in Joseph's personal journal. For Richards as amanuensis, see Andrew H. Hedges, Alex D. Smith, and Richard Lloyd Anderson, eds., The Joseph Smith Papers: Journals, Volume 2: December 1841-April 1843 (Salt Lake City: The Church Historian's Press, 2011), [xiii].

"Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 114n39, cited Quinn, Origins of Power, but Hales has never (to my awareness) acknowledged its statement (640) in the chronology for 1843: "5 Oct. Concerning the `doctrine of plurality of wives,' Smith's manuscript diary reads: `Joseph forbids it and the practice thereof. No man shall have but one wife.' History of the Church 6: 46 makes an addition which reverses this absolute denial." Compare with Joseph Smith journal, 5 October 1843, in Scott H. Faulring, ed., An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith (Salt Lake City: Signature Books/Smith Research Associates, 1989), 417.

Five years before becoming a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, Joseph Fielding Smith compounded this "lying for the Lord," by making an equally emphatic assertion in his Blood Atonement and the Origin of Plural Marriage (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1905), 55 ("I have copied the following from the Prophet's manuscript record of Oct. 5, 1843, and know it is genuine," yet Joseph Fielding Smith alleged that the entry in the manuscript ended: "and I have constantly said no man shall have but one wife at a time unless the Lord directs otherwise"). If he had actually examined the handwritten manuscript (as Joseph Fielding Smith claimed), he knew that he was misrepresenting it for his audience of LDS believers.

For essays from vastly different perspectives about "Lying for the Lord" regarding polygamy, see B. Carmon Hardy, Solemn Covenant: The Mormon Polygamous Passage (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 363-88; Dallin H. Oaks [a current apostle], "Gospel Teachings About Lying," Clark Memorandum [of the J. Reuben Clark School of Law, Brigham Young University] (Spring 1994): 16-17; Gary James Bergera, "Vox Joseph Vox Dei: Regarding Some of the Moral and Ethical Aspects of Joseph Smith's Practice of Plural Marriage," John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 31 (Spring/Summer 2011): 39. For the apostolic appointments of Oaks and Smith, see Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 4: 1643, 1647.

47. www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/AgnesCoolbrith.html (Internet website by Brian C. Hales, accessed on 20 June 2012); Hales, "Response" (25 August 2012), 51, 54n100, for "Agnes Coolbrith Smith, widow of Don Carlos Smith. Two and a half months after her sealing to Joseph, Clarissa Marvel" accused her, as recorded in "Relief Society organizational minutes, March 17, 1842 ..." Also Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 163, footnote ("BRIAN C. HALES {brianhales@mns.com} is the webmaster of www.JosephSmithsPolygamy.com ...")

48. Nauvoo Third Ward's Tax assessment roll for 1842, in "Nauvoo, Illinois Records, 1841-45," Microfilm Reel 2 for Folder 10, Box 4, MS 16800, LDS Church History Library.

Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 8, commented on "Benjamin Winchester, accusing him of impregnating her [Hannah Dubois Smith Dibble] while he [Joseph] visited Philadelphia in 1839-1840 when she was either widowed or divorced and known as 'Mrs. Smith.' ... There is no evidence that Winchester accused Joseph Smith of inappropriate actions with Agnes when Winchester lived in Philadelphia and Agnes lived in Illinois." Aside from comments in my Note 45 (last para.), the above statement by Hales is not relevant to what Winchester observed or learned during his visit to Nauvoo in 1842.

49. Benjamin F. Johnson, My Life's Review (Independence, MO: Zion's Printing & Publishing, 1947), 96; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 169n26.

50. Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 14: 2-3 (for name and details). Ugo A. Perego, "Joseph Smith, the Question of Polygamous Offspring, and DNA Analysis," in Bringham and Foster, Persistence of Polygamy, 237, mentioned Hannah Dubois Dibble (without any details) in Figure 7.1, "Provisional list of alleged children recorded as being born through the union of Joseph Smith Jr. and women other than Emma Hale, his first documented wife."

51. "Mary Elizabeth Lightner, Address at Brigham Young University, April 14, 1905, typescript, BYU," in Milton V. Backman Jr. and Keith W. Perkins, eds., Writings of Early Latter-day Saints (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1996), 2 (separately paginated, as are each of the "Writings" in this collection); Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner Smith, "Remarks" at Brigham Young University 14 April 1905, a typescript whose accuracy was certified by signed witnesses, Vault MSS 363, LDS Church History Library, also in its microfilm of Nels B. Lundwall Papers; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 195.

52. Andrew Jenson, "Plural Marriage," The Historical Record: A Monthly Periodical 6 (May 1887): 233-34 ("Mary Elizabeth Rollins" on page 234).

53. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 35, 315; Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 159n132; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 196, 196n118.

54. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 198.

55. Hales, "Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 105.

56. Aside from the narrative's quote for my Note 55, see my Note 207, see my Note 267 (last para.), see my Note 296 (2nd para.), and see the narrative's quote for my Note 299 (and within it).

57. Ugo A. Perego, Natalie M. Myres, and Scott R. Woodward, "Reconstructing the Y-Chromosome of Joseph Smith: Genealogical Applications," Journal of Mormon History 31 (Fall 2005): 42-60, esp. 60n39: "We are currently working on the Josephine Lyon Fisher case, where Y-chromosome testing is of no help since she did not inherit it from her father (either Windsor Lyon or Joseph Smith)"; Carrie A. Moore, "DNA tests rule out 2 as Smith descendants," Deseret Morning News, 10 November 2007, E-1, E-3; Perego, Jayne E. Ekins, and Woodward, "Resolving the Paternities of Oliver N. Buell and Mosiah L. Hancock Through DNA," John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 28 (2008): 128-36; Perego, "Joseph Smith, the Question of Polygamous Offspring, and DNA Analysis," in Bringham and Foster, Persistence of Polygamy, 233-56.

58. For example, Foster, "Sex and Prophetic Power," 76 ("Perhaps the most puzzling and difficult-to-interpret behavior of Joseph Smith during this period"), quoted (but cited without exact page number) in Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 100, 100n3.

59. Hales, "The Joseph Smith-Sylvia Sessions Plural Sealing," 41-42 ("... it is undeniable that between 1841 and 1843, Joseph Smith was sealed to women who were already civilly married to other men. These apparent polyandrous marriages are perhaps the most confounding detail in Joseph Smith's polygamy"). An Internet outreach of reassurance about this matter to Mormons worldwide can be seen in "Joseph Smith/Polygamy/Polyandry" on website of "The FAIR Wiki: Defending Mormonism by providing well-researched answers to challenging questions within a faithful context." (see URL of en.fairmormon.org/Joseph_Smith/Polygamy/Polyandry, accessed on 20 June 2012)

60. In the interest of time for this MHA session, I intended this sentence to include Hales' Power-point discussion of documents concerning the marriages of Sarah Ann Whitney and Ruth Vose Sayers. That brevity was my error, as stated in this "expanded-finalized" narrative for my Notes 26-31.

61. For example, Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 103n13 ("Quinn provides no documentation to explain his certainty that Mary Elizabeth Lightner was concealing anything" in her 1905 talk). However, (1) her 1905 talk claimed that she was sealed only "for eternity" to Joseph Smith, yet her 1877 affidavit (quoted fully in my Note 229) stated "time and eternity" (which Mormons understood then--and still understand--to involve sexual cohabitation during life); (2) it is obvious that she concealed the names of the three persons who "told me" that they were polygamous children of Joseph Smith, being raised by "other names" (see the narrative's quotes for my Note 51, and discussion within that note), (3) the same article by Hales quoted (135) Mary Lightner's 1892 letter about "my living with Mr L., after becoming the Wife of another [her emphasis]," something she did not state to the BYU audience in 1905. By my training as a historian, those three items are "documentation" of concealment.

62. Cook, Nauvoo Deaths and Marriages, 102 ("JONATHAN H. HOLMES AND ELVIRA A. COWLES, 1 December 1842 [--married] at Nauvoo, by Joseph Smith Jr."); Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4: 746.

63. One of the last, unnumbered charts (with far-left column labelled as "Joseph Smith's 'Polyandrous' Wives") in my print-out of Hales' presentation (totaling 127 unnumbered pages of charts, illustrations, and pre-printed statements) that constituted today's Power-point presentation. However, in his 2010 "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 151, Hales put a question mark in the column for "Eternity Only" regarding "Elvira Annie Cowles." I am curious about what caused Hales to switch that entry to "Probable" before today's MHA session.

64. [Emma Taylor Moon and Marlene Moon Bowen], comps., The Ancestors and Descendants of Job Welling: Utah Pioneer from England, 9 Jan 1833-7 Mar 1886 ([Farmington, UT]: Job Welling Family Organization; Bountiful, UT: Carr Printing, 1982), 24 ("Written by Phebe Louisa Holmes Welling 2/9/38"), 24-25 (for quote from "Aunt Phebe"), available on the Internet at the very long URL beginning: "<https://dcms.lds.org/view/action>," including these numeric codes "pid=IE47164" and "dvs=1342549987095," with bound copy available in LDS Church History Library and in LDS Family History Library. Fifteen years ago, the "REFERENCES" of Todd Compton's carefully researched In Sacred Loneliness, 755-59, also overlooked these sources for the sexual reality of what his narrative called Elvira's "polyandrous marriage to Smith" (548).

In the 1970s, I learned of Phebe Welling's statement by reading Ralph Martin McGrath, "Was Austin Cowles A Conspirator Against the Life of the Prophet?," typed term-paper, 13 December 1965, MS 308, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City. Item 6 in McGrath's "FOOTNOTES" and in his "BIBLIOGRAPHY," quoted it, citing "Unpublished Family History of the Job Welling Family written by Phebe Louisa Welling, Feb. 9th, 1938."

Early in Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), he questioned (11-12) the accuracy of 88-year-old Phebe's memory, yet stated (92): "if at least one--but preferably two or three--reliable narratives existed from one of the alleged dozens of informed individuals describing polyandrous sexuality, then some of the remaining accounts might be more believable as secondary evidence supplementing a core of credible documents." This claim by Hales for his openness to contrary evidence is undermined by his methodology and his closed system of logic. (see my Note 267, and see my Note 292--first and last paras.)

Worse, he has repeatedly failed to acknowledge several of the contrary evidences in publications he has cited (see my Note 36, 2nd para.; see my Note 46, 3rd para; see the narrative for my Note 70 and the note itself; see my Note 71, 2nd para. and last para.; see my Note 72, 2nd para.; see my Note 79, 5th para.--long one, beginning: "Nonetheless, Hales has known for years"; see the narrative for my Notes 125-132; see my Note 158, 2nd para.; see my Note 167, 2nd para.; see the narrative for my Note 198; see my Note 209, last sentence; see my Note 211, 2nd para.; see my Note 229, last para.; see my Note 234, 2nd para.; see my Note 240, 2nd para.; see my Note 278, 2nd para.; see my Note 287; see my Note 293, 15th para.--about his citing Kathryn M. Daynes; see my Note 299, 2nd para.). With regard to my making such stark assessments about Brian C. Hales, I have praised him throughout this "expanded-finalized" monograph as "an honest apologist" whenever I can, but I cannot remain silent about the perplexing gaffes in his

use of evidence. (also see my Note 22, last para.--within the context of my effort to exonerate Hales of intentional misrepresentation in my Note 31, last sentence)

Moreover, as with Phebe Welling, Hales repeatedly questions the memory-accuracy of faithful Mormons who said/wrote things he disagrees with (such as the occasional statements by Zina Huntington Jacobs, Mary Rollins Lightner, and Patty Bartlett Sessions that each of these already-married women was sealed to Joseph Smith "for time and eternity"). See Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 14, third paragraph (Mary: "for time & eternity"), 14, bloc quote (Zina: "for time and eternity"), 179, third paragraph (Patty: "for time and all eternity"), 213, second paragraph ("Mary: "for time, and all Eternity"), 659, fourteen lines from the bottom (Zina: "for time and eternity"), 660, eleven lines from the top (Zina: "for time and eternity"), my Note 229 (Mary: "a wife for time and all eternity"); also see my Note 99.

65. By contrast, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 14: "Given the ambiguities in the historical record, Phebe Louisa Holmes's recollection that her mother 'lived with' Joseph Smith as his 'plural wife' might represent a declaration of sexual relations between Elvira and Joseph" (emphasis added). One of the ambiguities he claimed: "nor did any of the other children leave similar recollections" (11).

However, by using equal standards for evaluating evidence, Hales should likewise question as "ambiguous" the solitary recollection he emphatically embraces: Mosiah L. Hancock, as the only child of Levi W. Hancock to leave a "recollection" that his father performed a polygamous marriage ceremony for Joseph Smith and Fanny Alger. See my Note 200, see my Note 285 (5th para., beginning: "Fanny Alger is missing").

66. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 548; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 203; my Note 62.

Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 13-14: "There seems to be no reason why Jonathan and Elvira's marriage would not have included sexual relations, but the lack of children during Joseph Smith's lifetime [--] coupled with Elvira's obvious fecundity afterwards [--] is puzzling."

67. Likewise, Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 352, expressed skepticism that any of these husbands were "living with a wife and not having sexual relations with her after a period of full marriage." By contrast, that is exactly what Hales, "Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 147-48, has affirmed, yet see my Note 66 for his statement of the opposite concerning one of the legal marriages.

68. Lucy Meserve Smith, "Temple Records," page 2, photocopy of her handwritten holograph, Folder 15, Box 6, George A. Smith Family Papers, MS 36, Marriott Library; Carol Cornwall Madsen, Journey To Zion: Voices From the Mormon Trail (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1997), 725; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, [620]. My comments never shorten her name to "Lucy M. Smith," because that is how the Prophet's mother Lucy Mack Smith is often mentioned.

Also, "**holograph** ... wholly written by the person in whose name it appears: a holograph letter ...," in Random House Webster's College Dictionary, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Random House, 2000), 629.

69. Lucy Meserve Smith statement, 18 May 1892, photocopy of her holograph, Folder 9, Box 6, George A. Smith Family Papers.

70. Foster, Religion and Sexuality, 157 (summarized); George D. Smith, "Nauvoo Roots of Mormon Polygamy, 1841-46: A Preliminary Demographic Report," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 27 (Spring 1994): 25n86 (summarized); Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery, Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith, 2nd ed. (1984; Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 212 (quoted); Todd Compton, "A Trajectory of Plurality: An Overview of Joseph Smith's Thirty-Three Plural Wives," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 29 (Summer 1996): 16 (quoted); compare with lack of any reference to Lucy Meserve Smith's statement in Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" [99]-151; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 163-228 (esp. 197-98, for his discussion of possible children born to Smith's polygamous wives).

71. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 29, countered: "Moreover, believing that Emma might have been completely naive of facts [about her husband's polygamy in 1841-43] that were plainly disclosed to George A. Smith (and apparently obvious to Quinn a hundred and fifty years later) is highly improbable."

Despite his apologetical claim for improbability, Hales knows that Emma had no awareness of her husband's marriage to the Partridge sisters on two separate days in March 1843. In 2010, Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 129n92, referred to "Jenson's 1887 Historical Record article on plural marriage" (also his page 144n134). Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 240, quoted Emily D. Partridge Smith Young as writing: "... I was married to Joseph Smith on the 4th of March, 1843, Elder Heber C. Kimball performing the ceremony. My sister Eliza was also married to Joseph a few days later. This was done without the knowledge of Emma Smith."

Hales also knows that Emma didn't even suspicion that Joseph had "carnal intercourse" with Emily in a room of Emma's own house on the day following that March ceremony, nor did Emma know that this secretly married couple repeatedly had sex in Emma's own house during the months from the March ceremony (about which she was completely "naive") to May 1843 (when she naively thought she was permitting Joseph to marry the Partridge sisters, while all the other participants in this May ceremony knew it was a repetitive charade to deceive Emma about Joseph's already-existing marriages with the Partridge sisters). Newell and Avery, Mormon Enigma (1994 ed.), 144 ("Emily `slept with him' between her first marriage and the second ceremony"); compare URL www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/EmilyPartridge.html (Hales' website on the Internet, accessed on 20 June 2012).

In 2010, Hales cited (100n2) Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, whose 1997 book stated on page 408: "According to Emily's later testimony in a law court, there was a sexual dimension to her marriage with Joseph. She testified that she `roomed' with him the night following the marriage and explicitly stated that she had `carnal intercourse' with him on a number of occasions." Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 127n85, cited "Emily Partridge, Testimony in the Temple Lot Case," and his 2009 "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 133n50, mentioned "Emily Dow Partridge Young's reluctant acknowledgement that she shared Joseph's bed on at least two occasions."

Although Hales didn't specify it, her testimony (under oath) was that this sexual intercourse occurred in the house Joseph shared with his legal wife Emma. See Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 175 ("Emily recalled that she was `living at his house at the time"); also H. Michael Marquardt, "Emily Dow Partridge Smith Young on the Witness Stand: Recollections of a Plural Wife," Journal of Mormon History 34 (Summer 2008): 134.

The above paragraphs and Joseph's warnings to the Whitneys about Emma (quoted in the narrative for my Note 195) are the best answers to Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 56 ("How readily could Quinn's conjectural description of Joseph's repeated clandestine sexuality have occurred without Emma's watchful and mostly intolerant eyes detecting and interfering?" In his various publications and in his "Response," Hales has quoted other sections from all of the documents I've cited in this endnote.

72. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 196; Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 315. However, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012) countered on its pages 29-30: "A more likely interpretation is that Emma was the midwife for one of Joseph's non-polyandrous wives, like Olive Frost, who delivered a child. Compton lists the Olive Frost plural marriage as occurring in the `summer [of] 1843.'"

Furthermore, Hales has not mentioned George D. Smith's analysis (Nauvoo Polygamy, 208-09) that Olive Frost apparently married Joseph Smith "within a few days or weeks of" 24 July 1843. In asserting that chronology, George Smith seemed not to know about the evidence for her becoming pregnant by the Prophet. If her conception occurred even three weeks following that day in July, Olive's child was born after 9 May 1844, when Apostle George A. Smith was absent from Nauvoo and unable to have the conversation he reported about Emma's serving as a midwife for one of Joseph's polygamous wives. See my Note 73.

As the narrative after my Note 71 maintains, Emma Smith would not give implicit endorsement to an unmarried woman's fornication by helping that woman to give birth to an illegitimate child. See Emma Smith's emphatic instructions to Nauvoo's Relief Society on 26 May 1842: "she wanted none [to remain] in this Society who had violated the laws of virtue." See Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 121, quoting from page 50 in "A Record of the Organization, and Proceedings of the Female Relief Society of Nauvoo," typescript at LDS Church History Library.

73. Smith, et al., History of The Church, 4: 10 (for George A. Smith's return to Nauvoo from England on 13 July 1841), 4: 454 (for GAS in Nauvoo on 21 November 1841), 4: 463 (for GAS not in Nauvoo on 30 November 1841), 4: 484 (for GAS not in Nauvoo on 25 December 1841), 4: 490 (for GAS in Ohio on 1 January 1842), 4: 495-96 (for GAS in Nauvoo again by 17 January 1842), 5: 161 (for GAS departure from Nauvoo for mission on 10 September 1842), 5: 183 (for GAS return to Nauvoo on 4 November 1842), 6: 362 (for GAS departure from Nauvoo on 9 May 1844), 7: 212 (for GAS return to Nauvoo on 28 July 1844, almost exactly a month since Joseph Smith's death).

74. For example, Perego, "Joseph Smith, the Question of Polygamous Offspring, and DNA Analysis," 236-37 (Figure 7.1, "Provisional list of alleged children recorded as being born through the union of Joseph Smith Jr. and women other than Emma Hale, his first documented

wife").

75. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of Polyandry," 137.

76. "Church Historians," in Jenson, Encyclopedic History of the Church, 139-40.

77. Wilford Woodruff, "Historian's Private Journal" (one volume, 1858-78), entries after 1 July 1866, LDS Church History Library. This was not Woodruff's personal journal at CHL (edited for publication by Scott G. Kenney, and cited in my Note 80), nor was it the Church Historian's Office Journal, which covered the period 1858-78 in sixteen manuscript volumes at CHL, written by clerks (not by the Church Historian himself).

This source is the reason that my 1994 Origins of Power, 587, stated that these marriages of Joseph Smith were: "Louisa Be[a]man 1840/1; Zina D. Huntington (Jacobs) 1840/1 ... Prescendia L. Huntington (Buell) 1840/1 ..."

As noted by Martha Sonntag Bradley and Mary Brown Firmage Woodward, Four Zinas: A Story of Mothers and Daughters on the Mormon Frontier (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2000), xxii, note 1, "The spelling of Presendia appears in a variety of forms in both legal and personal documents ..." Also stated with examples in Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 79n61.

My 1994 book followed the "Prescendia" spelling in Brigham H. Roberts, A Comprehensive History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: "By the Church," 1930), 5: 325n44; in Richard S. Van Wagoner, "Mormon Polyandry in Nauvoo," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 18 (Fall 1985): 81; and in the entry for "Olsen, Emma R." in Ellen M. Copley, "Mormon Bibliography 1992," BYU Studies 33 (Spring 1993): 402. The narrative of my 2012 "Comments" now drops the "c," thereby adopting the "Presendia" spelling that has become standard for those writing about Nauvoo polygamy.

78. Don Bradley email to D. Michael Quinn on 18 July 2012; my Note 44.

79. John W. Wight, The Legal Successor in the Presidency of the Church (Independence, MO: Ensign Publishing House, 1898), 11 (referring to the 1890s, "Joseph B. Noble ... claims to have sealed Joseph Smith and Louisa Beaman, but is not sure whether it was in 1840, 41 or 42"); also Brian C. Hales' Internet website www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/LouisaBeaman.html (accessed on 20 June 2012) stated as its note 2 that Noble also preached in an 1880 sermon that he "sealed Louisa Beaman to the Prophet Joseph Smith in 1840 under his direction," for which Hales cited a diary that he wrongly attributed to Noble, rather than to the diarist who recorded hearing Noble speak.

Regarding the Church Historian's writing in 1866 (see the narrative's quotes for my Note 77) that Joseph Smith married Zina Huntington, Presendia Huntington Buell, and Louisa Beaman in 1840 and in response to my analysis of Zina Huntington's separate statement indicating that 1840 was the actual year for Joseph's first marriage to her (which Hales had previously acknowledged in print was the meaning of her statement--my Note 75), Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 31, stated: "While Quinn's theory merits discussion, he apparently neglected to examine all of the evidence. Besides Zina's 1869 affidavit, which he readily dismisses, three other

eyewitnesses also signed affidavits affirming 1841, one from Dimick Huntington and a second from Fanny Huntington, and a third from Presendia Huntington declaring her sealing was in 1841 (December 11). All four firsthand notarized affidavits affirm that Joseph Smith was sealed to Zina (and Presendia) in 1841."

First, Hales' "Response" did not acknowledge that 70-year-old Joseph B. Noble also specifically claimed on more than one occasion (first paragraph above) that he performed the Beaman marriage in 1840. This also contradicted his own 1869 affidavit. Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 221: "... Elder Joseph B. Noble swears (the affidavit I have on hand) before a notary public, on June 6, 1869, that he did on April 5, 1841, seal to Joseph Smith, the Prophet, Miss Louisa Beaman, according to the revelation on plural marriage."

Second, Hales' emphasis on the accuracy of the 1869 affidavits regarding the year of Zina's polygamous marriage (despite contrary evidence he did not acknowledge until my June 2012 comments required him to so) is consistent with his approach in doggedly affirming two other problematic affidavits of 1869. Eliza M. Partridge and Emily Dow Partridge each signed a notarized statement that they were sealed to Joseph Smith in the presence of his legal wife Emma on 11 May 1843 by James Adams in Nauvoo. Hales cites fourteen sources in support of that date. (see his www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/ElizaPartridge.html and his www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/EmilyPartridge.html, both accessed on 15 October 2012)

Nonetheless, Hales has known for years that Emily and Eliza Partridge erroneously claimed May 11th as the date when Joseph Smith allowed Emma Smith to think she was witnessing their wedding ceremonies, which had actually occurred the previous March (see my Note 71, 2nd para.). His articles have repeatedly cited all but one (i.e., Walker) of the following sources, none of which are listed on his website for the Partridges:

--(1) Beginning with the same page in their 1984 edition, Newell and Avery, Mormon Enigma (1994 ed.), 143, wrote: "On May 23, 1843, Emma watched Judge James Adams, a high priest in the Church who was visiting from Springfield, marry Joseph to Emily and Eliza Partridge in her home," explaining on 333n54 that "Emily remembered her marriage as 11 May. Judge James Adams was not in Nauvoo on that date but he did arrive on 21 May 1843."

--(2) John Phillip Walker, ed., Dale Morgan on Early Mormonism: Correspondence & A New History (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1986), 151-52 ("He [RLDS President Israel A. Smith] said that [Andrew] Jenson's Historical Record says the Partridge girls were married to Joseph on May 11, 1843 (I think it was) by James M. Adams, and it seems that he [Israel] had found a court record in Springfield showing that Adams was presiding over his court in Springfield on May 13. 'Springfield is 125 miles from Nauvoo,' he said. 'Draw your own conclusions.' He then complained that none of the Utah historians know how to qualify a witness, etc.")

--(3) James B. Allen, Trials of Discipleship: The Story of William Clayton, a Mormon (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 136, wrote: "On May 23 she [Emma Smith] watched Judge James Adams, a high priest, perform the ceremonies ..."

--(4) Richard S. Van Wagoner, Mormon Polygamy: A History (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 53, explained why "Emily is probably incorrect on the date of the second sealing. On 11 May, Emma Smith left Nauvoo at 10:00 a.m. for Quincy, Illinois, and did not return for four

days. Unless the ceremony was performed at an early hour, she could not have been in attendance. Moreover James Adams, a Sangamo County probate judge who performed the second sealing, did not arrive in Nauvoo from Springfield until 21 May. The sealing most likely occurred two days later. Smith's journal for 23 May reads: 'At home in conversation with Judge Adams, and others.' ..."

--(5) Quinn, Origins of Power (1994), 494 ("23 May [1843]--Emma Hale Smith witnessed stake patriarch James Adams perform the polygamous marriage ceremonies for Joseph Smith and two of her house-servants, Emily D. Partridge and Eliza M. Partridge. ..." Emphasis in my original publication)

--(6) Compton, In Sacred Loneliness (1997), 732nIX ("Emily may be dating this second ceremony incorrectly, as apparently both Emma and Judge Adams were not in Nauvoo on the 11th ...")

--(7) Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy (2008), 179n66 ("The date of the May marriages is controversial. Smith's clerk, Willard Richards, dated the remarriage to May 23, 1843 ... On Saturday, March 14, 1892, as a Temple Lot respondent, Emily acknowledged she 'may be mistaken in the date,' since the questioner quoted the Millennial Star having Emma going to Quincy that day [of May 11th], making it difficult for her to witness a marriage between her husband and the Partridge girls ...")

While all of the above sources (except the RLDS president) affirmed that Emily and Eliza Partridge were honestly reporting their marriages to Joseph Smith, none of the above explained why the sisters mistakenly emphasized May 11th. The answer, I think, is that the Partridge sisters were the unnamed polygamous wives whom Joseph Smith described as "&c" when he rebaptized his polygamous wife Eliza R. Snow, his polygamous wife Louisa Beaman, and Joseph B. Noble's polygamous wife Sarah Alley on 11 May 1843. Joseph's manuscript journal recorded this as "6 A.M. Baptized [Eliza R.] Snow, Louisa Beman [sic], Sarah Alley, &c," in Faulring, An American Prophet's Record, 377. Whether or not Emma Smith witnessed those early-morning baptisms of polygamous wives on May 11th, that was the date Emily and Eliza Partridge were remembering in their 1869 affidavits and subsequent statements.

80. In the late 1830s, Brigham Young "told him [Thomas B. Marsh, then the senior apostle] if the Twelve were faithful[,] they would soon see the day that they would have all the influence they could wield," reported by Young in Scott G. Kenney, ed., Wilford Woodruff's Journal: 1833-1898 Typescript, 9 vols. (Murray, UT: Signature Books, 1983-85), 4: 171 (31 December 1852); Brigham Young preached in 1848: "No man was ever ordained to any higher order than an Apostle--and that Joseph Smith never received any higher ordination," as recorded in William Greenwood diary, 8 October 1848, LDS Church History Library.

81. Roger D. Launius, Joseph Smith III: Pragmatic Prophet (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 233. For the admission into the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles by Joseph F. Smith in 1867, by Brigham Young Jr. in 1868, and by Albert Carrington in 1870, see Joseph Fielding Smith, Essentials In Church History (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1950), 592.

82. For example, Joseph B. Noble's affidavit ("before a notary public, on June 6, 1869") was partially paraphrased in Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 221 (preceded on same page by quote of a

different affidavit by Noble on 26 June 1869 which had no specific reference to the Smith-Beaman ceremony); Roberts, Comprehensive History of The Church, 2: 102 (for transcript of Noble's affidavit on "this 26th day of June, A.D. 1869 ... that on the fifth day of April, A.D. 1841 ...").

83. Robin Scott Jensen, Robert J. Woodford, and Stephen C. Harper, eds., The Joseph Smith Papers: Revelations and Translations, Volume 1: Manuscript Revelation Books (Salt Lake City: The Church Historian's Press, 2011), xxxii, 7-8, 199, 309-11; Jensen, Richard E. Turley Jr., and Riley M. Lorimer, eds., The Joseph Smith Papers: Revelations and Translations, Volume 2: Published Revelations (Salt Lake City: The Church Historian's Press, 2011), xxx-xxxi, 199-200, 306, 709; H. Michael Marquardt, "Changing Revelatory Messages: A Mormon Example," John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 33 (Spring/Summer 2013): 122-39; also Quinn, Origins of Power, 5, 6, 9, 15, 16, 17, 26, 30, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41-42, 49, 70-71, 88, 198, 272n25, 288n132, 299n15, 304n47, 310n96, 317n151, 617, 618-19, 623.

84. "HYMENIAL," Times and Seasons 2 (1 April 1841): 374; Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 137; also Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4: 201 (for Zina's birthdate).

85. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 109, 130-32; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 185-86.

86. Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 25: 229, 28: 166, 864; Howard H. Barton, Orson Hyde: Missionary, Apostle, Colonizer (Bountiful, UT: Horizon Publishers, 1977), 323.

87. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 110, gave an anachronistic assessment of Jacobs as "unpredictable" in his "relationships to the Church and its leaders," citing only one source (110n30) in support of this dismissive description. It was a woman's diary that referred to his problems with plural wives whom Henry Jacobs married in the 1850s, a decade after his first wife Zina had married Joseph Smith, and then married Brigham Young, by whom she bore children. Thus, aside from being a fallacy of irrelevant proof (see my Note 134), Hales' above assessment was chronologically false.

Concerning the LDS devotion of Henry B. Jacobs in the early 1840s, see Smith, et al., History of The Church, 4: 494-95 (Jacobs to go on mission--17 January 1842); "ELDERS CONFERENCE," Times and Seasons 4 (1 April 1843): 157 (Henry Jacobs laboring in "West Part of the state of New York"); George P. Dykes, "TO THE EDITOR," Times and Seasons 4 (15 May 1843): 195 ("... I was joined by a worthy brother, by the name of Henry B. Jacobs, who baptized twelve ..."); "MINUTES OF A CONFERENCE HELD IN BUFFALO, N.Y.," Times and Seasons 4 (15 September 1843): 334 ("The following elders were then examined and unanimously received ... Henry Jacobs ..."); John D. Lee, "MR. EDITOR," Times and Seasons 4 (1 September 1843): 311 ("proceeded south in company with elder Henry B. Jacobs"); Smith, et al., History of The Church, 6: 387 ("Henry B. Jacobs [--] Agent for the friends of General Joseph

Smith"--17 May 1844); Wilford Woodruff and George A. Smith, "EDITOR," Times and Seasons 5 (1 June 1844): 558 (Henry Jacobs on mission "to Michigan"); entry for 8 October 1844 (Jacobs as a president of local Seventy's quorum), in Andrew Jenson, Church Chronology: A Record of Important Events Pertaining to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1914).

88. Barton, Orson Hyde. Nonetheless, Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 140-41, stated in 2010: "The reproductive history of Marinda shows that Orson Washington Hyde was born on November 9, 1843; conception would have occurred approximately February 16, 1843. No evidence has been found to connect Joseph Smith with this child."

89. Hales, "The Joseph Smith-Sylvia Sessions Plural Sealing," 46 (for Lyon's excommunication); Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 110 (for Lightner among the "friendly non-members"), 114-16 (for Lyon's excommunication).

"An excommunicated person is no longer a member of the Church," as stated by Bruce C. Hafen, "Disciplinary Procedures," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 2: 387.

90. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 113, 116; also Hales, "Joseph Smith-Sylvia Sessions Plural Sealing"; my Note 13.

I agree with the following two relevant statements by Hales: "There is no question that in special circumstances, Joseph Smith, as President of the Church, believed himself capable of granting permission to ignore legal unions" (116), also "for most Latter-day Saints, the sealing ceremony constituted a matrimonial upgrade sufficient to dissolve previously contracted earthly matrimones" (117). However, neither Joseph's beliefs nor the beliefs of other Mormons proves what Sylvia and Windsor Lyon did regarding cohabitation following her marriage to Joseph Smith. See Smith, et al., History of The Church, 5: 135 (the Prophet's letter-essay "On Happiness," partly quoted in my Note 290--midway through its 2nd para.)

91. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 118.

92. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 149.

93. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 114.

94. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 114.

95. Quoted by Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 178.

96. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 682nVII. He made the parenthetical statements that appear in my narrative's quote.

97. For David Sessions continuing to cohabit with Joseph Smith's polyandrous wife Patty from 1842 to 1850, see Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 181-82, 186-89, 192, 195-96.

98. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 127. See my Note 64 (last para.), my Note 182, and my Note 218.

99. See my Note 64 (last para.), and contrast with my Note 65--2nd par. (regarding 62-year-old Mosiah L. Hancock's narrative in 1896), with my Note 79--3rd para. (regarding 70-year-old Joseph B. Noble's narrative in 1880), with my Note 268--1st para. (regarding Ruth Daggett Vose's reminiscence in 1886 or 1887, when she was 78 or 79 years old), and with my Note 287 (regarding 73-year-old William Clayton's reminiscence in 1887).

100. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 101n7, 135; also today's Power-point presentation by Hales for five pre-printed statements: "it is impossible to prove something did not happen" (repeated verbatim forty-nine illustrations later), and "Did I mention that it is impossible to prove something did not happen?," and "These two observations are often treated almost like irrefutable proof of sexual polyandry in Joseph Smith's polygamy: ... 2. It is impossible to prove something did not happen," and "Joseph Smith's Sexual Polyandry ... 2. Can't prove a negative."

Actually, Hales is overstating the problem of proving a negative. For example, it is possible to prove that someone didn't die on a particular date, didn't enroll in a particular college at any time, didn't serve in the military, or to prove the negative of any other event/activity for which there is reliably continuous documentation. In recent years, that is how several political candidates and office-holders have been proven not to be veterans of the Vietnam War as they had long-claimed. Likewise, prosecutors sometimes prove the negative of a defendant's alleged alibi with closed-circuit television's video showing the defendant in a different place than claimed by the defendant at the crime's time--a place close to the scene of the crime.

101. "Evidence from Zina D. Huntington-Young ... copy of an interview had by John W. Wight, elder of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, with Mrs. Zina D. Huntington-Jacobs-Smith-Young, at her home in Utah, October 1, 1898, in the presence of ... Susie Walker, stenographer," Saints' Herald 52 (11 January 1905): 28-30 (with first quote and bloc-quotes from page 29, and final quote from page 30).

Remarkably, Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 129-30, 130n94, cited this interview to support his claim that "Other documents from Zina Huntington" and from two other already-married wives of Joseph Smith "indicate their marriages may also have been `eternity' only sealings as well." To me, that is not the obvious meaning of Zina's replies to two questions that made the exact distinction that Hales makes: to the first question, she affirmed what Hales denies; to the second question that emphasized the distinction Hales affirms, she refused to answer.

As part of his own bloc-quote, Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 14, quoted what my bloc-quote presents as its first section. However, Compton wrongly changed "It is a fact then" to "Is it a fact then," as a grammatical improvement in his quote that was nonetheless different from the original source. Compton used some brackets in his bloc-quote, but not for that change.

As one of Mormon history's many ironies, this 1898 interview's anti-polygamy John W. Wight was born in Texas to a polygamous wife of Nauvoo's LDS Apostle Lyman Wight. Zina didn't know that fact about her RLDS interrogator. Of course, he didn't volunteer it.

102. Danel W. Bachman, "A Study of the Mormon Practice of Plural Marriage Before the Death of Joseph Smith" (M.A. thesis, Purdue University, 1975), 135; compare BYU Studies 20 (Summer 1980): 344-45 ("Daniel Bachman is an instructor at the Logan Institute of Religion at Utah State University"), 28 (Fall 1988): 103 ("Daniel W. Bachman, institute curriculum writer, LDS Church Educational System").

103. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 104n18.

104. Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 7: 418 (giving birthdate for "John Hyrum" Buell as 13 July 1844), when Willard Richards was absent from Nauvoo (see my Note 73). Black wrongly dated this birth as one year too late, as shown by Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 124 (for Zina Huntington Jacob Smith's journal in October 1844 about the death of "my sister Presendia Buells child, John Hiram by name, age about 1 year"--i.e., born in 1843), also 671nVII, and Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, ed., "All Things Move in Order in the City": The Nauvoo Diary of Zina Diantha Huntington Jacobs," BYU Studies 19 (Spring 1979): 297. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 105n22, described the birth of "John Hiram" Buell as "July 13, 1843 at Adams, Illinois" (which was distant from Nauvoo, and also while Richards was absent from the city); compare my Note 73.

105. Newell and Avery, Mormon Enigma (1994 ed.), 292, 298, 301-02.

106. Newell and Avery, Mormon Enigma (1994 ed.), 307.

107. Widtsoe, "Did Joseph Smith Introduce Plural Marriage?" (1946); also John A. Widtsoe, Joseph Smith--Seeker After Truth, Prophet of God (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1951), 234. Both of his publications were defensive responses to Fawn M. Brodie, No Man Knows My History: A Biography of Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945), esp. 434-65.

108. Here are two examples of "eternity only" misrepresentation in family-written histories. Despite the published sources showing that Joseph Smith performed the civil marriage for Elvira Cowles and Jonathan Holmes six months before she became Smith's literal wife (see my Note 62 and see the narrative's quote for my Note 64), [Moon and Bowen], Ancestors and Descendants of Job Welling, 20, quoted the "following written by Job's daughter Roxie Welling Taylor," in part: "After the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, Elvira Annie Cowles (Smith) married young widowed Jonathan Harriman Holmes ..."

Likewise (but with different chronology), McGrath, "Was Austin Cowles A Conspirator Against the Life of the Prophet?," 3, stated: "Elvira Ann Cowles, had been sealed to the Prophet sometime between 1837 and 1842 (the exact date is unknown) and had lived with him as his wife ... In 1842, the prophet released Elvira 'for time only' and sealed her to Jonathan Herriman Holmes ..." McGrath's historically disprovable claim is the kind of "divorce" that Hales claimed Joseph Smith gave to his plural wife Flora Ann Woodworth (see narrative discussion for my Note 156).

109. Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 144n82.

110. Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 144n82 (for quote), compared with his pages 153, 153n11.

111. Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 234. Compare my Note 46 (paragraphs 2-5) about "lying for the Lord," and my Note 108 (for a family's misrepresentations of the Holmes-Cowles marriage).

112. Hales' bracketed explanation ("slang for sexual relations") inside the quote on page (beginning: "In his defense, Joseph E. Johnson reported") of today's Power-point presentation; compare with Oxford English Dictionary (2nd ed., 1989), s.v. "frigging"; Tom Dalzell and Terry Victor, eds., The New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English (New York: Routledge, 2006), 804.

113. Council meeting and trial of Joseph E. Johnson, 2 September 1850, Miscellaneous Minutes, Brigham Young Papers. For Lorenzo Snow's 1845 marriage to Hannah M. Goddard, sister of his legal wife, see his manuscript diary, page 51 (which used initials for Brigham Young performing their polygamous marriage on 19 January 1845), LDS Church History Library, a typescript of which is in my Research Files, Beinecke Library, the basis on which I listed Hannah among Snow's wives in Quinn, Extensions of Power, 701.

With regard to the above citation of the 1850 manuscript, I was stunned to receive a copy of Brian C. Hales' accusation against me in his email to Joseph Geisner on 15 October 2012, copies of which went to Don Bradley and Gary Bergera. Hales stated (in part): "there is one [document's transcription] that was removed from the CHD [Church Historical Department] without permission by Michael Quinn. Don Bradley transcribed it for me from Quinn's Yale collection[,] and it continues to be restricted at the CHL [Church History Library] (I checked). It is the council meeting discussing Joseph E. Johnson's church discipline."

Upon belatedly reading Hales' totally false accusation, I immediately drafted an email to Hales, Geisner, Bradley, and Bergera on 17 October 2012, which stated (in part): "I first learned about those minutes when Ron Esplin came up to me in the offices of [LDS Church Historian] Leonard Arrington's staff in the early 1970s. Ron was chuckling about [elderly] Edith Romney, who was transcribing the minutes, asking people what 'frigging' meant. Ron was in charge of transcriptions from Brigham Young's collection, and I asked him if I could examine the original minutes, not Sister Romney's transcription. Ron Esplin quickly provided the manuscript minutes to me. I personally returned them to him when I had finished taking the notes he knew I was typing."

Furthermore, in his explanatory response to me (with copies to Bradley, Geisner, and Bergera) later in the day of 17 October 2012, Brian Hales' email stated (as his "assumption") that it is currently necessary to obtain written permission to publish any quotes from such manuscripts housed at the LDS Church History Library (formerly known as the Historical Department of the Church). He assumed that it had been necessary to obtain written permission to publish quotations when I typed my transcriptions during the early 1970s to mid-1980s. Hales is wrong on all counts.

To the contrary, a pre-printed document at the Church History Library currently informs all researchers that they do NOT need permission to publish "fair use" quotations from ANY document they examine there. Brian Hales KNOWS that fact, because he had to sign this pre-printed agreement in order to examine manuscripts at the CHL (which I observed him doing in early August 2012). This provision is in accordance with U.S. copyright laws, and has been specified in the Church Historical Department's research-agreement for twenty years. Furthermore, after being given access to a document (including restricted items) researchers have been allowed to make a verbatim copy (in handwriting or in typescript) by the rules of the Church Historian's Office from 1971-72, of the Historical Department of the Church from 1972-2010, and of the Church History Library from 2010 to the present.

It is extremely difficult for me to believe that Brian Hales was unaware of this still-current policy of the LDS Church History Library before he sent his email of 17 October 2012 in which he asserted that I allegedly made a transcription "without permission." Whenever the CHL currently grants researchers its permission to examine restricted documents, the CHL specifies in writing that the researchers are permitted to make complete copies by handwriting, by typewriting, or by keyboarding on their personal computers.

Furthermore, I was only a graduate student at the University of Utah in April 1971 when I began typing detailed transcriptions from the journals of general authorities (including Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Willard Richards, and Heber J. Grant) at what was then called "The Church Historian's Office" (located on the third floor of the Church Administration Building, 47 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah). I did so as a graduate student from April 1971 to March 1972 without signing any agreement that I needed permission to publish quotes from my own 20-30 pages of single-spaced, typed transcriptions with which I left the CHO every day. Moreover, I was never instructed verbally by any official or staffmember of the Church Historian's Office that such permission was necessary before publishing such quotes.

After March 1972, administrators and staffmembers of the newly created Historical Department of the Church knew that I continued to be a full-time graduate student doing independent research for a master's thesis about Mormon history. Even though I became a part-time researcher-writer on the staff of Church Historian Leonard J. Arrington in March 1972, I was not required to obtain written or verbal permission to publish quotes from manuscripts I continued to examine at the LDS Church's archives.

The above conversation with Ronald K. Esplin occurred a full year after I ended my employment with the Historical Department in August 1973, in order to become a full-time doctoral student in history at Yale University. According to my daily journal, I first gained access to those Miscellaneous Minutes of Brigham Young's Papers on 14 August 1974: "Today at HDC[,] I talked with Ron Esplin about doing research in semi-processed MSS, on the 3rd Floor ... Spent the day researching Misc. minutes and found some very important items, among them the full minutes of the Dec. 5, 1847 meeting at which Brigham Young was authorized by the Quorum of Twelve to form a separate First Presidency."

Previously, on 27 June 1974, my journal recorded that the officially appointed Church Archivist Donald T. Schmidt gave me added permission as an independent researcher to examine and make my personal transcriptions from restricted documents housed in HDC's vault. From

June 1974 to June 1986, Archivist Schmidt and his successor Glenn R. Rowe continued to authorize me (as a non-staffmember) to make my own typed transcriptions from documents at HDC that were restricted to the general public, and Schmidt specifically agreed to allow me to re-examine and take added notes from any document I had examined as a part-time employee before 1974. At no time did Don Schmidt or Glenn Rowe even suggest that I should seek permission before publishing quotes from such documents that I had examined at LDS Archives. After June 1986, I did not do research in manuscripts of the Historical Department until 1997, when I signed its pre-printed agreement that gave permission to researchers to publish "fair use" quotes from its documents.

Although Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012) objected to my use of "obvious," the above will be obvious to anyone who examines the following publications. Beginning with D. Michael Quinn, "The Evolution of the Presiding Quorums of the LDS Church," Journal of Mormon History 1 (1974): 23n11, I did NOT use the phrases "by permission of" or "courtesy of" within my first citation of the LDS Church's Archives for quoting its manuscripts (whether restricted or unrestricted there). That same kind of citation was in my "The Practice of Rebaptism at Nauvoo," BYU Studies 18 (Winter 1978): 226-32, my "Latter-day Saint Prayer Circles," BYU Studies 19 (Fall 1978): 79-105, my "The Council of Fifty and Its Members, 1844 to 1945," BYU Studies 20 (Winter 1980): 163-97 (including its citation to the Young Collection's "Miscellaneous Minutes," as used for Johnson's trial, above), my "Joseph Smith III's 1844 Blessing and the Mormons of Utah," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 15 (Summer 1982): 69-90, my "Jesse Gause: Joseph Smith's Little-Known Counselor," BYU Studies 23 (Fall 1983): 487-93, my "The Mormon Church and the Spanish-American War: An End to Selective Pacifism," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 17 (Winter 1984): 11-30, my "From Sacred Grove to Sacral Power Structure," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 17 (Summer 1984): 9-34, and my "LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 18 (Spring 1985): 9-105.

Concerning that last article, a few days before general authority G. Homer Durham died in January 1985, I asked Archivist Rowe for permission to examine and type notes from original records of Utah temples and to re-examine and type added notes from some of the First Presidency's documents, both of which were then at the Historical Department. In making this request, I explained to Rowe that I needed to finalize some quotes and source-notes for an article about post-Manifesto polygamy that Dialogue was publishing in April. About ten minutes later, Glenn returned with my request-slips (initialed by Elder Durham) for all of those heavily restricted documents that I had requested. As usual, I then made my own transcripts on one of HDC's typewriter that day. This was two years after the publication of my authorized biography of J. Reuben Clark, for which the First Presidency in 1977 had given me full access to any document I wanted to examine at HDC.

Despite the expiration of the First Presidency's special authorization upon my completion of Clark's biography, Elder Durham continued to give me access to nearly every restricted document I asked to see from 1983 to 1985. He knew those requests were for my independent research and publishing, and Durham had known since 12 January 1979 (due to my 12-page, single-spaced, typed letter to him) that post-Manifesto polygamy was one of the controversial topics I was

researching at HDC (with intent to publish when I decided on my own responsibility to do so).

Moreover, in a telephone conversation with the First Presidency's counselor Gordon B. Hinckley on 26 May 1982, I told him that I planned to publish the most detailed, supportive study I could about post-Manifesto polygamy. President Hinckley replied: "That's YOUR decision to make, Brother Quinn." He then repeated his statement that he had done what he could to help me get access to historical documents in the Presidency's vault regarding post-Manifesto polygamy. Significantly, I thought, he did NOT even suggest during this 1982 telephone-conversation that I should not publish what I already knew about it from my research at HDC. I had previously outlined my research on post-Manifesto polygamy in a letter to him, after verbally summarizing it during an hour's conversation at his home on 22 November 1981.

114. Full citation and explanation in my Note 113; also "Disfellowshipment is a temporary suspension of membership privileges," as stated by Bruce C. Hafen, "Disciplinary Procedures," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 2: 387.

115. Hales' criticism ("First is the willingness to assume Joseph E. Johnson was accurate and accurately quoted?"), as pre-printed statement filling a page in today's Power-point presentation.

However, countering the above, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 36n65, stated: "In fact, I believe the Johnson quote is accurate. Quinn was working from a powerpoint slide and assumed my commentary was to criticize the quotation." As I understood it, his 2012 Power-point slide criticized my own "willingness to assume" Johnson's accuracy, an affirmation I had stated in my email to Hales on 17 May 2011 ("You have Johnson's statement, but conceal it from your presentations").

Furthermore, for a similarly absurd "suggestion" that Hales made in his carefully considered "Response," see my Note 253 (1st para.); also see my Note 133 for red-herring as an argumentative fallacy.

116. "PHONOGRAPHY, Or Writing by Sound ... by G.D. Watt," The Wasp, facsimile edition (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2003), 207 (issue of 26 April 1843); for "clerks skilled in shorthand" after 1844, see Ronald K. Esplin, "Joseph, Brigham, and the Twelve: A Succession of Continuity," BYU Studies 21 (Summer 1981): 304n10; for Thomas Bullock's capturing the "precise phrases" of speakers as "secretary of the Twelve from 1846-56," see Jerald F. Simon, "Thomas Bullock as an Early Mormon Historian," BYU Studies 30 (Winter 1990): 88n49; also Jenson, Church Chronology, entry for 17 February 1851 ("Robert Dickson opened a school in the 14th Ward, G.S.L. City, with 18 scholars, teaching phonography," i.e., shorthand).

117. Off-the-cuff comment by Brian C. Hales during today's Power-point presentation.

118. Council meeting/trial of Joseph E. Johnson, 2 September 1850.

119. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 177-78, 180-81, 193; E. Dale LeBaron, Benjamin F. Johnson: Friend to the Prophet (Springville, UT: CFI/Cedar Fort, Inc., 2008), [212] for ("Appendix D [--] Family of Ezekiel and Julia Hills Johnson," with last daughter "Esther

Melita, born January 12, 1827," i.e., age sixteen in the spring of 1843), 227 ("At the marriage of Sister Almera to the Prophet [in late April 1843--p. 226], there was still our youngest sister, for whom he manifested partiality, and would gladly have married, also, but she being young and partially promised to my first wife's brother, although reluctantly, the matter by him [Joseph Smith] was dropped"), 227 ("The marriage of my eldest sister to the Prophet was before my return to Nauvoo ["in June, 1842"--p. 226], and it being tacitly admitted, I asked no questions").

Johnson's statement that the Prophet "reluctantly ... dropped" his request to marry a 16-year-old girl is yet another evidence that Joseph Smith regarded his marriages to teenagers as earthly and sexual (see the narrative for my Notes 151-152, 159, 161-163, 165-166, 189, 195-196, and discussions within no Notes 153, 162, 189). By the reasoning Brian Hales insists upon, the Prophet could have easily chosen an "eternity only" sealing to Esther, while allowing her to continue as "partially promised" in marriage to Benjamin's brother-in-law. What Joseph Smith "reluctantly ... dropped" in the spring of 1843 was the opportunity of an earthly, literal marriage with 16-year-old Esther Melita Johnson.

120. First among "Observations," pre-printed statement on five separate illustrations in Hales' Power-point presentation today.

121. Council meeting/trial of Joseph E. Johnson, 2 September 1850.

122. Journal of Discourses, 26 vols. (London and Liverpool: Latter Day Saints' Book Depot, 1854-86), 8: 226 (B. Young/1860), 9: 332 (B. Young/1862); available in electronic format in Gospelink and in New Mormon Studies CD-ROM.

123. Council meeting/trial of Joseph E. Johnson, 2 September 1850.

124. Without knowledge of the minutes for the 1850 trial, Rufus David Johnson, J.E.J.: Trail To Sundown, Cassadaga to Casa Grande, 1817-1882 ([Salt Lake City]: Deseret News Press/Joseph Ellis Johnson Family Committee, 1961), 142-43, stated: "... after his conference with Brigham Young in the Valley [in August-September 1850], he did not make a statement[,] but it was established in his [JEJ's] mind that an apostle [like his traveling companion Orson Hyde] could unite people in this relation, or he could delegate the power to a member of a lesser echelon of the priesthood.

"... He ["Elder John Brown"] was delegated by Bro. Hyde to tie the nuptual [sic] knot for Joseph and Hanna, which he did some time before the 14 of December, 1850, at Kanesville. ... This joining in celestial marriage[,] as well as Joseph's first and third marriages, was made of lasting record in the Endowment House at Salt Lake City, Nov. 17, 1861, soon after his [J.E.J.'s] arrival in the Valley as a permanent resident."

125. Hales' pre-printed statement filling a page in today's Power-point presentation.

126. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 277, 706nVI; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 105, 105n130. Likewise, Hales, Modern Polygamy, 91n19, cited "Mrs. Joseph Horne, 'Migration and

Settlement'."

127. Lorraine Wight Hales, comp., The Chronicles of the Hales Family in America: Book One, 1791 to 1867 (Ogden, UT: Dingman Professional Printing, 2008), 79, citing "(Mrs. Joseph Horne, Migration and Settlement of the Latter Day Saints)," which was described in S. George Ellsworth, "A Guide to the Manuscripts In the Bancroft Library Relating To the History of Utah," Utah Historical Quarterly 22 (July 1954): 205.

For Mary Isabella Hales as the legal wife of Joseph Horne since 1836, see Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 4: 187. She was wrongly identified as a "plural wife of Joseph Horne," in Carol Cornwall Madsen, "Emmeline B. Wells: `Am I Not a Woman and a Sister?,'" BYU Studies 22 (Spring 1982): 176.

128. Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 234 ("Sarah M. Cleveland").

129. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 179.

130. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 312.

131. Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, ed., The Personal Writings of Eliza Roxcy Snow (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1995), 109.

132. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 4, 277; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 104.

133. "**red herring**, n. ... **2.** something intended to divert attention from the real problem or matter at hand; a misleading clue," in Random House Webster's College Dictionary (2nd rev. ed.), 1106.

134. For irrelevant proof, see David Hackett Fisher, Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), 45-47.

135. Pre-printed statement on page beginning: "John Snider was on a mission to England," in Hale's Power-point presentation.

136. Tax assessment roll for 1841, in "Nauvoo, Illinois Records, 1841-45," Folder 1, Box 4, MS 16800, Church History Library; Susan Easton Black, Harvey B. Black, and Brandon Plewe, Property Transactions In Nauvoo, Hancock County, Illinois and Surrounding Communities (1839-1859), 7 vols. (Wilmington, DE: World Vital Records, 2006), 3: 2064 (for "**JOHNSON, Joseph** ... Father: Johnson, Ezekial [sic] ... Transaction Date: 21 December 1841 ... Town Parcel: Lot #2, Block #154, Nauvoo Plat, Town of Nauvoo"), 3: 2050, for "**JOHNSON, Benjamin Franklin** ... Father: Johnson, Ezekiel ... Transaction Date: 11 August 1842 ... Town Parcel: Lot #1 and 2, Block #10, Hibbard Second Plat, Town of Nauvoo." (emphasis in original)

However, there is a remarkable contradiction in the alternate-spelling entries (6: 3818, 3836) for "**SNIDER, John**"/"**SNYDER, John**" and his wife Mary Heron. Despite listing "Sources: Nauvoo LDS census, 1842, Hancock County Taxes, 1842," Black, Black, and Plewe stated that

his first purchase of land in Nauvoo occurred on 18 September 1843. This contradiction would have been even more obvious if Black, Black, and Plewe had included Nauvoo's 1841 municipal assessment role in their sources for John Snider/Snyder.

Every historical writer makes mistakes, and Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 39n68 wrongly claimed ("Quinn reports that Joseph Ellis Johnson owned lot 3, block 7, in Ramus [-] giving the reference of Nauvoo Land and Records Research Center, P.O. Box 215, Nauvoo, IL 62354"). To the contrary, my "unabbreviated" version (dated "end of July" 2012), which Hales received on August 2nd, "reports" no such thing, nor did it make such statements ANYWHERE in its narrative, nor in any of its source-notes. Its note 90 cited only MS 16800 and the book by Black, Black, and Plewe (as in this "finalized" note's first paragraph), made no statement about lot number or block number, and I certainly made no reference to Ramus within that source-note. Nauvoo's tax assessments in MS 16800 give the legal description for each parcel of land owned in Nauvoo (but never for Ramus or anywhere else). Hales mistakenly assigned my name to added information he obtained on his own from another source, or that his research-assistant Don Bradley found.

137. Nauvoo Third Ward's tax assessment roll for 1842, in "Nauvoo, Illinois Records, 1841-45"; compare Black, Black, and Plewe, Property Transactions In Nauvoo, 3: 2050 (for Benjamin F. Johnson's purchase on 11 August 1842).

138. Hales, Chronicles of the Hales Family in America: Book One, 74; also Horne, "Migration and Settlement."

139. Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff, The Modern Researcher, 4th ed. (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1984), 115.

140. Smith, et al., History of The Church, 4: 364 (4 June 1841), compare all its indexed references for Carlin.

141. Tax assessment roll for 1841, in "Nauvoo, Illinois Records, 1841-45."

In the order listed by the assessor, Nauvoo's non-landed residents in 1841 who owned personal properties totalling as little as \$5.00 for each person were Joseph Rese [sic, Rees], Eli Chase, Mary Ives, Isaac Jud[d], Edmond Oakly [sic, Oakley], George Foster, James Proctor, Samuel Parker, James Smithies, James Spencer, Betsy More [sic, Moore], L.A. Pitkin, Caroline Jordon [sic, Jordan], Seth Jackson, and John Parker. By contrast, "John Snider" was listed in 1841 with \$56 in personal property and \$120 worth of land.

As another fallacy of irrelevant proof, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 34-35 stated that "Nauvoo's tax records for 1842 identify nine male property owners with the surname of `Snyder' or `Snider,' seven of whom were married ... Any of these seven women [living in Nauvoo during 1842] could have been `Sister Snyder' if they had ventured to Quincy at that time [in June 1841]." Residencies in 1842 that are not demonstrated for 1841 have no significance whatever for the identity of Nauvoo's land-owners surnamed Snider/Snyder in 1841, when Mary Isabella Horne saw "Sister Snyder" riding in a buggy with Joseph Smith.

On the other hand, it is relevant to Hales' challenge that the already-cited tax assessment roll of 1841 listed one other entry of pertinence: Robert Snider owned \$125 worth of land, compared with John Snider's \$120 worth of land. Hales, "Response," 34, accurately identified Robert's wife as Almeda Melissa Livermore Snider, whom I discuss in the following narrative and in my Note 142.

142. Born on 20 September 1815, Almeda Melissa Livermore married Robert Snider on 3 April 1841. (<http://wc.rootsweb.ancestry.com> for her)

Oddly, like two other monogamous marriages relevant to these comments (see my Note 36, next-to-last para., and Note 45, 2nd para., last sentence), this marriage was absent from the municipal sources used for Cook, Nauvoo Deaths and Marriages.

143. See www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/SarahKingsleyCleveland.html (Internet website operated by Brian C. Hales, accessed on 20 June 2012), and www.geni.com/people/Mary-Heron for their birthdates.

144. Quinn, Origins of Power, 587. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 37n66, wrongly corrected ("sic, should be p. 588") Todd Compton's accurate page-number citation to my book.

145. Smith, et al., History of The Church, 4: 483, 503 ("cut off from the Church"), 568. Mormons typically do not explain that the quoted phrase from page 503 means "excommunication," but that equivalence was stated by Hoyt W. Brewster Jr., Doctrine and Covenants Encyclopedia (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1988), 167.

146. Brian C. Hales email to D. Michael Quinn in May 2011, partially stated in his Power-point slide today: "Mary died in 1852 and was not sealed to John Snider during their lifetimes," from the electronic attachment emailed to me by Brian C. Hales on 23 June 2012.

147. Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 234 ("Ruth D. Vose, known as the wife of Edward Sayers"); also the narrative for my Notes 26-29, and their contents.

148. "The sealings of those named below were performed during the life of the Prophet Joseph[,] but there is no record thereof. President Lorenzo Snow [president of the Salt Lake Temple, 1893-98] decided that they be repeated in order that a record might exist; and that this explanation be made," regarding "FANNIE ALGER ... LUCINDA HARRIS ... ALMERA W. JOHNSON ... SARAH BAPSON ... FLORA ANN WOODWORTH ... FANNY YOUNG ... HANNAH ELLS ... OLIVE FROST ... SARAH M. CLEVELAND ... SYLVIA SESSIONS (LYON) ... RUTH VOSE ... died 15 Nov 1870," as extracted (with all-CAPS added) from Salt Lake Temple Sealing Record Book D, 243 (4 April 1899), Film 184,590 (not available to the general public), LDS Family History Library, in Tinney, Royal Family of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 41, 63, and quoted from Tinney in Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 631n3.

However, this 1899 notation referred to Snow's inability to find marital sealings of those wives (as spelled) in records of the Salt Lake Endowment House to 1889 and of the Salt Lake

Temple from 1893 onward. While living, Lucinda Pendleton Morgan Harris, Sarah M. Kingsley Cleveland, and Sylvia P. Sessions Lyon were sealed by proxy to Joseph Smith in the Nauvoo Temple in 1846, as recorded in Lisle G. Brown, comp., Nauvoo Sealings, Adoptions, and Anointings: A Comprehensive Register of Persons Receiving LDS Temple Ordinances, 1841-1846 (Salt Lake City: Smith-Pettit Foundation, 2006), 130, 281-83; Sarah "Rapsin" (Rapson/"Bapson") was sealed to him by proxy (while she was living) by Brigham Young in the Endowment House on 11 March 1856 (Film 183,389--not available to the general public), LDS Family History Library, while Fanny Young and Almera W. Johnson were sealed to him in the St. George Temple on 13 March 1879 and 21 March 1879 respectively (Film 170,597--not available to the general public), LDS Family History Library, both as recorded in Tinney, Royal Family of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 30 (for Young and Johnson), 48-A (for "Rapsin").

Despite the absence of a previous record for her proxy sealing to the Prophet, "Ruth Vose Smith" served as a living proxy on 2 July 1873 for nineteen deceased women, including "Sally Vose ... Sister" and "Mary Sayers ... Friend," in Salt Lake City's Endowment House Record of Baptisms for the Dead, Book D, pages 215-16 (Film 183,385--currently available to the general public), LDS Family History Library; also my Notes 26-29.

For Ruth Vose Sayers (died in Utah in 1884), see "SAYERS," Deseret Weekly News, 20 August 1884, 496; Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 386. For the identification of Sarah "Bapson" as Sarah Rapson Poulterer (died in Utah in 1879), see Bergera, "John C. Bennett, Joseph Smith, and the Beginnings of Mormon Plural Marriage in Nauvoo," 64n65; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 135 (with biographical sketch).

149. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 186, 186n90. I admire Hales (as honest apologist) for being the first to publicize this fact, even though Flora's legal marriage in August 1843 complicated his apologist-analysis of Clayton's references to her during that month.

150. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 185 ("in the spring of 1843 Joseph Smith was sealed to Flora Ann Woodruff [sic, Woodworth]," 185n87 ("a possible date for their sealing is March 4, 1843").

151. George D. Smith, ed., An Intimate Chronicle: The Journals of William Clayton (Salt Lake City: Signature Books/Smith Research Associates, 1991), 119 (28-29 August 1843).

152. Hales' pre-printed statement ("No evidence of sexual relations and if that were the reason, why would Clayton have mentioned it? Discretion was observed regarding polygamous relationships and mentioning a sexual liaison would not be discrete [sic, discreet]") in today's Power-point presentation; also his off-the-cuff remarks during today's presentation about the absence of "bed" or "bedroom" in the Clayton journal's references to these private meetings of Joseph Smith with Flora Woodworth in Clayton's house.

153. Smith, Journals of William Clayton, 99 (27 April 1843, for Joseph Smith's performing Clayton's polygamous marriage to Margaret Moon), 99 (30 April 1843, for Clayton's consummating that marriage), 101 (14 May 1843, "Walked out with Margt"), 103 (17 May 1843,

referred to Joseph B. Noble's polygamous marriage), 105 (21 May 1843, "Evening I took a walk with my wife M to H Kimball's"), 105 (23 May 1843, referred to Emma Smith's jealousy about Eliza Partridge), 106 (29 May 1843, referred to Joseph Smith's jealousy about Clayton, "asked if I had used any familiarity with E [Emma]"), 108 (23 June 1843, about Joseph Smith saying that he "gave" a plural wife to Vinson Knight, wrongly identified by George Smith as Newell Knight--see my Note 179--plus allusion to Brigham Young's polygamous wife), 117 (16 August 1843, Emma's jealousy about Eliza and Emily Partridge), 117 (18 August 1843, "that I had slept with her," Clayton's plural wife Margaret), 118 (20 August 1843, "M came upstairs to me"), 118 (20 August 1843, Parley P. Pratt's polygamous proposals), 118 (21 August 1843, Emma's jealousy about Eliza R. Snow's letters), 118 (23 August 1843, Emma's jealousy about Joseph's gift of a watch to Flora Woodworth), 118 (24 August 1843, referred to sleeping with plural wife Margaret and first wife Ruth together), 122 (18 October 1843, "Spent 2 hours with lovely M"), 122 (19 October 1843, if Clayton gets into trouble for his pregnant polygamous wife, Joseph Smith said: "I will give you an awful scourging and probably cut you off from the church and then will baptise you and set you ahead as good as ever"), 126 (18 February 1844, birth of his plural wife's son), 145 (27 August 1844, death of that infant); with more complete transcriptions of the originals available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library.

Many of the above events were in the 1987 biographical narrative of Allen, Trials of Discipleship, 190-95, which cited the dated entries from "Clayton, Nauvoo Journal," first cited (105n3) as: "William Clayton Journals, 2 vols, Nov. 1842 to Jan. 1846, 21, 28 Jan. 1843 (in private custody and used here with special permission)." The "private custody" referred to what was then known as the Historical Department of the Church, located in the east wing of the Church Office Building (50 East North Temple Street, Salt Lake City), where the originals had been on loan in the mid-1980s from the vault of the LDS First Presidency in the Church Administration Building (47 East South Temple Street).

For biographical sketches of Clayton, Knight, Noble, Pratt, and Young, see Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 1: 8-13, 83, 4: 691, 696; Hyrum L. Andrus, "Little Known Friends of the Prophet Joseph Smith" in Seminar on the Prophet Joseph Smith, Mar. 2, 1963 (Provo, UT: Adult Education and Extension Services, Brigham Young University, 1963), 13-14.

154. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 186 (for Flora's impulsively marrying Carlos Gove the day after her confrontation on 22 August 1843 with Emma Smith, who jealously demanded the gold watch her husband had given to Flora), 186n90 (for Flora's admitting to Helen Mar Kimball that she eloped with Gove "in a reckless moment"), 187 (Helen's statement that Flora "felt condemned for the rash step she had taken" of marrying Gove); Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 392, overlooked the fact that Flora's marriage to non-Mormon Carlos Gove occurred in August 1843, and Compton wrongly claimed it was in "late 1844," but also quoted Helen Mar Kimball (another of Joseph Smith's wives) who stated this error of chronology.

155. Smith, Journals of William Clayton, 118 (26 August 1843, for Joseph Smith "conversing some time" with Flora Woodworth and her mother), 119 (for Joseph Smith's solitary meetings in Clayton's home with Flora on 28 August and 29 August 1843--while Clayton was working "at Temple" on each occasion); with more complete transcriptions of the originals in my Research

Files, Beinecke Library.

Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 46-47, stated that "another more plausible reconstruction is that Joseph and Flora met at least three times (the 26th with her mother, and the 28th and 29th) to discuss the status of Flora's membership and the future of her sealing to the Prophet" because "Flora had unilaterally broken her marriage covenant with the Prophet," and therefore "Joseph was positioned to judge and apply Church disciplinary consequences," i.e. disfellowshipping or excommunication (see my Note 89, 2nd para.; see my Note 114). To the contrary, Hales should know that "disciplinary" action was impossible for the Prophet to impose by himself. It required the Nauvoo High Council to know that the Prophet had married Flora in a polygamous marriage, the kind of marriage he had repeatedly denied in public and private statements. (e.g., see the narrative for my Notes 34-35, see my Note 46, 2nd para.-3rd para.; see the narrative's quote for my Note 168; also Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 122, for Joseph's denial in May 1844: "What a thing it is for a man to be accused of committing adultery and having seven wives, when I can only find one").

Furthermore, as part of his effort to assert that nearly all of the Prophet's polygamous marriages were sexless, Hales, "Response," 47, alleged that there was a reason to doubt "the level of physicality in the Flora-Joseph plural union." Hales made that assertion due to the reminiscence by Apostle Lyman Wight's son that Flora Woodworth allowed the 19-year-old to show romantic interest in her without informing him that she was already married to Joseph Smith. This portion of Orange L. Wight's autobiography has been published in Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 41.

However, Hales knows that each wife had the solemn obligation to tell nobody that they were married to Joseph Smith unless he permitted her to. Such silence cannot logically be asserted as even the slightest indication of celibacy in those oath-bound polygamous marriages. For example, in his 2009 "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 133, Hales stated that "the need for complete secrecy about plurality in Nauvoo--both because of danger from other Church members and from outsiders--meant that Joseph's plural wives used great care when speaking of their involvement with him. Indeed, we have no contemporary records from any of them directly acknowledging their relationship at the time they were involved in it before his death or describing their relationship until much later." In 2012, Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 176, quoted Emily Dow Partridge's statement that he "asked me if I could keep a secret ..." Hales has also frequently cited Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, who stated (409): "The secrecy of polygamy was so great that neither Emily or Eliza knew that the other [sister] had been married or that they now shared a common husband," and Compton quoted (502, 503) Heber C. Kimball's letter to his 14-year-old daughter Helen (shortly after her marriage to the Prophet), in which Apostle Kimball reminded her: "Now let us be careful that we do not make a breach. ... having feelings in your heart, tell them to no one but your father and mother; if you do [confide to someone else], you will be betrayed and exposed to your hurt ..." Likewise, Hales' publications have cited Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, which quoted (78) Zina Huntington's statement about her marriage to Joseph Smith: "I never breathed it for years." Also "Evidence from Zina D. Huntington-Young," 29.

156. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 185 ("JOSEPH SMITH QUIETLY ALLOWED FOR ONE DIVORCE").

157. William Clayton journal, 16 August 1843, located at one time in the vault of what was then called the Historical Department of the Church (see my Note 153, 2nd para.), quoted here from transcript available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library; different bracketed phrases for this journal-entry have been published in Smith, Journals of William Clayton, 117; and Linda King Newell, "The Emma Smith Lore Reconsidered," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 17 (Autumn 1984): 90-91, although my narrative's quote follows the latter's additions more closely.

Modern American English uses "should" in its meaning of an obligation, synonymous with "ought," which is how I intend the word "should" throughout my narrative and source-notes of these finalized "Comments." However, older English usage (as in Clayton's 1843 statement) commonly intended "I should" as what is now called an "auxiliary" version of "I shall" (the emphatic form of "I will"). For example, see entry for "**should**" in Random House Webster's College Dictionary (2nd rev. ed.), 1217.

Therefore, according to the context of Clayton's entry, Joseph Smith's statement that he "should not relinquish" his plural wives had the emphatic meaning of "shall not relinquish."

158. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 410-11, a narrative based on the autobiography by Emily D.P. Young, who stated (in part): "Joseph came to us and shook hands with us, and the understanding was that all was ended between us." For the approximate date when the Prophet "cast off" the Partridge sisters, Compton cited (411) a poem by plural wife Eliza R. Snow to Emily on 19 October 1843.

Nonetheless, despite Emily's specific statements (and despite the frequent references to In Sacred Loneliness by Hales' own publications), Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 49 claimed: "No documentation that their plural sealings were 'ended' has been found ..."

159. Newell and Avery, Mormon Enigma (1994 ed.), 144 ("Emily 'slept with him' between her first marriage and the second ceremony"); Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 408, quoted Emily Partridge's testimony in court that she "roomed" with Joseph Smith, as well as her statement that she had "carnal intercourse" with him; also Marquardt, "Emily Dow Partridge Smith Young on the Witness Stand," 134, 138-39. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 193, acknowledged that there was "a sexual component" in the Prophet's marriage with her and probably with her sister Eliza. Likewise, for Joseph's sexual intercourse with 17-year-old Lucy Walker, see the narrative for my Notes 161-162 (and their sources).

Nonetheless, Hales requires Emily's and Lucy's kind of explicitness before he will admit that Joseph Smith had physical intimacy with his 14-year-old bride, Helen Mar Kimball: "I conclude, based on my reading of the available evidence, that this plural marriage did not include conjugality" (Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 176). However, when she was 52-years-old, Helen's handwritten autobiography stated that Heber C. Kimball "offered me to him [Joseph Smith] ... My father had but one Ewe Lamb, but willingly laid her upon the alter [altar] ..." (Compton, 498). Likewise, "None but God & his angels could see my mother's bleeding

heart--when Joseph asked her if she was willing, she replied `If Helen is willing[,] I have nothing more to say'" (Compton, 499); also quoted fully in Jeni Broberg Holzapfel and Richards Neitzel Holzapfel, eds., A Woman's View: Helen Mar Whitney's Reminiscences of Early Church History (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1997), 482, 486.

Those words about anguished sacrifice are not the way a woman would describe her non-sexual relationship as a teenager with a 37-year-old man. However, Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy" included her "Autobiography, March 30, 1881" in his sources (176n49) for his denial that their marriage included sex.

By contrast, a statement from Eliza R. Snow's stake president indicated that Joseph Smith had sexual intercourse with the 38-year-old spinster following their "sealing" in 1842, as well as having sex with 14-year-old Helen Kimball after hers in 1843. During a long conversation with the Prophet's polygamy-denying son Joseph Smith III:

He said, "I am informed that Eliza Snow was a virgin at the time of her death." I in turn said, "Brother Heber C. Kimball, I am informed, asked her the question if she was not a virgin [--] although married to Joseph Smith and afterwards to Brigham Young, when she replied at a private gathering, `I thought you knew Joseph Smith better than that.'" (Angus M. Cannon's narrative about his 1905 interview with Joseph Smith III, page 23, LDS Church History Library)

I see only one way to understand her reply: Eliza R. Snow assumed that (as the father of the Prophet's youngest bride) Heber C. Kimball should know that Joseph Smith had sexual intercourse with his plural wives. See also Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 313 ("According to Angus Cannon, later her stake president ... Eliza affirmed that her marriage to Smith had a sexual dimension").

Likewise, on 26 September 1872, she told the women of Payson, Utah's Relief Society: "Polygamy did not hurt me, but to be looked upon as a woman of light character [--] that did hurt me, the very idea of my not being a virtuous woman," quoted in Jill Mulvay Derr, "The Significance of `O My Father' in the Personal Journey of Eliza R. Snow," BYU Studies 36, No. 1 (1996-97): 119n28 (with "spelling and punctuation standardized").

Furthermore, Helen Kimball's polygamous marriage at age fourteen, with the consent of her parents Heber and Vilate, was consistent with Nauvoo's February 1842 ordinance for marriage: "Male Persons over the Age of seventeen years, and Females over the Age of fourteen years, may contract and be joined in Marriage: Provided in all Cases where either Party is a Minor, the consent of Parents or Guardians be first had ..." (quoted in Bergera, "John C. Bennett, Joseph Smith, and the Beginnings of Mormon Plural Marriage in Nauvoo," 74); my Note 119 (2nd para.). Again, Hales has ignored the above evidence.

Nevertheless, in his consistent effort to claim that nearly all of Joseph Smith's polygamous marriages were sexless, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 85, stated: "The most obvious reason Helen Mar Kimball was not summoned [for the Temple Lot Case in 1892] is that she could not honestly testify that her plural marriage with the Prophet included conjugality." Both he and I are interpreting the absence of any documented statement for why she was not invited to testify by the Mormons defending the actuality of those plural marriages, but I see an equally plausible reason--one that is more "obvious" in my view.

Even if Helen did not volunteer the fact under oath in 1892, hostile cross-examination by RLDS deniers of Joseph's polygamy would have required her to state that she was only fourteen when she married Joseph Smith. According to the prudish sensibilities of Victorian America in the 1890s, that would have been a source of ridicule and attack upon the Prophet, a prospect Mormons would not invite when other of his somewhat older wives (Emily Partridge, Lucy Walker, and Melissa Lott) could testify in 1892 that they had sex with Joseph. America's social norms and criticisms were far more restrictive in 1892 than in the 1840s.

160. Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 133n50 (for quote); also Marquardt, "Emily Dow Partridge Smith Young on the Witness Stand," 129 (for "Emily balked. 'Do I have to answer the question?')"), 134 (for "Well I don't want to answer that question").

161. Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 230.

162. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 193; see the narrative and quotes for my Notes 151, 152, 159, 161, 163, 165, 189, 195, 196, and discussions within my Notes 119 (2nd para.), 153, 189.

Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, [36], listed Sarah Lawrence's bridal age as sixteen. Her seventeenth birthday was on 13 May 1843, and their marriage occurred at an unspecified date in the spring of 1843--sometime after the secret marriage of the Partridge sisters to Joseph Smith on two separate days during the first week of March 1843 and before the re-performance of their marriage to him in Emma Smith's presence (traditionally dated as 11 May 1843).

Those are the dates Compton's In Sacred Loneliness seemed to affirm (408-09, 475), yet he gave Sarah's bridal age as "seventeen" (475). This was due to a revisionist view that the second ceremony did not occur until May 23rd because officiator James Adams did not visit Nauvoo until that date. See my Note 79 (long paragraph, beginning: "Nonetheless, Hales has known for years"), and Van Wagoner, Mormon Polygamy, 53. Compton In Sacred Loneliness, 732nIX, wrongly cited Van Wagoner as "MP 50, 35," which Compton intended to refer to Mormon Polygamy's page 53 and its note 5.

163. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 193n109 (for "very deed"), 199 (for "voluptuous love"), the latter citing "In Honor of Joseph Smith: An Anniversary of his Birth Celebrated in the Sixteenth Ward," Deseret Evening News, 25 December 1899, 2; also the narrative for my Notes 151, 152, 159, 161, 162, 165, 189, 195, 196, and discussions within my Notes 119 (2nd para.), 153, 162, 189. For Melissa's polygamous marriage in September 1843, see Hales (225).

164. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 199.

165. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 180, 180n63, 206, 207n153; see narrative for my Notes 150-151, 159, 161, 162, 189, 195, 196, and discussions within my Notes 119 (2nd para.), 153, 162, 189.

166. A. Crane, "A Phrenological Chart of Joseph Smith," The Wasp (2003 facsimile): 46 (for quotes from Crane and his chart in issue of 2 July 1842); also Smith, et al., History of The Church, 5: 53 (for same quotes), 4: 600 (for William Smith as editor of The Wasp since April 1842). For phrenological "reading" of cranial bumps, see Davis Bitton and Gary L. Bunker, "Phrenology Among the Mormons," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 9 (Spring 1974): 51; Stanley B. Kimball, Heber C. Kimball: Mormon Patriarch and Pioneer (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981), 82.

167. Bitton and Bunker, "Phrenology Among the Mormons," 44. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 51, confused Alfred Woodward's phrenological reading of "Mr Joseph Smith jr's HEAD" (for which Hales provided a photograph) in Philadelphia on 14 January 1840 with the chart the Prophet received in 1842 from Nauvoo phrenologist "A. Crane."

Hales, "Response" emphasized Joseph's expressions of skepticism, but didn't acknowledge the 1840 examination, and wrongly claimed that Nauvoo's Wasp newspaper changed the numbers given by the 1842 phrenologist. Moreover, Hales didn't acknowledge that Joseph submitted himself to a third examination by phrenologist "Dr. Turner" on 13 October 1843, as mentioned by Bitton-Bunker (44), as well as recorded in Joseph Smith's journal, 13 October 1843, in Faulring, An American Prophet's Record, 420; Smith, et al., History of The Church, 6: 56; also Smith, Journals of William Clayton, 121 (14 October 1843--"Joseph said they could not prove that the mind of man was seated in one part of the brain more than another &c").

168. Letter from Joseph Smith (dated 23 June 1842) in Wasp, 25 June 1842; reprinted in Smith, et al., History of The Church, 5: 36. For Bennett, see Andrew F. Smith, The Sainly Scoundrel: The Life and Times of Dr. John Cook Bennett (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997); "OTHER COUNSELORS IN THE FIRST PRESIDENCY," Deseret News 2011 Church Almanac (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2010), 93; Bergera, "John C. Bennett, Joseph Smith"; Bergera, "Illicit Intercourse," 65-67, 70, 74; and the narrative for my Note 258.

169. Eliza R. Snow, "To President Joseph Smith, and His Lady, Presidentess Emma Smith," Wasp, 20 August 1842, emphasis in the newspaper.

A non-sexual, non-controversial reference to phrenology's use of the term "bump" appeared in Benjamin F. Grouard, "My Ever Dear and Respected Wife," Times and Seasons 6 (15 January 1845): 980-81, that they should "live in anticipation, or as the phrenologists say, we must cultivate the 'bump of hope', and get a large share of that ..."

However, the 1842 poem's line about "thunder bolts malice may strew" showed Eliza's expectation that the specific section of Joseph's phrenological chart she was emphasizing involved something that his enemies would use to criticize him (not the kind of non-controversial "bump" that Grouard cited). I regard that meaning of her 1842 poem as obvious, even though Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012) repeatedly criticized my conclusion that various documents had "obvious" meanings.

170. Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, "Inadvertent Disclosure: Autobiography in the Poetry of Eliza R. Snow," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 23 (Spring 1990); 101 (for the poem's text), 102-03 (for my quote from Beecher's analysis).

Beecher didn't specify the sexual meanings in the English language of "key" and "bump" during the hundreds of years before Eliza's poem, but see Frankie Rubinstein, A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns and Their Significance, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan Press, 1989), 140 ("**key** [--] allusive to coitus and genitals ..."); Gordon Williams, A Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery In Shakespearean and Stuart Literature, 3 vols. (London: Athlone Press; Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1994), 1: 172, "**bump** [--] copulate with (vigorously)," 2: 759 ("**key and lock** [--] symbolic of penis and vagina").

Shakespeare's plays, puns, monologues, and dialogues were immensely popular among the common people of early nineteenth-century America. Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, Shakespeare In America (Oxford, Eng.: Oxford University Press, 2012), 72, have noted that "copies of Shakespeare's plays often appeared on the shelves of general stores and in peddler's wagons. In 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville, the peripatetic French author of Democracy in America, claimed (albeit hyperbolically): 'There is hardly a pioneer's hut that does not contain a few odd volumes of Shakespeare ...'"; also "Shakespearean allusions and quotations were a regular feature of nineteenth-century newspapers," from Internet website of www.shakespeareinamericancommunities.org.

171. The narrative's discussion for my Notes 254-259.

172. "BENNETTIANA," THE WASP--EXTRA, 27 July 1842; the narrative's quote for my Note 168; also see my Note 258.

173. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 307, 313; also Hales' website (accessed on 20 June 2012) at the Internet URL of www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/ElizaSnow.html.

174. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 164, 193.

175. Cory H. Maxwell, "Restoration of All Things," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 3: 1218-19.

176. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 196. Compare with Bergera, "Vox Joseph Vox Dei: Regarding Some of the Moral and Ethical Aspects of Joseph Smith's Practice of Plural Marriage," 33 ("A fourth preliminary concerns the purpose of Smith's plural marriage doctrine. ... Love and sex, or as he termed it, 'reproduction,' occupy an integral place in his plural marriage teaching"), 34 (quoting a retrospective account reported by future apostle Rudger Clawson, "Finally, when one of Joseph Smith's followers asked about marrying two elderly sisters who were more acceptable to this particular follower's civil wife, Smith reportedly declared that such an 'arrangement is of the devil[;] you go and get you a young wife[,] one you can take to your bosom and raise children by'").

Then Bergera concluded (33, with my added emphasis): "As I read the sources, Smith clearly

intended that plural marriage provide sexual intimacy and facilitate the production of offspring. While there may be social and biological aspects as well to Smith's teaching, the erotic element should be minimized."

177. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 197-98, with my quote from 198, and his tally of thirty-four polygamous wives on 191 (with Fanny Alger only in the 1830s, whom he listed by name on 191n101). Moreover, George D. Smith, "Nauvoo's Inner Circle of Thirty-Two Men Who Accepted 'Celestial Marriage,'" John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 32 (Spring/Summer 2012): 2, presents a chart of Emma Smith's pregnancies from 1827 to 1844, including the birth of "an unnamed son" (probably stillborn) on 7 February 1842.

178. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 227.

179. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 195.

180. Barzun and Graff, Modern Researcher, 50 (for "the distortions brought about by 'present-mindedness,' the habit of reading into the past our own modern ideas and intentions"); Harry Ritter, Dictionary of Concepts in History (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 9 ("the conscious or unconscious attribution of present attitudes, values, and modes of behavior upon the past is 'presentism,' an inexcusable violation of the past's integrity"); Paul K. Conkin and Roland N. Stromberg, Heritage and Challenge: The History and Theory of History (Wheeling, IL: Forum Press, 1989), 204; also James B. Allen, "Emergence of a Fundamental: The Expanding Role of Joseph Smith's First Vision in Mormon Religious Thought," Journal of Mormon History 7 (1980): [43], began the article with this statement: "One of the barriers to understanding history is the tendency many of us have to superimpose upon past generations our own patterns of thought and perceptions of reality."

181. The bibliographic data for its 1834 Boston edition and its 1848 Philadelphia edition are in WorldCat, available by subscription through the Internet, but free-of-charge as an electronic resource at libraries of most colleges and universities. My narrative's quote is from the edition available to me: James Copeland, M.D., A Dictionary of Practical Medicine, ed. Charles A. Lee (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1845), 370.

182. Michael Ryan, M.D., The Philosophy of Marriage, In Its Social, Moral and Physical Relations; With an Account of the Diseases of the Genito-Urinary Organs (London: John Churchill, 1837), 155, 156.

183. WorldCat shows that the first American editions of Dr. Michael Ryan's book were The Secrets of Generation, and Philosophy of Marriage ... (New York: Moore and Jackson, 1844) and The Secrets of Generation, Comprising the Art of Procreating the Sexes at Will ... (New York: Douglass, 1844).

184. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 194.

185. Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, [36], for Table 1.1 showing the age of polygamous wives at the known (or approximate) date of their marriages to Joseph Smith (seven at age 40 or older, and six at age 45 or older).

186. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 194.

187. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 638 (7th line from the top, after the words "**did not visit frequently**"), citing Allen J. Wilcox, Clarice R. Weinberg, and Donna D. Baird, "Timing of Sexual Intercourse In Relation To Ovulation," New England Journal of Medicine 333 (7 December 1995): 1517-21, 1563.

188. However, there is ambiguity in a relevant sentence of the preceding citation from Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 638: "Joseph Smith was almost certainly having daily sexual relations with none of his thirty to forty plural wives." If this is understood to mean "not with all of his wives" every day, that is obviously true. If Compton's wording is understood to mean that the Prophet did not have cohabitation visits on consecutive days with even one of his polygamous wives, William Clayton's 1843 journal disproves such a claim by recording consecutive days during which Smith visited alone with Flora Woodworth (see the narrative for my Notes 151-159). If (as I think) Compton intended his statement to mean that no individual wife had sexual intercourse with Joseph Smith every day of a particular week, that was certainly true (possibly even for his legal wife Emma).

189. For example, Richard Lloyd Anderson and Scott H. Faulring, "The Prophet Joseph Smith and His Plural Wives," FARMS Review of Books 10, No. 2 (1998): 88, for Melissa Lott cohabiting with Joseph Smith at her father's home.

190. Johnson, My Life's Review, 95-96.

191. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 179.

192. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 179, 260, 278; also Van Wagoner, Mormon Polygamy, 52, for Durfee.

193. Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 222-23; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 576-77, for Benbow's first plural marriage in January 1846 to Agnes Taylor. Her own first husband's last child was born on 1 September 1845. See www.geni.com/people/Agnes-Taylor/6000000007210828279, accessed on 25 July 2012.

194. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 198.

In his attempted refutation of this paragraph, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 54, stated: "Quinn's description would have required the cooperation of dozens of men and women. So we must assume a conspiracy among them," adding (55): "Either there are a lot of accomplices or a lot of clandestine encounters that nobody detected. Neither depiction seems very plausible." In making such statements, Brian Hales is raising an apologetical smoke-screen

by questioning the well-known facts of Nauvoo's polygamy.

First, there is no need to "assume a conspiracy," which legally requires only two persons who make plans to violate a statute or law. Second, as Hales knows, it was a crime in Illinois during the 1840s to perform a ceremony for an illegal marriage, and it was a crime to have sexual intercourse with someone other than one's legal spouse.

"Criminal conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons formed for the purpose of committing a crime"--Paul Marcus, "Conspiracy: The Criminal Agreement In Theory and In Practice," Georgetown Law Journal 65 (1977): 928. Likewise, Benjamin Vaughn Abbott, Dictionary of Terms and Phrases Used in American or English Jurisprudence, 2 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1879), 1: 269 ("CONSPIRACY, The agreement or engagement of persons to co-operate in accomplishing some unlawful purpose ... conspiracy is, in its nature a joint offense; less than two persons cannot be accused of it").

Each of Joseph Smith's polygamous ceremonies involved a criminal conspiracy of at least three people (Joseph, his polygamous bride, and the officiator). Any parent or sibling who gave advance approval for such a ceremony was joining a criminal conspiracy. When any of those religiously motivated conspirators told another person about the polygamous marriage after-the-fact, that newly informed person became part of the criminal conspiracy when they failed to inform the police or file a criminal complaint against Joseph Smith. Whenever the polygamously married couple's relatives or friends aided the clandestinely married couple in having a rendezvous, all those aiding-and-abetting persons were participating in a separate conspiracy to violate the law.

Furthermore, concerning Hales' questioning the plausibility that Joseph Smith had "a lot of accomplices" in his polygamous marriages and cohabitations, the answer is correspondingly obvious. Even limiting the total number of the Prophet's polygamous marriages at Nauvoo to thirty-three (as Hales does--my Note 177), there were at least a hundred relatives and trusted associates who knew about those illegal marriages. That's "a lot of accomplices," by my training as a historian.

195. Dean C. Jessee, comp. and ed., Personal Writings of Joseph Smith, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2002), xx ("Insertions [by Joseph Smith] are enclosed in angle brackets: <>"), 566-67 ("TO THE WHITNEYS[,] 18 AUGUST 1842"); Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, [144-45], for photo of Joseph Smith's holographic letter.

As a fallacy of irrelevant proof, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 60, seized upon Joseph's use of "comfort" in this 1842 letter and asserted: "An examination of twelve other separate usages of the word `comfort' or `comforted' by Joseph Smith in his speech and writing fails to identify even one that carried a sexual overtone." A reasonable researcher does not expect (or demand) to find sexual double entendre in a man's expressions that were not directed to the man's recently married bride.

196. See the narrative for my Notes 150, 151, 159, 161, 162, 163, 165, 189, 195, and discussions within my Notes 119 (2nd para.), 153, 162, 189.

197. Hales' pre-printed statement in today' Power-point presentation.

198. Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 39: 654-55 (for Esther Dutcher Smith's third child on 21 December 1833, and fourth child Joseph on 21 September 1844).

199. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 7: "Quinn affirms that Joseph Albert may have been the biological child of Joseph Smith. The child's first name is perhaps suggestive, but his middle name of `Albert' seems inconsistent with that interpretation. If Esther was trying to keep the child's paternity secret from [her legal husband] Albert, it seems she would be less inclined to name the child after the Prophet."

However, the same can be said for Sylvia Sessions Lyon, her legal husband Windsor Lyon, and her daughter Josephine, yet Hales has affirmed that "several historical documents support a genetic relationship between the Prophet and Josephine ..." ("Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 113, 2nd para.); also the narrative's discussion for my Notes 13-15.

200. Jenson, "Plural Marriage," 233. For different views about whether Joseph Smith's relationship with Fanny Alger was a plural marriage (performed by Levi W. Hancock in 1833) or simply an extra-marital "affair" (which began in the mid-1830s, allegedly not performed as a marriage), see Newell, "Emma Smith Lore," 88-89; Van Wagoner, Mormon Polygamy, 5, 8, 10; Richard D. Poll, History and Faith: Reflections of a Mormon Historian (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 98; Quinn, Origins of Power, 45, 619; Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 25-42; Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 30n75; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 38-42; Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation"; Don Bradley, "Mormon Polygamy before Nauvoo?: The Relationship of Joseph Smith and Fanny Alger," in Bringhurst and Foster, Persistence of Polygamy, 14-58; also my Note 285 (5th para., beginning: "Fanny Alger is missing") and my Note 295 (2nd para.).

201. Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 130 (for quote, including bracketed addition by Hales), 130n42 (for source as "'Harris,' Document 2, in Andrew Jenson Papers"), 142n16 (for "probably February-March 1887" as Hales' estimate for "Document 10 ... Andrew Jenson Papers").

202. John E. Thompson, "The Mormon Baptism of William Morgan," Philaethes 36 (June 1985): 6-8; Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 45.

203. Quinn, Origins of Power, 587 ("bet. 1838-42"); Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 49 ("these two months [March-April 1838] are a good possibility"); Bergera, "John C. Bennett, Joseph Smith, and the Beginnings of Mormon Plural Marriage in Nauvoo," 61 ("sometime in 1841-42"); Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 157 ("winter, 1841-42").

204. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 105n21, in 2010 (for first quote), which paraphrased Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 132, in 2009 ("counting back four years establishes Lucinda's `mistress-hood' as beginning some months prior to July 1837"); compare Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation,"

130 (for my narrative's second quote). See my Note 207.

Also Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 42n81: "I argue that Joseph Smith would not have attempted a plural relationship [with Lucinda in 1838] at the peak of Oliver Cowdery's criticism of him in part for committing 'adultery' with Fanny Alger in Kirtland, Ohio a few years earlier."

However, multiple fallacies are involved in part of Hales' argument against the marriage of Lucinda Pendleton Morgan Harris to Joseph Smith in 1837-38, His "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 130, stated: "If Harriet's assertion was true, Lucinda's sealing to Joseph Smith would have been the second after that of Fanny Alger. However, my study of Nauvoo polygamy suggests that no sealings were performed prior to Louisa Beaman's in April 1841." First, as reported by Jenson, Harriet Cook Young claimed that Lucinda "was married to Joseph in Missouri," not sealed (as Hales wrongly alleged). Second, Hales used his alleged word "sealed" as the basis for his "useful argument" that "the most likely time and place appear to be Nauvoo in 1842" for their polygamous marriage. Third, when one legitimately uses the same standards of evidence to apply to different cases, Hales' use of "no sealings" to refute Lucinda's marriage also applied to Fanny Alger in Kirtland during the 1830s. Fourth, his same article nonetheless repeatedly affirmed that "Fanny was, in fact, the first plural wife of Joseph Smith" (139), that "seven [reminiscent accounts] considered the relationship [of Joseph and Fanny to be] a plural marriage or sealing" (143), that Eliza R. "Snow's testimony as a contemporary witness helps to break the scholarly deadlock about whether Joseph and Fanny were actually married as opposed to having an affair" (144), that "it seems unlikely that discussions of eternal sealings, the new and everlasting covenant of marriage, or a patriarchal priesthood order would have accompanied her [Fanny Alger's] introduction to plural marriage" (151n105), that concerning "the ceremony performed [for Joseph and Fanny] by Levi Hancock ... Levi was not acting with the authority by which plural marriages were later sealed in Nauvoo, even though 'sealed' is the term used by Eliza Jane Churchill Webb" (157), and "Joseph and Fanny, this first plural marriage ... Joseph's marriage to Fanny Alger" (158); also my Note 295 (2nd para.).

205. Thompson, "The Mormon Baptism of William Morgan," 6-8. For Joseph Smith's visit in Far West, Missouri, from "the latter part of October or first of November" until shortly after 10 November 1837, see Smith, et al., History of The Church, 2: 521, 525.

206. Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 21: 40-41; Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 44, 48.

207. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 105n21 (last sentence), in which he dismissed Lucinda's "reported" marriage to Joseph Smith as an "adulterous relationship" that Hales could not believe existed; stated less emphatically in 2008 as "My analysis of geographical and chronological considerations further reduces the likelihood of a marriage in Missouri," as stated by Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 130-31.

208. Susan Easton Black, Who's Who in the Doctrine and Covenants (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1997), 122.

209. "Far West, May, 1838," Elders' Journal of the Church of the Latter Day Saints 1 (July 1838): 45; available in electronic format in Gospelink and in New Mormon Studies CD-ROM. Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," 131, stated: "On November 2, 1837, a special council of Church members and leaders in Far West transacted several items of Church business but had to leave unresolved `a matter between Oliver Cowdery, Thomas B. Marsh' and the Prophet. I think that the logical topic was Oliver's perception of Joseph's `immoral' relationship with Fanny Alger." However, Hales did not acknowledge the statement of George Harris that he participated in that discussion during early November 1837.

210. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 51, 154 (both pages referring to this dinner on 17 January 1842, as well as referring to his page 153's discussion of Joseph marrying his brother's widow on 6 January 1842).

211. Michael S. Riggs and John E. Thompson, "Joseph Smith, Jr., and `The Notorious Case of Aaron Lyon': Evidence of Earlier Doctrinal Development of Salvation for the Dead and a Trigger for the Practice of Polyandry?," John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 26 (2006): 105-07 (esp. 106: "Joseph Smith engineered himself a place on the Aaron Lyon defense team"), 110.

Published four years later, Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" did not cite or mention this article, even though Hales cited (128n88-89, 105n22) that journal's issues for 1997, 2003 and 2008. There was a similar absence of reference in his 2012 "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," which cited (183n74) the John Whitmer Historical Association Journal for 2005.

212. "The Scriptorium Book of Joseph Smith, Jr." (28 April 1838) in Faulring, An American Prophet's Record, 179; transcribed somewhat differently in "MISSOURI JOURNAL, 1838, MARCH TO SEPTEMBER" (28 April 1838), in Dean C. Jessee, ed., The Papers of Joseph Smith: Volume 2, Journal, 1832-1842 (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992), 236.

213. Riggs and Thompson, "Joseph Smith, Jr., and `The Notorious Case of Aaron Lyon,'" 102 ("logical trigger that prompted Joseph Smith's initial practice of polyandry"), 117, "When his attentions did again turn to polyandry later in Nauvoo, however, one of his chosen wives was Sylvia (Sessions) Lyon. She was the wife of Aaron's son Windsor P. Lyon."

Nonetheless, I don't share their assessment of "Joseph's Don Juanistic qualities" (118). See the narrative for my Notes 174-176.

214. Thompson, "The Mormon Baptism of William Morgan," 6-8, which Riggs and Thompson, "Joseph Smith, Jr., and `The Notorious Case of Aaron Lyon,'" acknowledged only indirectly twenty-one years later by citing (108n19) John E. Thompson, The Masons, The Mormons, and the Morgan Incident (Ames, IA: Iowa Research Lodge No. 2 AF&M, circa 1982), without acknowledging the chronology Thompson published in 1985. Oddly, Thompson's 2006 co-authored article asserted a Joseph-Lucinda marriage in March 1838, a date that he had very effectively challenged in 1985.

215. Smith, et al., History of The Church, 3: 8-9; Riggs and Thompson, "Joseph Smith, Jr., and 'The Notorious Case of Aaron Lyon,'" 108 (for quote); Newell and Avery, Mormon Enigma (1994 ed.), 70.

216. Brown, Nauvoo Sealings, 282, 282n267; Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 52; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 93.

217. As research-assistant for Professor Davis Bitton (my adviser as a newly enrolled graduate student in the University of Utah's Department of History), I examined these three diaries in the summer of 1971 at what was then the Church Historian's Office on the third floor of the Church Administration Building, 47 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. My typed notes were the basis for many of the abstract-summaries in Davis Bitton, Guide to Mormon Diaries & Autobiographies (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1977), iv (listing me as one of those who "assisted in compiling the data on individual diaries"), 127 ("Michael Quinn has categorized and analyzed this material").

218. Bachman, "Study of the Mormon Practice of Plural Marriage Before the Death of Joseph Smith" (1975); Foster, Religion and Sexuality (1981); Van Wagoner, Mormon Polygamy (1989); Compton, In Sacred Loneliness (1997); Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy (2008).

219. Compare with D. Michael Quinn, "Filling Gaps and Responding to 'Silences in Mormon History,'" letter to the editor, Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 40 (Summer 2007): x.

220. Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 108, 137.

221. Hedges, Smith, and Anderson, Joseph Smith Papers: Journals, Volume 2: December 1841-April 1843, [xiii].

222. Willard Richards 1841-1842 journal, 21 January 1842, Folder 8, Box 1, MS 1490, LDS Church History Library, a restricted source there. I was permitted to re-examine that page on 14 August 2012--only to verify the accuracy of the transcript that is presently in my Research Files, Beinecke Library (which, for the reasons listed in my Note 225, 2nd para., added "interrupted" after "lap"); also Bitton, Guide to Mormon Diaries & Autobiographies, 295 (for this document's description and summary, based on typed notes I submitted to Bitton in 1971, but--like most of that book's entries--without identifying which of his research-assistants provided the specific information).

The tightly written words-letters of Willard's original holograph are transcribed somewhat differently in Folder 1, Box 15, Series IX, Leonard J. Arrington Collection, Merrill-Cazier Library, Utah State University, Logan, Utah (i.e., "Joseph a woman" and "in the old womans lap." After re-examining the original in 2012, I can see why Arrington's transcription of the mid-1970s stated those variants, but I think the quote in my current comments is what Richards intended and what his handwriting indicated.

223. Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 7: 418, 25: 229.

224. James B. Allen, David J. Whittaker, and Ronald K. Esplin, Men With a Mission: The Quorum of the Twelve Apostles in the British Isles (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992), 210.

225. Willard Richards 1841-1842 journal, 21-22 January 1842, LDS Church History Library. Both my 1971 transcription and Arrington's somewhat later transcription (see my Note 222, 2nd para.) presented this as the entry for January 22nd. However, my careful examination of his original holograph on 14 August 2012 demonstrated that the holographic entry for January 22nd (written in large script) was only "22 Mailed a letter to Jennetta."

The words "lap--interpted Dream" were at the end of the entry in small script for January 21st. Because the referent for the last phrase seemed to be "little boy," my 1971 typescript stated this as "interrupted"--which is a possibility I repeated in the first version of my comments at MHA in June 2012.

Nonetheless, both Arrington and I also linked "interpted Dream" as the original's insertion of "interpreted" for the new entry on January 22nd. To the contrary, the different-sized handwriting for the two indicates that (whether Richards intended "interpted" to be "interrupted" or to be "interpreted") it applied to his dream-narration on January 21st.

226. Jessee, Personal Writings of Joseph Smith (2002 ed.), 551-52.

227. Willard Richards to Jennetta Richards, undated holograph in "Jennetta Richards Collection, 1842-1845," MS 23042, LDS Church History Library. This was first brought to my attention by Devery S. Anderson, "Willard Richards and Nauvoo Polygamy, 1841-42," a formal paper he delivered to Sunstone Symposium, Salt Lake City, 28 July 2012.

However, Anderson's paper wrongly dated Willard's letter as "January 22," which was the day his diary showed that Willard mailed his interpretation of it to her. According to the slowness of overland mail-delivery in 1842, his letter of January 22nd (with his "Interpretation") took at least three weeks to reach Jennetta in Massachusetts, with similar delay for her response from there to reach him in Nauvoo. Therefore, Willard's undated letter, a reply to her response, had to be in March 1842.

228. See www.josephsmithspolygamy.com/JSWives/MaryRollins.html (Hales' Internet website, accessed on 20 June 2012).

229. Folder 10, Box 87, Joseph F. Smith Papers, LDS Church History Library (where it is currently restricted), with transcript available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library, as follows:

Minersville [--] Beaver County
Utah
March 23rd 1877

I [--] Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner do testify, that in the year 1842 in the month of February[,] the Prophet Joseph Smith came to me and said he had received a direct command from God to take me for a wife for time and all eternity; after receiving what I felt to be a witness of the truth of the said statement made to me by the said Joseph Smith the Prophet, I was sealed to the said Joseph Smith by Pres Brigham Young in Nauvoo, Hancock County[,] Illinois ... The said ceremony was solemnly performed in the month of February A.D. 1842 as first above written

[signed] Mary E R Lightner

--NOTE A, FOR ABOVE TRANSCRIPTION: Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 33: "Nothing in Mary Elizabeth's [Lightner's] numerous writings supports a sexual relationship with Joseph Smith."

--NOTE B, FOR ABOVE TRANSCRIPTION: Even though he has not quoted or acknowledged it, this is another of the first-person sources that required Hales to claim in "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 127 ("It is true that some later reminiscences [by already-married women] state that their sealings [to Joseph Smith] in Nauvoo were for `time and eternity.' However, to assume that the women were remembering the exact language may not be warranted ... to presuppose that sexual relations were present based solely on a late memoir that declared a Nauvoo marriage (`polyandrous' or not) was for `time and eternity' would be unjustified by the documents alone"). See also my Note 64 (last para.) and the narrative for my Note 99.

--NOTE C, FOR ABOVE TRANSCRIPTION: Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 688nVI (midway, under heading for "**time and eternity**"), cited and briefly quoted it as "a Mar. 23, 1877, affidavit (Kenney collection, Marriott Library, box 11, fd 14)." Before that citation, he fully quoted the imprecise and less detailed affidavit she signed on 21 February 1905 (which also specified "Elder Brigham Young officiating").

--NOTE D, FOR ABOVE TRANSCRIPTION: By contrast, Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 170n29, 172n36, 195nn14-115, 218n185, 219n186, did not include either of the two affidavits that Compton cited in Hales' sources for Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner, but he did report her marriage as "Feb. 1842" in Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 108.

230. Augusta Adams Young affidavit, 10 July 1869, LDS Church History Library (where it is currently restricted), with transcript available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library; Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 274; Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 73.

For the early American pattern of abandoned/abandoning spouses re-marrying bigamously with a civil license while the first spouse was legally undivorced and living somewhere else, see Hendrik Hartog, "Marital Exits and Marital Expectations in Nineteenth Century America," Georgetown Law Journal 80 (October 1991): 95-129, esp. 122 ("If appellate court records are any indication of an underlying social reality, bigamy was rife in early America"), 126 ("In the eyes of the law, at least through the first half of the nineteenth century, bigamous marriages were less threatening to the permanence of marriage than either voluntary divorces or contractual separations"), 129 ("What did it mean to be married in 1840? ... The point to be drawn from the

bigamy cases is that a stable and public identity as a husband or a wife took precedence over the formalities of monogamous marriage"); also Beverly Schwartzberg, "Lots of Them Did That: Desertion, Bigamy, and Marital Fluidity in Late-Nineteenth-Century America," Journal of Social History 37 (Spring 2004): 573-600.

231. Jeffery Ogden Johnson, "Determining and Defining 'Wife': The Brigham Young Households," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 20 (Fall 1987): 60; also Mary Cable, "She Who Shall Be Nameless," American Heritage 16 (February 1965): 50-55. Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 275, misstated this as: "and took five of her seven children with her" to Nauvoo.

"Staed [stayed--in Massachusetts] till September 29 [--] then started home [to Nauvoo] with sisters Alley & Cobb," in Brigham Young 1840-44 journal (29 September 1843), LDS Church History Library (where it is currently restricted), with transcripts available to the public in Folder 1, Box 14, Series IX, Arrington Collection, and in my Research Files, Beinecke Library. Young's journal also described the death of Augusta Adams Cobb's youngest child (a baby) before their arrival in Nauvoo.

Bitton, Guide to Mormon Diaries & Autobiographies, 398, for this document's description and summary, based on typed notes I submitted to him in 1971. Like most of the book's entries, it did not identify which research-assistant provided the information.

232. For Brigham Young's subsequent reference to his having sex with Augusta Adams Cobb after their polygamous sealing, see my Note 291 (last para.).

233. I interpret a hearse-ride as the meaning of Brigham Young's closing words about the dream: "... but [then] saw nothing of Mary ann [--] for She was in side [inside it--] and the caredge [carriage was] closed in with curtins [curtains] and they was Black [--] we was puling [sic] it over a Bridg[e] the last I remember," from his 1840-44 journal (2 December 1843), in sources of my Note 231.

Published three months after I presented my comments to the MHA session in June 2012, John G. Turner, Brigham Young: Pioneer Prophet (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press, 2012), 98, wrote concerning this dream: "he wondered if he would have to make the ultimate sacrifice and allow Mary Ann to be sealed to his prophet. ... The latter portion of the dream refers to Mary Ann's death, whereas the beginning appears to include Joseph's proposal of marriage to her."

This holographic source in Brigham Young's handwriting should not be confused with Lee Nelson's erroneously titled The Journals of Brigham: Brigham Young's Own Story In His Own Words (Provo, UT: Council Press, 1980), acknowledged on page vi as "a compilation of the first person writings in Brigham Young's manuscript history," but which he erroneously claimed "were first published serially in the Millennial Star beginning in 1867." This "Manuscript History of Brigham Young" was first published in Salt Lake City's Deseret News, and re-printed in England's Millennial Star. The content of Nelson's version is identical to the first twentieth-century reprint by Elden Jay Watson, comp., The Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 1801-1844 (Salt Lake City: Smith Secretarial Service, 1968). None of those four versions actually repeated the exact wording of Brigham Young's handwritten journal, and none have its references

to Augusta Adams Cobb, nor its account of his dream in December 1843.

234. Franklin D. Richards journal, 25 June 1896, LDS Church History Library (where it is currently restricted), with transcript available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library.

As cited here, this quote was in the narrative for note 152 in my "unabbreviated" version (dated "end of July" 2012) that Hales received on August 2nd, yet his "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 63-64 claimed that "current historical research has yet to uncover any specific documentation regarding a plural marriage `test' for Brigham Young ..." Hales should explain why he doesn't regard an apostle's account of statements in a temple meeting as "specific documentation."

235. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 212, 212n169.

236. Orson Hyde affidavit of 15 September 1869 ("And in the month of February or March (1843) I was married to Miss Martha R. Browitt [also spelled "Browett"] by Joseph Smith," witnessed by Marinda N. Hyde), and Hyde's affidavit of 16 September 1869 (Joseph Smith performed polygamous marriage for him and Mary Ann Price in April 1843, witnessed by Marinda N. Hyde), in Smith, Blood Atonement and the Origin of Plural Marriage, 89. Compare with Faulring, An American Prophet's Record, 313 (28 February 1843, "To Elder Hydes to dinner at 4 o'clock P.M."), 396 ("The following list of marriages is written on one of the last leaves of this journal," beginning: "Apr 42 Marinda Johnson [Hyde] to Joseph Smith 1843," and including: "July 20 [1843] M.P. to O Hyde").

Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 212, claimed: "his civil wife, Marinda Nancy Johnson, was sealed to Joseph in Nauvoo, although records exist of two sealing dates, further complicating the reported timeline," adding in 212n169: "The second sealing date is given as May 1843 in an affidavit Marinda signed in 1869." To be precise, Thomas Bullock's decades-earlier entry in Joseph Smith's journal affirmed that there were two ceremonies, first in April 1842 and second at an unspecified date in 1843. The first was without her husband's knowledge, but the second was with his permission. Her 1869 affidavit provided better dating for the 1843 ceremony of sealing, which was thirteen months after she actually became Joseph Smith's wife.

237. Marinda N.J. Hyde affidavit, 1 May 1869, LDS Church History Library (where it is currently restricted), with transcript available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library.

238. Franklin D. Richards journal, 9 December 1887. For previous discussion of Vinson Knight's marriage to Philinda Clark Eldredge (Myrick--sometimes spelled "Merrick") as a plural wife, see Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 14 (which he dated as "mid-1842"); Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 47, 155 (dating it likewise), 262 (but he also quoted a family history that the polygamous marriage was "about May 1842"), 275, 308 (where Smith dated the marriage as sometime after "March 1842"), 603 (finally dating it as "<July 31 1842").

239. Smith, Blood Atonement and the Origin of Plural Marriage, 86-87; also Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 155. However, the unintended meaning of the syntax in George Smith's narrative seemed to wrongly claim that the 1869 affidavit itself stated that "shortly after Vinson's death on July 31, 1842, she agreed to marry Smith." To the contrary, Martha McBride Knight's affidavit (as quoted in Nauvoo Polygamy, 155) made no mention of Vinson, nor referred to his death, but stated only that her marriage to Joseph Smith occurred in "the summer of the year 1842." I regard this imprecise date as her intentional effort to obscure the fact that she married Joseph Smith before her husband died. (see the narrative's quote for my Note 239)

However, Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 724nVI and Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 155, accepted Martha's obituary (by one of her children) that "in August, 1842, she was sealed to the Prophet, Joseph Smith in the Nauvoo temple." Nonetheless, Compton's note acknowledged: "One might theorize that the obituary writer was using the [previous affidavit's] 'summer of 1842' phrase, and also assumed that it meant August ..." That is my conclusion, especially in view of a family history quoted for my Note 240.

240. Brent J. Belnap, "Life Story of Martha McBride Knight Smith Kimball, 1995," at website of www.belnapfamily.org/martha_McBride_Knight_DUP_Biography_1995, accessed on 20 June 2012. "DUP" refers to the Daughters of Utah Pioneers Museum, Salt Lake City. My narrative says "apparently unaware" because Belnap's biographical sketch gave no sources.

As cited here, Belnap's statement (with its underlined emphasis) was quoted in the narrative for note 158 in my "unabbreviated" version of comments (dated "end of July" 2012) that Hales received on August 2nd. Nonetheless, his "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 66, claimed: "Quinn's reconstruction ... speculates that Martha was sealed to Joseph Smith prior to Vinson's death." In making that assertion about my alleged speculation, he did not mention Belnap's statement that was in my "Comments" to which Hales was responding.

241. The Franklin D. Richards version seemed to indicate that the plural wife was a quid pro quo to Vinson Knight after Joseph Smith married his wife Martha, while Adeline Knight Belnap's written history seemed to indicate that this exchange with her father occurred after Vinson's polygamous marriage (see Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 262, for Adeline's statement). For Knight as a bishop with various jurisdictions, see Smith, et al., History of The Church, 2: 365, 509, 3: 38, 345, 4: 49, 286, 5: 84; Quinn, Origins of Power, 73-75. See my Note 285 (5th para., beginning: "Fanny Alger is missing") for the marital transaction involving Levi W. Hancock and Joseph Smith.

242. Foster, Religion and Sexuality, 163-66; Foster, "Sex and Prophetic Power," 79.

Compare with Samuel Pufendorf, Of the Law of Nature and Nations, 2nd ed. (Oxford, Eng: Lichfield and Churchill, 1710), 453 ("The borrowing and lending of Wives, amongst the Romans, is a Practice much talk'd of by Authors. Solon, in his Laws, permitted an Heiress, whose Husband prov'd impotent, to call in the Assistance of his nearest Kinsman"); also from "The Comparison of NUMA with LYCURGUS," at end of Paul Rycout's translation of "THE LIFE OF Numa Pompilius," in John Dryden, ed., Plutarch's Lives: In Five Volumes. Translated from the Greek, By several Hands, 5 vols. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1716), 1: 203 ("For when a Roman

thought himself to have a sufficient Provision of Children, in case his Neighbour who had none, should come and desire him to accommodate him with his Wife, that he also might have the benefit of Issue from his fruitful Woman; he had a lawful Power to lend her to him who desired her, either for a certain time, or else to loose the Bonds of Marriage, and consign her into the Hands of her Paramour for ever. But the Laconian had another rule: for it was allowable for him to afford the use of his Wife to any other that desired to have Children by her, and yet still to keep her in his House, and retain the Bond and Conditions of Marriage in the same force and vertue [virtue] as before"); Ashley Cooper, et al., trans., The Whole Works of Xenophon (London: Jones & Co., 1831), 706 ("If any person, again, should have an aversion to living with a wife, and should be desirous of a fair and robust family, he [Lycurgus] enacted a law that if he [i.e., the "person"] saw a woman of a good disposition, and well fitted for procreating such a progeny, and could persuade her husband to allow it, he should beget children by her").

243. Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 32, 41-42, discussed the first example of this "most troublesome" practice of early Mormon "exchange of women," the 1833 polygamous marriage of Joseph Smith to Fanny Alger by her uncle, for whom Joseph performed a monogamous marriage in exchange. (see Compton, 35, for its date)

Section titled "An Exchange of Women," in George D. Smith, "Persuading Men and Women to Join in Celestial Marriage," John Whitmer Historical Association 30 (2010): 157-59, gives several examples involving Joseph Smith. For his reasoning in excluding Fanny Alger as an example, see my Note 285 (5th para., beginning: "Fanny Alger is missing").

244. John M. Whitaker typed and edited journals, 1: 242 (1 November 1890), Special Collections, Marriott Library. Whitaker provided this transcription from his original journals that he wrote in his own version of Pitman shorthand (invented by Sir Isaac Pitman in Britain).

245. W. Wyl, pseud. [Wilhelm Ritter von Wymetal], Mormon Portraits, or The Truth About the Mormon Leaders From 1830 to 1886 (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Tribune Printing Office, 1886), 71-72.

246. Cook, Nauvoo Deaths and Marriages, 76, was initially uncertain about the exact death-date for "Taylor, Leonora A.," but concluded that this "fourth child of John Taylor, died 10 October 1843," a month after the date in Leonora Cannon Taylor's "diary"-memoir.

247. "Diary of Leonora Cannon Taylor [--] Property of Franklin D. Taylor," with last dated entry on 28 January 1845, Folder 13, Box 2, George J. Taylor Papers, LDS Church History Library (still available to the public in June 2012, on microfilm reel 2, MS 2936, filmed by LDS Genealogical Department on 23 January 1979). George was her oldest child.

I can only guess at the reason why her "diary"-memoir was not among the alphabetized entries in Bitton, Guide to Mormon Diaries & Autobiographies, 353-54. However, there was an entry on Bitton's page 353 for George J. Taylor's 1860-61 diary (still located in the above collection of his Papers as of 2012) which (with her diary) I had read and summarized in typed notes I submitted to Bitton in 1971.

Even though a typescript of her document (with the passage quoted here) was available at the Utah Humanities Research Foundation since 1944 (see my Note 250, 3rd para.-last para.), there was no entry for Leonora Cannon Taylor in the bibliography (389) of Samuel W. Taylor's Nightfall at Nauvoo (New York: Macmillan, 1971), which portrayed the incident imaginatively on 95-96 ("Leonora had injured her hand in a pan-throwing rage ... in a hushed and unbelieving voice, 'Joseph wants the wives of the Twelve'"), and on 153 ("Leonora Taylor, only after pan-throwing rages that cost her a joint of her little finger"), an account based only on Mormon Portraits (cited in his list of "Books" on page 386 of the bibliography, which did not cite Leonora's "diary" in its list of "Letters and Journals" on 389-90)

Furthermore, although the same typescript was available at the University of Utah's Marriott Library as of 1973 (see my Note 250, last para.), there was still no entry for Leonora Cannon Taylor in the bibliography (395-96) of Samuel W. Taylor's The Kingdom or Nothing: The Life of John Taylor, Militant Mormon (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1976), 88, which expanded his imaginative narrative ("as blood poisoning set in, the doctor amputated the middle finger of Leonora's left hand"), an account based only on Mormon Portraits (cited in his bibliography, 396). Writing delightfully entertaining letters to me since 1970, Sam Taylor's imagination couldn't decide whether Leonora severely cut "her little finger" or her "middle finger."

248. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 69, wrongly stated: "Quinn asserts: 'Leonora Cannon was initially free in associating ...,'" despite the fact that my "unabbreviated" version (dated "end of July" 2012, which Hales received on August 2nd) stated in the narrative following its note 165: "... was initially discreet in associating ..." (as it does now). As a stunning gaffe, Hales substituted a word that reversed the meaning of the phrase he was allegedly quoting.

249. Although clearly beginning as "bolt," the remainder of this word is difficult to decipher as written in what her grandson labeled "Diary of Leonora Cannon Taylor" (see my Note 247, 1st para.). My 1971 typescript (now in the Beinecke Library) made two impromptu suggestions (without consulting any dictionaries) about what the remaining letters might be, neither of which added up to a word recognizable to me at that time.

Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 70, stated: "In his MHA comments, he also affirms it is a phallic reference rather than another word like 'balderdash.'" However, the text of his response shows that Hales had independently examined the holographic document (publicly available as MS 2936 at LDS Church History Department). Having done so, Hales knows that the disputed word's first letters are clearly "bolt..." (giving NO possibility for his red-herring suggestion of "balderdash"). For red-herring as an argumentative fallacy, see my Note 133.

I did not re-examine the original document until preparing for this 2012 MHA session. This time, I compared its partially readable word with several dictionaries of English words and slang phrases that were in use before the 1830s. The only possibilities for this word seem to be "boltheads" and "bolthrusts" (as Leonora's misspelling of bolt-thrusts).

As specified in my Note 251, bolt was well-established British slang for penis. Correspondingly, if Sister Taylor wrote "bolthrusts," it would refer to the act of sexual intercourse. My narrative uses the less sensational of the two possible readings for the word she wrote in this obviously sexualized passage.

As a phallic image, bolthead's reference was not to the metal bolt, but instead to: "Bolthead ... a long strait-necked glass vessel, a mattress, or receiver," as in John Walker, A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, and Expositor of the English Language, 5th ed. (Philadelphia: Ambrose Walker, 1818), 82.

250. "Diary of Leonora Cannon Taylor [--] Property of Franklin D. Taylor," George J. Taylor Papers. Her holographic manuscript's previous entry about 27 June 1844 ended with the words "Doctor Richards was in the Prison at the time," which was on the last line of the left-side page. She left the following right-side page blank, and then on its verso (the next left-sided page) was the large, handwritten entry ending "O Dear." Its opposite page (the next right-sided page) began "Cure for Hooping [sic, Whooping] Cough," followed by some other recipes in her handwriting. This little volume's inside back cover was inscribed: "Leonora Cannon May 2, 1832," a date shortly before she sailed from England to Canada and eight months before her marriage there to John Taylor.

Brigham H. Roberts, The Life of John Taylor (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon & Sons, 1892), 474, quoted her diary, including the section beginning: "1st of May," but with some alterations of the original manuscript's capitalization and punctuation. After that section's description of the martyrdom, his biography skipped to "the back page of her diary, dated Nauvoo, Jan. 28th 1845 [--] 12 anniversary of my Marriage."

Folder 19, Box 1 of "The Records of the Utah Humanities Research Foundation," Marriott Library, has a selectively edited, 11-page typescript titled: "A little of the diary of Leonora Cannon Taylor. Property of Franklin D. Taylor, 954 Wilson Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah" (page 1), which skips (page 10) from the entry about Carthage Jail to the recipes for cures, thus deleting (without ellipses or other acknowledgement) her "diary"-memoir's original entries that began: "Come Joseph" and ended "O Dear."

Those entries were apparently in the first, 11-page, typed version of the donated typescript. It was listed in "A BIBLIOGRAPHY of the ARCHIVES of the Utah Humanities Research Foundation, 1944-1947," Bulletin of the University of Utah 38 (December 1947): "Taylor, Leonora Cannon, 1830. ff. [i.e., from 1830 onward,] 11 pp. T. [i.e., 11-page typescript] Diary describing polygamy and early days in Utah. (Mrs. Franklin D. Taylor) A-R-II-3-C(3); Hector Lee and Maxine Cahoon. ... Informants, Collectors and Donors [--] Taylor, Mrs. Franklin D."

The collection's "Finding aid prepared by Della Dye (c) 1973" showed that the original typescript's few lines of Leonora's polygamy-references had been removed before a re-typed version of 11 pages went to the Marriott Library: "The [printed] bibliography describes the manuscript as a 'Diary describing polygamy and early days in Utah,' but this is not an accurate description of that material that Taylor discusses" (available at URL of udadb.orbiscascade.org/findaid/ark:80444/xv47195).

251. Rubinstein, Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sexual Puns, 16 ("**Apples** [--] testicles"), 29 ("**Bolt/boult** [--] 1. Penis"), 30 ("2. To bolt is to copulate"), 108 ("**Garden** [--] Female pudendum"); Williams, Dictionary of Sexual Language and Imagery In Shakespearean and Stuart Literature, 1: 29 ("The figure is still current, as is 'Apples of Love' = testicles"), 1: 126 ("**bolt** [--] penis"), 1: 482 ("**fill** [--] impregnate"), 2: 581, "But the garden as vagina (see **bowls**) figures

prominently."

252. My Note 170 (last para.) about Shakespeare's popularity with the common people of early nineteenth-century America.

Madsen, Journey To Zion, 728 ("Leonora Cannon Taylor was born 6 October 1796 ... moved to London [in 1811] ... where she lived and worked for a wealthy lady of rank. ... When Leonora returned to the Isle of Man[,] she was able to find employment with the family of the governor. These positions allowed her to meet many prominent persons ... traveled to Canada in [May] 1832"). For her date of departure as seven months after her thirty-fifth birthday, see "Diary of Leonora Cannon Taylor [--] Property of Franklin D. Taylor," which begins the narrative of her emigration with the words: "May 5th[,] I left Douglas ..."). Madsen, Journey To Zion, 106, cited "Leonora Cannon Taylor Papers, LDS Church Archives," and its bibliography (303n188) cited "Leonora Cannon Taylor, Personal Diary, 1846-47, in George John Taylor Collection, LDS Church Archives."

Concerning my Note 251, her employment for twenty-one years with Britain's elite gave Leonora opportunities to read the plays of Shakespeare in household-libraries and to see their performances.

253. It is difficult to take seriously the suggestion by Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 71, that her adult-sounding, sexually charged dialogue with "Joseph" might have referred to "Leonora's five year old son [who] was Joseph James Taylor." For red-herring as an argumentative fallacy, see my Note 133.

Closer to reality, Hales also suggested (71) that among "other possible identities for [this] 'Joseph'" was "Joseph Fielding ... [who] lived in Nauvoo at that time and was not the only 'Joseph,' besides the Prophet, acquainted with Leonora." Hales' accurate description of Fielding and of Nauvoo's residents named "Joseph" is absolutely irrelevant, since Joseph Smith Jr. was the only man that Wilford Woodruff publicly and privately claimed had asked for Leonora Cannon Taylor to be his polygamous wife, plus her account to others (as printed in Mormon Portraits). This is yet another example of Hales' frequent use of polemical red-herrings to undermine historical evidence he dislikes.

254. Ebenezer Robinson, "TO THE PUBLIC," Times and Seasons 3 (15 March 1842): 729. Following Robinson's apology, a letter to "PRESIDENT JOSEPH SMITH" from "L.O. LITTLEFIELD" admitted that he was the one who had written the notice without Smith's knowledge, nor approval, nor editorial review. Bergera, "John C. Bennett, Joseph Smith, and the Beginnings of Mormon Plural Marriage in Nauvoo," 73, identified Lyman O. Littlefield as "twenty-two and married ... [who] worked for the Times and Seasons and, in the 15 February issue, inserted the following anonymous double entendre into one of the paper's marriage announcements ..."

255. "MARRIED--In this city on the 6th inst. by the Rev. Erastus H. Derby, Mr. Gilbert H. Rolfe, to Miss Eliza Jane Bates," Times and Seasons 3 (15 February 1842): 701, with the following statement on page 702: "The Times and Seasons, IS EDITED BY Joseph Smith"

(emphasis in original). This announcement was immediately followed by another "MARRIED"-notice, signed "Ed."

256. The Wasp (2003 facsimile): 11 (issue of 30 April 1842); Noah Webster, An American Dictionary of the English Language, 2 vols. (New York: S. Converse, 1828), s.v. "**BOWER**, noun (Saxon bur, a chamber or private apartment ...)"

257. Thomas Campbell, The Poetical Works of Thomas Campbell (London: Edward Moxon, 1837), 23 ("no pledge is sacred"), 24 ("Eden's rosy bower").

258. John S. Dinger, ed., The Nauvoo City and High Council Minutes (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2011), 415n40 ("Sarah Miller's statement, dated May 24, 1842 ... [about] the special conference this spring"), 417 ("Charge [was preferred] against Mrs. Catherine Warren for unchaste and unvirtuous conduct with John C. Bennett and others"), 417n46 (for Mrs. Catherine Fuller Warren's testimony); also "CONFERENCE MINUTES," Times and Seasons 3 (15 April 1842): 761 ("Special Conference ... April 6, 1842"); Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 189 ("Bennett performed no ceremonies; neither did he teach that marriage vows were needed prior to conjugal relations"), 189n97 ("Catherine Fuller, Testimony before the Nauvoo High Council, May 25, 1842, copy of holograph, in Valeen Tippetts Avery Collection, MSS 316, Box 24, fd 14, Merrill-Cazier Library, Utah State University"). For Bennett as "Assistant President with the First Presidency" in 1841-42, see Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 4: 1632.

259. Van Wagoner, Mormon Polygamy, 24.

260. Despite the previously cited quote from his publisher's 1989 book, Dinger, Nauvoo City and High Council Minutes, 415-17, made no reference in 2011 to the 1842 manuscript's testimony about William Smith's having sex with these women, even though his editing was based (in part) on the detailed extracts in my Research Files at the Beinecke Library. Citing the same source, my 1994 Origins of Power, 220, stated: "Two women identified William Smith as one of Bennett's friends who visited for sexual intercourse ... According to a later reminiscence [by Apostle Lorenzo Snow], Joseph Smith then asked Brigham Young to excommunicate his brother for 'adultery and many other sins.' As Young was about to act, however, the prophet changed his mind, accused the quorum's president of maligning the Smith family, and required Young to exonerate William. Then someone (probably Joseph) tried to eradicate William's name from the women's testimony."

261. Kenney, Wilford Woodruff's Journal: 1833-1898 Typescript, 4: 157 (22 December 1852).

262. The Wasp (2003 facsimile): 151 (issue of 21 January 1843), which was quoting from Washington, D.C.'s Globe newspaper. My quote corrects an error in the 1843 typesetting that misspelled the French word as "enterdre," instead of entendre.

263. Endowment House Record Book (1851-1854), Entry 65, for marriage of "Lydia Smith" (born on 11 December 1800) to James Goff on 8 June 1851 (Film 183,393--not available to the

general public), LDS Family History Library, but with typescript available to the public in my Research Files, Beinecke Library. However, Vermont's vital records show that she was born on that date in 1799. Tinney, Royal Family of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 13, first brought this marriage-sealing to my attention, and I included it in Quinn, Origins of Power, 588; also Brown, Nauvoo Sealings, 171, 171n139.

The Endowment House's records indicated that after she became the Prophet's widow, "Lydia Smith" was "Sealed by R. Cahoon to H.C. Kimball in 1844 in R. Cahoon's house in presence of Sister [Lucina Roberts] Johnson who was sealed to R. Cahoon." Lydia's memory was off by one year when she provided this information to officials in the Endowment House, because Heber C. Kimball's diary noted on 17 November 1845: "went to Bro Cahon [Cahoon] and Seelled [sic, sealed] a Sister to his honor."--Heber C. Kimball 1840-1845 diary, LDS Church History Library, published in Stanley B. Kimball, ed., On the Potter's Wheel: The Diaries of Heber C. Kimball (Salt Lake City: Signature Books/Smith Research Associates, 1987), 143-44 (17 November 1845).

Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 581, dated the Cahoon-Johnson marriage as "1842," the year it was originally performed (apparently without the sealing for "time and eternity") after which she bore him a child in 1843 (641n57; also Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 6). Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 601, also dated Lydia's marriage to Kimball as "ca. Dec 1844" and her sealing to him as "Dec 1844." Without details, quotes, or noting her status as "wd of Joseph Smith (Prophet)," Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 8 (described Lydia as only a posthumous sealing "in late 1844, HCK proxy"), 362 (again, without the essential details), Compton noted: "Endowment House Sealing Record, #65. In the record of her marriage of [sic, to] James Goff, there is an apparent reference to an 1844 proxy marriage to Joseph Smith/Kimball."

The Endowment House's 1851 record for "Lydia Smith" was wrongly identified as "Dibble, Lydia" in Black, Membership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1848, 13: 999.

264. For example, his 1843 wife Sarah Lawrence (born in 1826 in Canada, and married/sealed to Joseph Mount in 1853 by Brigham Young) was described in the records of the Endowment House (Film 183,393--not available to the general public), LDS Family History Library, as "SARAH SMITH, wd of JOSEPH SMITH" (Tinney, Royal Family of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 13).

265. Lyndon W. Cook, The Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith: A Historical and Biographical Commentary of the Doctrine and Covenants (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 74; my Note 266.

266. Bryan Lee Dilts, 1856 UTAH CENSUS INDEX: An Every-Name Index (Salt Lake City: Index Publishing, 1983), iv ("Names of individuals appear in double columns with tally marks to show if they are male or female. The only additional information is the census takers' certification that the copies are true and correct for their district"), 46 (for "CARTER, LYDIA" and "CARTER, SIMEON" in Box Elder County--no town listed but they were on the original pages 27 and 16 respectively of the manuscript census), 99 (for "GOFF, JAMES" AND "GOFF,

LYDIA"--both on page 941 of the manuscript census for Provo); also Kenney, Wilford Woodruff's Journal: 1833-1898 Typescript, 6: 305 (12 December 1866): "I attended the funeral of the first wife of Simeon Carter who now lives at Box Elder. She was 67 years old ..."

Dilts (144) also showed that "KIMBALL, HEBER CHASE" and "KIMBALL, LYDIA HOLMES" were on page 468 of the 1856 manuscript census for Salt Lake City. However, she was his recently born daughter by polygamous wife Lucy Walker Kimball.

267. By contrast, nothing--not the co-residence of legally married couples, not saying "I was the wife of another man for time while I continued to live with my legal husband" (see my Note 61, item "3"), not the childbirth that the wife attributed to her "other" husband Joseph Smith (see the narrative for my Notes 13 and 91)--NOTHING can satisfy Brian Hales' calculatedly stringent requirements that are impossible to achieve, unless he finds a Victorian American woman who said, wrote, or testified that she (as a devout Mormon) alternated sexual intercourse with two husbands during a period of time. Also see my Note 289 (last sentence), my Note 292.

For example, Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 118 ("Researchers who accept Josephine's 1915 statement as evidence that she was Joseph's offspring cannot easily reject ... the implication that [her publicly assumed father] Windsor's church estrangement was interpreted by Josephine as an official separation or divorce ... Neither is there any indication that Josephine thought her mother was simultaneously married to two men polyandrously or that Sylvia [her mother] continued to cohabit with Windsor ..."), 127 ("It is true that some later reminiscences [by already-married women] state that their sealings [to Joseph Smith] in Nauvoo were for `time and eternity.' [see my Note 64, last para., in these "Comments"] However, to ... presuppose that sexual relations were present based solely on a late memoir that declared a Nauvoo marriage (`polyandrous' or not) was for `time and eternity' would be unjustified by the documents alone"), 132 ("observing that a woman lived under the same roof with a man does not verify a sexual connection between her and her legal husband").

This approach is consistent with the double-standard of LDS apologists who narrowly define acceptable evidence for unpleasant realities (even when researched and semi-officially published by Andrew Jenson). See Anderson and Faulring, "The Prophet Joseph Smith and His Plural Wives," 75-77, 81-84.

To his own credit, Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 105-06, has acknowledged that he makes an evidentiary requirement that is UNachievable: "... to openly refer to a polyandrous sexual involvement would be very extraordinary. ... Hence, the women would be essentially declaring themselves to be unchaste. Zina, Lucinda, and Presendia all partook of the conservative Victorian standards of the time and were devout Latter-day Saints. It seems highly unlikely that these women would make such comments."

268. Brian Hales has presented persuasive evidence that, during the lifetime of Joseph Smith, the non-Mormon husband of Ruth D. Vose Sayers consented to her being "sealed to the prophet for eternity, as he himself should only claim her in this life." See Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 220 (for a document of late-1843-to-early-1844 stating: "She went to see whether she should marry her husband for eternity"), 221 (for photocopy of Andrew Jenson's handwritten summary of his interview with "Ruth Daggett Vose" in 1886-87, quoted at beginning of this

note); also briefer discussion (without photocopy) in Hales, "Joseph Smith and the Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 129, both quoting from the 1843-44 document as transcribed in my Research Files at the Beinecke Library; also the narrative for my Notes 26-29 and comments within the notes themselves.

For Hales' article of 2010 (129n93) and the longer treatment in his 2012 article (220n195), Hales stated: "I have been unable to identify the primary document to verify this quotation." However, my typescript identified the original manuscript of late-1843-to-early-1844 as located in the Beinecke Library, where his research-assistant Don Bradley examined my typescripts from which Hales quoted in 2010 and 2012. I even published its current catalog number at Yale in the John Whitmer Historical Association 2002 Nauvoo Conference Special Edition, 183n131.

I regard the Smith-Sayers ceremonial marriage as the only non-sexual relationship among the dozen or so already-married women who became Joseph Smith's plural wives during his lifetime. However, Hales regards the Smith-Sayers marriage as "compelling" evidence "that some of Joseph's other plural sealings may have been similar" (Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 222). Readers can decide which conclusion is more consistent with the full context of evidence I present in this monograph.

For whether the Smith-Sayers ceremony occurred in 1843 or in 1844, see discussion in the next paragraph of my narrative.

269. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 226, 227.

270. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 220.

271. D. Michael Quinn, Early Mormonism and the Magic World View, rev. and enl. ed. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1998), 419n96 (3rd para.).

272. My Note 263 (2nd para.).

273. Barzun and Graff, Modern Researcher, 115.

274. Nonetheless, Brian Hales prefers to believe that Ruth Vose Sayers made the HUGE error of wrongly identifying Hyrum Smith as the officiator of her sealing-marriage to Joseph Smith (Hales, "Puzzlement of 'Polyandry,'" 129n92, last sentence). Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 75, reaffirmed that view and expressed doubt about my June 2012 argument that she made the comparatively minor error of misremembering the year of that ceremony as 1843. Also see my Note 29 (last para.) and with compare with my Note 263 (2nd para.).

On this matter, Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 32-33, wrote in 2005: "both Almera Johnson and Ruth Vose Sayers recalled Hyrum Smith performing their plural marriages: Almera in the spring of 1843, and Ruth in February 1843. However, Hyrum evidently did not accept his brother's doctrine until May 26, 1843. Thus if the two women are remembering correctly that Hyrum was the officiator, the two ceremonies presumably would have occurred between May 26, 1843, and Joseph's and Hyrum's deaths on June 27, 1844. If the dates are correct, then someone else may have officiated. In Ruth's case, it is possible that she

was reporting a resealing performed by Hyrum."

However, Bergera wrongly stated that Almera's remembered date was a problem. The "spring" of every year includes the period from May 26th to June 20th.

275. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 227.

276. Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 182, quoted Cordelia Morley concerning "the spring of forty-four," but he did not specify even a year for the refusal by Rachel Ridgeway Ivins. However, his source for her (182n71) was Ronald W. Walker, "Rachel R. Grant: The Continuing Legacy of the Feminine Ideal," in Donald Q. Cannon and David J. Whittaker, eds., Supporting Saints: Life Stories of Nineteenth-Century Mormons (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1985), 23-24, which specified that Joseph Smith's attempted proposal to her occurred about the time that Charles Ivins and James Ivins joined dissenters William Law and Robert D. Foster. This was in April-May 1844, according to Smith, et al., History of The Church, 6: 354, and Smith, Essentials In Church History, 300.

For a convenient list of the birthdates and birthplaces for Cordelia Morley and Rachel Ivins among the women sealed by proxy to the Prophet in the Nauvoo Temple in 1846, plus a very abbreviated list of the proxy sealings performed in early Utah (including only two more of his known pre-1844 wives), see Cook, Revelations of the Prophet Joseph Smith, 119n4 ("Many of the women listed below were sealed to Joseph Smith before his death"), with misspellings beginning: "Andres" [sic, Andrews].

Regarding my discussion of Joseph Smith's known proposals in the spring of 1844 and the likelihood of polygamous marriages after November 1843, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 75, stated: "First, he does not present contradictory evidence, but contradictory assumptions." Hales does not explain how two of the Prophet's polygamous proposals--that unquestionably occurred in the spring of 1844--are "assumptions" that Joseph Smith at least attempted to marry plural wives after 1843.

277. Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 224; Quinn, Origins of Power, 588.

278. Quoted (without my bracketed addition of "e") in Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 37 (with his citation on 38n91 to "A Sinopsas [sic] of Remarks made by Apostle E[rastus] Snow July 22 [1883] at Nephi [Utah] Sunday evening,' reported by Thomas Crawley, clerk of the Juab Utah Stake Conference, LDS Church Archives").

Hales has never acknowledged Apostle Snow's statement as evidence for Joseph Smith's practical and theological provision for polyandry before the July revelation, even though Hales cited Bergera's article in "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 114n39.

279. Jenson, Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia, 1: 103.

280. William Clayton journal, 16 August 1843, quoted (without my bracketed additions) in Smith, Journals of William Clayton, 108.

281. Smith, et al., History of The Church, 5: 454.

282. Quoted in Van Wagoner, Mormon Polygamy, 58; Newell and Avery, Mormon Enigma (1994 ed.), 176.

283. Lyndon W. Cook, "William Law, Nauvoo Dissenter," BYU Studies 22, No. 1 (Winter 1982): 72 (last para.).

284. Newell G. Bringhurst, "Section 132 of the LDS Doctrine and Covenants: Its Complex Contents and Controversial Legacy," in Bringhurst and Foster, Persistence of Polygamy, 71 ("The revelation through two verses further affirmed both the power and exalted status of Joseph Smith. ... Through a second [132: 49], the Mormon leader was divinely guaranteed exaltation"). Aside from that observation, Bringhurst's essay (on pages [59]-86) did not discuss the July 1843 revelation in the way my narrative does.

285. Charles Buck, A Theological Dictionary, Containing Definitions of All Religious Terms ..., 2 vols. (London: J. Haddon, 1811), 1: 166 ("CONCUBINAGE, the act of living with a woman to whom the man is not legally married. It is also used for a marriage with a woman of inferior condition [i.e., social rank] (performed with less solemnity than the formal marriage,) and to whom the husband does not convey his rank. As polygamy was sometimes practised by the patriarchs, it was a common thing to see one, two, or many wives in a family, and [--] besides these [--] several concubines." This applied to faithful Abraham's servant-concubines Hagar and Keturah, as well as to God-blessed Jacob's servant-concubines Bilhah and Zilpah. (Genesis 16: 3; Genesis 25: 1, 6; Genesis 30: 3, 9; I Chronicles 1: 32; also Galatians 3: 9 for faithful Abraham, and Genesis 35: 9 for God-blessed Jacob)

Buck was the most likely source for Joseph Smith's understanding of the Biblical word "concubines" during the 1840s. As editor of Nauvoo's Times and Seasons, he recommended that his Mormon readers "see Buck's Theological Dictionary" in his editorial "TRY THE SPIRITS," Times and Seasons 3 (1 April 1842): 745-46, also 750 (for Joseph Smith as its editor).

On the other hand, Noah Webster's 1828 American Dictionary of the English Language gave the negative view of the 1820s ("a woman kept for lewd purposes") as his first definition for "CONCUBINE," and he secondarily listed the word's ancient meaning ("2. A wife of inferior condition [i.e., social rank]; a lawful wife, but not united to the man by the usual ceremonies, and of inferior condition [i.e., social rank]. Such were Hagar and Keturah, the concubines of Abraham ...").

The July 1843 revelation indicated that Joseph Smith regarded "concubines" as a latter-day reality that God sanctioned, not as an ancient practice that was no longer applicable, nor as American society's negative view. Moreover, if Joseph understood "concubine" literally in its Biblical context (a polygamous wife who had previously been a servant to the man or to the man's legal wife), then the July 1843 revelation was applying that term to the Prophet's house-girls Fanny Alger, Desdemona W. Fullmer, Elvira A. Cowles, Emily D. Partridge, Eliza M. Partridge, Lucy Walker, and Melissa Lott, all of whom were united to him in a ceremony performed by a trusted associate.

Fanny Alger is missing from "Table 1.2: House Girls Who Married Joseph Smith," in George D. Smith, "Nauvoo's Inner Circle of Thirty-Two Men Who Accepted 'Celestial Marriage,'" John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 32 (Spring/Summer 2012): 4. He regards her as an extramarital "affair" in Kirtland, not a marriage, despite the narrative of her first cousin (Mosiah L. Hancock) that his father Levi W. Hancock performed their polygamous ceremony in exchange for Smith's performing Levi's monogamous marriage in 1833 to another of Joseph's house-girls.

For Hancock's detailed narrative, see Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 29-33, 36. Contrast with Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 39n81 ("regarding Joseph and Fanny's relationship ... I hesitate to concur with Compton's interpretation of their relationship as a marriage"), 42 ("an affair"), 222 ("affair," quoting Oliver Cowdery), 237 ("the prolonged dalliance with Fanny Alger"), 691 ("affair"); also my Note 199.

Dismissing all claims of a marital ceremony for Joseph and Fanny as "the assumption of a marriage" (40), Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 41n90, noted that "Compton, Sacred Loneliness, 33, 646, draws from a late reminiscence by Mosiah Hancock to suggest that Smith married Alger in early 1833." Nonetheless, George Smith obviously agreed with the earlier assessment by Gary James Bergera, whom Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy cited more often than Compton (compare its index-pages 692, 694). Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 75n30, stated: "I do not believe that Fanny Alger, whom Compton counts as Smith's first plural wife, satisfies the criteria to be considered a 'wife.' Briefly, the sources for such a 'marriage' are all retrospective and presented from a point of view favoring plural marriage, rather than, say an extramarital liaison, which seems clearly to be Oliver Cowdery's [1837-38] interpretation of the relationship." However, Bergera's logic can also legitimately be applied in reverse to Cowdery, who assessed the Alger-Smith relationship from a point of view favoring an extramarital liaison, rather than, say a polygamous marriage.

There is no evidence (either contemporary or retrospective) that Cowdery had any knowledge of Levi W. Hancock's claim that he performed a marital ceremony for Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith in the early 1830s. Gary Bergera and George Smith regard that fact as proof that there was no polygamous wedding, but I see Cowdery's ignorance as the reason he condemned it as an "affair." Also my Note 295 (2nd para.).

Moreover, Bergera and George Smith have not acknowledged that Mosiah Hancock did not write his narrative as a defense of Joseph Smith, but instead intended his reminiscence to explain to his descendants the unusual circumstances by which his father married his mother. The family-emphasis of his narrative increases the believability of its by-the-way account of the Smith-Alger ceremony of marriage.

286. My interpretation centers on how Joseph Smith or any other person in 1843 would understand these words. However, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 78, argued for the perspective of post-Nauvoo Mormons regarding verse 26: "Importantly, dozens of other men and women (and millions since) have entered into the same covenants making them eligible for the same promises, but none of them have apparently viewed themselves as having immunity from future sins and transgressions."

287. Smith, Journals of William Clayton, 114 (11 August 1843). Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 203, quoted Clayton's 1887 statement ("when he was seventy-three"), for Joseph Smith's words as "It is your privilege to have all the wives you want" (emphasis in original), but Hales did not refer to the original wording in his already-cited source of George D. Smith's book.

288. Minutes of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, 5 December 1847, page 15, Miscellaneous Minutes, Brigham Young Papers.

289. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 81: "Fourth, if Quinn's description--that a man could be appointed essentially to any woman and thereafter have sex with her without committing adultery were a true practice, why would it have been implemented only in the utmost secrecy and then abandoned so quickly that no trace of it can be found in the historical record."

The answer to his question about secrecy is self-evident to anyone who has studied any aspect of Nauvoo's polygamy. Concerning its abandonment, see my Note 296 (1st para.). Regarding his final argument, for the past decade Hales has done his best to deny or ignore every "trace of it [that] can be found in the historical record." (see my Notes 267, 292)

290. In one of today's Power-point slides, Hales claimed that D&C 132 did not authorize polyandry, emphasizing: "Joseph Smith might have affirmed: 'Whatever God commands is right,' but the revelation did not do so, Hales alleged today.

To the contrary, its verse 48 not only authorized the Prophet to perform any kind of marriage ceremony he chose, but its use of "whatever" is significant for two reasons. First, it was exactly the "word" and frame-of-reference that Hales claimed was missing from the revelation. Second, the revelation's use of "whatever" echoed the often-quoted letter-essay "On Happiness" that Joseph Smith dictated to a scribe for the purpose of persuading Nancy Rigdon to accept his proposal of plural marriage: "Whatever God requires is right, no matter what it is" (Smith, et al., History of The Church, 5: 135). Paradoxically, rather than ignoring this letter-essay, today's presentation and Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 167n22 both argued that this letter had a dual purpose of converting Nancy's father Sidney Rigdon, his anti-polygamy first counselor.

Because of the emphasis Hales gives to the 1842 document, I do not understand how he overlooks the significance of his required word "whatever" in D&C 132: 48. Its unconditionality was no different from his Power-point's suggested/required phrase, which itself was a paraphrase from the 1842 letter-essay.

As an extraordinarily important insight, Anderson, "Willard Richards and Nauvoo Polygamy, 1841-42" has demonstrated that the apostle's fully dated letter to his wife Jennetta on 26 February 1842 had phrases that echoed the "Happiness" letter, whose original manuscript has been missing since 1842 but that was alleged to be in the handwriting of Richards as Joseph's scribe.

291. My Notes 90 (2nd para.) and Notes 231-232 (for Augusta Adams Cobb); Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists," 29 (quoting devout Mormon, Benjamin F.

Johnson: "My mother having finally separated from my father, by the suggestion or counsel of the Prophet [Joseph Smith,] she accepted of and was sealed by him to father John Smith," the Prophet's uncle), 42 (Edwin D. Woolley's 1843 polygamous wife Louisa Gordon Rising "was separated from David L. Rising ... but David did not die until September 1845"). Johnson's quote (first publicized by the LDS Church's Midwest publishing company in My Life's Review, 98-99) can be read in two ways--(1) that his mother chose on her own to separate in 1842-43, after which Joseph Smith suggested that she marry his uncle polygamously, or (2) that the Prophet advised her in 1843 to leave her husband (a non-believer) so that she could marry his uncle (formerly an assistant counselor in the First Presidency).

The biography of Benjamin's brother expanded the chronology for their mother's polygamous decision in 1843. Johnson, J.E.J., 57 (Julia and Ezekiel Johnson first separated in the mid-1830s at Kirtland, Ohio), 78-79 (after she moved to Ramus, Illinois, in July 1842, "Ezekiel joined the family for the time being at Ramus, but a little later turned up in Nauvoo"). This doesn't actually state that she remained reconciled with her legal husband until the Prophet's advice to Julia in 1843, but Joseph E. Johnson's biography gives a basis for that view.

As for Edwin D. Woolley, he probably received his polygamous wife after his compliant response to the request for him (as a Nauvoo merchant) to give his store's entire inventory to the Prophet, also a merchant. See Truman Madsen, "Joseph Smith Tests Edwin D. Woolley's Faith," in Jack M. Lyon, Linda Ririe Gundry, and Jay A. Parry, eds., Best-Loved Stories of the LDS People (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1997), 129-30. For the Prophet as a merchant in Nauvoo, see "Joseph's Red Brick Store," New Era 13 (December 1983): 18-21; Roger D. Launius and F. Mark McKiernan, Joseph Smith, Jr.'s Red Brick Store (Macomb: Western Illinois University Press, 1985).

Immediately after mentioning "Wooleys wife," Brigham Young told the apostles on 30 November 1847: "Sister Cobb was given me by Revelation ~~from Joseph~~ but I never did anything till long after she was given [--] until I got the ceremonies performed and all made right ..." (Minutes of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles, LDS Church History Library--where they are restricted--with typescripts available to the public in Quinn's Research Files, Beinecke Library). In my reading of this document, Brigham was saying that he had sex with Augusta Cobb after they were ceremonially sealed by Joseph Smith, but not during the previous time when Brigham knew that she belonged to him "by Revelation." Likewise, commenting on this statement to the apostles, Turner, Brigham Young, 101, has noted: "Young's comment makes clear that the relationship included sexual relations after their sealing."

292. Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 77, countered: "a more probable explanation is that God's foreknowledge allowed him to know that the Prophet would be obedient." It is difficult to argue with a closed system of logic, but I have done my best in my own responses to Brian C. Hales.

I regard his negative arguments about "sexual polyandry" as an updated version of the denials by Joseph Smith III until his death and by members of his Reorganized Church until the 1960s. They likewise refused to believe any evidence that the founding Prophet had plural wives during his lifetime (or if he did, Joseph III insisted that they were for "eternity only"). See Alma R. Blair, "RLDS Views of Polygamy: Some Historiographical Notes," John Whitmer Historical

Association Journal 5 (1985): 16-28; Roger D. Launius, "Methods and Motives: Joseph Smith III's Opposition to Polygamy, 1860-90," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 20 (Winter 1987): 105-21; David J. Howlett, "Remembering Polygamy: The RLDS Church and American Spiritual Transformations in the Late Twentieth Century," John Whitmer Historical Association Journal 24 (2004): 149-72 (esp. 151-71).

I also see the historical methodology of Brian Hales as ironically similar to what Lawrence Foster described in his "Career Apostates: Reflections on the Works of Jerald and Sandra Tanner," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought 17 (Summer 1984): 49 ("a logically closed system ... a skillful shell game in which the premises for judgment are conveniently shifted so that the conclusion is always the same--negative"). That is the approach Hales has used to negate any of the evidence for Joseph Smith's sexual polyandry.

293. With regard to that revelatory authorization of July 1843 (initially printed in a special edition of Deseret News in August 1852), Foster's 1981 Religion and Sexuality, 312-13, was the first to publish LDS President Brigham Young's letter of 5 March 1857 to a Mormon woman (whose husband was unable to father more than the two children she had borne in the 1840s): "... if I was imperfect and had a good wife[,] I would call on some good bror. [brother] to help me. that we might have increase ..."

In today's Power-Point presentation, as in his "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 215-16, Brian Hales denied (216) that this was polyandry. In support of that conclusion, his article cited Clare B. Christensen, Before & After Mt. Pisgah: Cox-Hulet-Losee-Morley-Tuttle-Winget & Related Families (Salt Lake City: By the author, 1979), but Hales more often quoted from Annie Richardson Johnson and Elva Richardson Shumway, Charles Edmund Richardson, Man of Destiny (Tempe, AZ: Publication Services, 1982). On their page 29, Johnson and Shumway stated that "as governor of the State of Utah, Brigham Young granted Mary Ann Darrow Richardson a civil divorce from her husband, Edmund Richardson. Then, on January 9, 1858, he performed a civil marriage between Mary Ann and Frederick Walter Cox." (emphasis added here, also quoted in Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 216, without emphasis)

In repeating the Richardson Family's narratives, Hales ignored a contradiction and other problems within the two sources he cited concerning the Richardson-Darrow-Cox marriages in Manti, Sanpete County, Utah. First, Christensen (page 234) stated: "Brigham Young gave a temporary separation to Edmund and Mary," not the "civil divorce" claimed by Johnson and Shumway, who also cited Christensen as one of their sources. Second, U.S. President James Buchanan had already appointed non-Mormon Alfred Cumming as Utah Territory's new governor to replace Brigham Young in July 1857--seven months before the officially ex-governor performed the 1858 Darrow-Cox marriage. Although Young continued to claim he was governor, any of his acts as such were legally void after July 1857. See Leonard J. Arrington, "Young, Brigham," in Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 4: 1608; Eugene E. Campbell, Establishing Zion: The Mormon Church in the American West, 1847-1869 (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1988), 235, 236.

Third, while Brigham Young did not have the authority to grant a divorce for civil marriages, Utah's probate judges did. However, there was no entry for the alleged divorce of the Richardsons among those granted from January 1857 to November 1861 in Sanpete County

Probate Court, Minute Book A, pages 30-50 (Film 481,650, Item #1, LDS Family History Library).

Fourth (and most important) about her second marriage, as both of the Richardson Family's books implied (but Hales didn't mention), Cox was already a polygamist when he married Mary Ann Darrow Richardson. In fact, by the date of their marriage, Frederick W. Cox's four other wives had already borne twenty-three children to him. (John Clifton Moffitt, "Frederick Walter Cox, Sr.: Frontiersman of the American West," typescript, 50-51, LDS Church History Library)

Because the Richardson-Cox union in 1858 was polygamous, theirs was NOT "a civil marriage," as claimed by Christensen (page 234) and by Johnson and Shumway (29). As a repeatedly published chronicler-interpreter of pre-1890 Mormon polygamy and post-1890 polygamy, Hales should have recognized that the Richardson Family made an inaccurate claim for Mary Ann entering a "civil marriage" with a polygamist in 1858. Young performed it as an LDS ceremony only.

Johnson and Shumway quoted (29) sorrowful words that Mary Ann Darrow Richardson Cox allegedly uttered as she watched her first husband Edmund allegedly leave their Manti residence for Tintic, Juab County, Utah, more than eighty miles distant. The Richardson Family's histories asserted that he allegedly resided in Tintic continuously for three full years (Christensen, 234; Johnson and Shumway, 29-30, 32, 34). Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 216, emphasized those claims for denying that the Richardson-Darrow-Cox unions were sexual polyandry. Nonetheless, while Edmund Richardson might have lived in the mining town of Tintic for a couple of months during 1858, a couple of months during 1859, and a couple of months during 1860, documentary evidence shows that he resided in Manti most of the time after his wife married Cox in January 1858.

First, Edmund was a member of Manti's 48th Quorum of Seventies, whose attendance-rolls for the 1850s-1860s are cataloged by the LDS Church History Library as LR 8045/32. The roll-book's pages 5-18 verify that Edmund Richardson attended his quorum's meetings (usually held semi-monthly) in Manti on 8 November 1857, 22 November 1857, 20 December 1857, 3 January 1858, 17 January 1858, 31 January 1858, 28 February 1858, 14 March 1858, 28 March 1858, 11 April 1858, 25 April 1858, 30 May 1858, 27 June 1858, but not again until 22 August 1858, 5 September 1858, 19 September 1858, 17 October 1858, 14 November 1858, 28 November 1858, 15 December 1858, 26 December 1858, 9 January 1859, 23 January 1859, 6 February 1859, 20 February 1859, 6 March 1859, 20 March 1859, 17 April 1859, 1 May 1859, 26 June 1859, 24 July 1859, 7 August 1859, 21 August 1859, but not again until 30 October 1859, 13 November 1859, 27 November 1859, 25 December 1859, 8 January 1860, 22 January 1860, 5 February 1860, 19 February 1860, 4 March 1860, 18 March 1860, 1 April 1860, 8 April 1860, 1 May 1860, 10 June 1860, 24 June 1860, 8 July 1860, 22 July 1860, 5 August 1860, 16 September 1860, but not again until 11 November 1860, 9 December 1860, 6 January 1861, 20 January 1861, and 17 February 1861. Even if Edmund Richardson could travel forty miles a day on horseback--to cover more than eighty miles from Tintic to Manti--the necessary full-day in Manti to rest his horse and to meet with the local Seventies (plus the return trip to Tintic) would total at least five days of absence from his alleged employment in Tintic twice each month during those years. As indicated below, the attendance-gap in the fall of 1859 was due to the travel of Edmund

Richardson and Mary Ann Richardson Cox to Salt Lake City to reaffirm their own marriage, despite her continuing to have sexual intercourse with her second husband Frederick W. Cox.

Second, Richardson was still residing in Manti on some of the days that the quorum's roll-books showed him absent for its scheduled meetings. For example, its page 7 noted that his absence at the meetings of 13 June 1858 and 25 July 1858 was due to his performing "mil. duty" in the local militia.

Third, almost exactly five months after she gave birth in October 1858 to the first child fathered by her second husband Frederick W. Cox, both of Mary Ann Darrow's husbands served together as jurors for the county's probate court. See Sanpete County Probate Court, Minute Book A-1 (30 March 1852 to 3 September 1866), page 43 ("Manti, Sanpete Co., UT [Utah Territory]. Mar 7th 1859. ... The following named persons were selected to serve as Jurors ... 4 F.W. Cox Senr. farmer ... 25 Edmund Richardson carpenter ..."), Film 481,650, Item #2, LDS Family History Library. By law, the courts selected jurors who were residents of a particular jurisdiction, specified as Manti in this case.

The above two documents and the few specific references to Edmund Richardson's performing militia duty show that he wasn't making 160-mile round trips from Tintic to attend his Seventy quorum's semi-monthly meetings, but was instead a CONTINUOUS resident in Manti. The day after one of those meetings in March 1859, he began serving there as a juror.

The next significant fact omitted by Hales is that the "divorced" Edmund Richardson re-asserted his own spiritual rights to his "former" wife in October 1859. This was six months before Mary Ann conceived another child by her second husband Frederick. Johnson and Shumway acknowledged (32): "When Charles Edmund [the first child fathered by her second husband] was a year and four days old, October 17, 1859, Edmund [Richardson] and Mary Ann [Cox] met at the Endowment House in Salt Lake City, received their endowments and had their sealing repeated as the prophet [Brigham Young] had said any couple desiring to be sealed in the Endowment House could do." However, Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 216-17, did not include this information from his otherwise-quoted source.

In fact, the Seventy's rolls indicate that Edmund Richardson cohabited with his wife in Manti before-and-after their 1859 sealing, while she was also having sexual intercourse with Frederick W. Cox. Although the modern Richardson Family tried to conceal this by inventing a family-tradition that Edmund Richardson was allegedly continuously absent from Mary Ann's Manti residence for three years following the Darrow-Cox marriage, Frederick's second son by her demonstrated such polyandrous cohabitation. That becomes obvious when compared with Edmund's regular attendance with his Seventy's quorum in Manti. I see the Richardson Family's concealments and invented traditions as no different from descendants of Joseph Smith's already-married wives claiming that he had an "eternity only" marriage with their female ancestor.

Then Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," wrongly claimed (216): "Shortly after the second child's birth on January 26, 1861, Edmund returned to Mary Ann, Brigham Young divorced her and Cox, and remarried her to Edmund" (emphasis added here). In making that assertion, Hales failed to acknowledge more than the Richardson Family's account of this couple's 1859 sealing.

In the source-notes ("Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 216nn177-79) for his discussion of

the Richardson-Darrow-Cox marriages, Hales did not cite Kathryn M. Daynes, More Wives Than One: Transformation of the Mormon Marriage System, 1840-1910 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001). However, he had previously cited (210n159) her book, which discussed on her page 81 the significance of Manti's 1860 census for the Richardson-Darrow-Cox marriages. Enumerated in June 1860, the manuscript census showed that Edmund Richardson was still living in Manti's household-enumeration-Number-3 with his "divorced" wife, with their own children, with her son Charles E. (fathered by Cox), and with an adopted Indian baby (named "Wm E"). At this same time, Frederick Cox was living in Manti's household-enumeration-Number-78 with two of his other wives and their children. (1860 federal census for Sanpete County, Utah, microfilm at LDS Family History Library)

When enumerated by Manti's census-taker on "1st day of June 1860," Mary Ann Cox was only one month pregnant with her second child by her second husband, while she continued living with her first husband. Although Hales didn't think of examining them, Manti's attendance-rolls for its Seventy's quorum show that Edmund Richardson had been residing continuously in Manti (with his "former" wife in his only house there) for the five months before Frederick W. Cox impregnated her again. Without knowing about Richardson's regular attendance with his Seventy's quorum during the three years of their descendant-alleged separation, Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 89, acknowledged: "Doubtless, Mary Ann and Edmund considered their separation 'temporary' and there was no change in the ownership of the [Manti] home."

Furthermore, having already read Daynes, More Wives Than One, Hales should have recognized that the 1860 census alone proved that the Richardson Family made a huge error of chronology for the Richardson-Darrow-Cox marriages. It was an error to claim that Edmund Richardson allegedly did not return from allegedly working in Tintic, Utah, to resume living with his allegedly "divorced" wife until after the second Darrow-Cox child was born on 26 January 1861. The 1860 census also showed that their error of less importance was claiming that Mary Ann Darrow Richardson Cox didn't adopt the Indian baby until after the birth of Sullivan Edmund Richardson in January 1861 (Johnson and Shumway, 34). By contrast, the census shows that the five-month-old Indian baby was already a member of her household in June 1860. Combined with Edmund Richardson's nearly constant attendance with his Seventy's quorum from November 1857 onward, the 1860 census indicates that he never stopped cohabiting with his legal wife during the three years while Mary Ann Darrow's repeated instances of sexual intercourse with Frederick Cox produced two children.

Unacknowledged by Hales in 2012, even the evidence that Daynes published in 2001 did not support his unqualified conclusion eleven years later that the Richardson-Cox case was a matter of "consecutive marriages, not sexual polyandry with a proxy husband," as he stated today and in "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 216. Instead, the known and knowable evidence in Utah's civil records and in the LDS Church's records indicates that the Richardson-Darrow-Cox marriages, residences, cohabitations, and childbirths constituted sexual polyandry in pioneer Utah. Far more clearly than the Carter-Kenyon-Goff residential patterns in pioneer Utah (see my Note 266), this fulfills Larry Foster's strict, academic definition of polyandry.

294. Marquardt, Joseph Smith Revelations, 315, emphasis added here.

295. Therefore, the 1842 revelation negates the "legalistic" chronology in Smith, Nauvoo Polygamy, 222: "It may be proper to put all of the [polygamous] marriages before July 1843 into that same category [of "an `affair"]--not for the purpose of rendering judgment about them but from a legalistic standpoint because they violated the law of the church at the time ..." George D. Smith's 2008 book never referred to Joseph Smith's handwritten revelation of 27 July 1842, nor did its bibliography (675) cite H. Michael Marquardt's 1999 compilation of revelations (see my Note 31), which included it.

Furthermore, the 1842 revelation's text described the "legalistic" basis on which ALL of Joseph Smith's previous polygamous marriages had been performed "by revelation and commandment and by legal Authority." This included Fanny Alger from 1833 until 1836, when she fled Kirtland, Ohio, abandoned Mormonism and her polygamous marriage, then civilly married a non-Mormon in Indiana. See Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 25-42; Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation"; Bradley, "Mormon Polygamy before Nauvoo?: The Relationship of Joseph Smith and Fanny Alger." See my Note 285 (5th para., beginning: "Fanny Alger is missing").

296. Listed among the "antagonistic--and sometimes sensational--sources" by Compton, In Sacred Loneliness, 7, 7n14, John D. Lee, Mormonism Unveiled; or the Life and Confessions of the Late Mormon Bishop, John D. Lee... (St. Louis: Bryan, Brand & Co., 1877), 147, nonetheless offered what I consider a neutral assessment of Smith's proposals and marriages to already-married women: "... Brigham Young told me that Joseph's time on earth was short, and that the Lord allowed him privileges that we could not have." Immediately before this assessment, Lee referred to his non-sensationalized understanding of the already-discussed examples of Marinda N. Johnson Hyde and Leonora Cannon Taylor.

This exceptionalism for Joseph Smith (also indicated in my narrative's comments on D&C 132) is part of my answer to a counter-argument by Brian C. Hales. Because Nauvoo apostles Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, Orson Pratt, and George A. Smith condemned the idea of polyandry from 1847 onward, Hales argues that Joseph Smith as God's faithful Prophet could not have experienced sexual polyandry during the early 1840s. See Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 119, 147; Hales, "Response" (dated 25 August 2012), 86.

297. I coined "theocratic ethics" as a non-pejorative, non-judgmental term in D. Michael Quinn, "Plural Marriage and the Mormon Twilight Zone," Sunstone 16 (March 1993): 58, subsequently emphasized in Quinn, Origins of Power, 88-89, 112, 121, 624, 634; also see my Note 13 (last para.), my Note 290 (midway into 2nd para.).

If it mattered to the listeners of my comments at MHA or if it matters to the readers of this "finalized" monograph, I remain a believer that Joseph Smith was "the Prophet" as he defined himself, and in the way his written revelations affirmed. However, one's personal faith must at least acknowledge the evidence for the deeply flawed humanity of every living prophet.

Abraham nearly killed his son Isaac, then actually abandoned his wife Hagar and son Ishmael in the desert to die. Each of them survived only through God's intervention. Those actions by this Biblical prophet were ethically worse than any accusation or evidence against Joseph Smith, even if Biblical literalists insist that Abraham was merely following God's instructions. Is that

different from what LDS believers affirm about Joseph Smith? Human fallibility and divine callings coexist, even when we try to impose our personal ethics on God and his prophets.

I don't argue with those who disbelieve all claims for God, for divine interventions, for revelations, and for prophetic callings, nor with those who see only lust in Joseph Smith's polygamy, rather than (as I do) acknowledging that his spiritual motivations were mixed with the Prophet's sexual responses. Atheism, agnosticism, and skepticism are profoundly rational, and I regard those approaches as legitimate--even when I profoundly disagree with them. Cynicism is not rational, but is as legitimate as any enthusiasm, including gullibility.

Religiously supportive views can be rational, intellectually honest, and academically rigorous. Nonetheless, at its core, faith is irrational (or at least non-rational) because its foundations are metaphysical assumptions (postulates) that are not humanly provable or demonstrable. Faith is both a gift and a burden, especially for a thorough-going rationalist like me.

298. Webster, American Dictionary of the English Language (1828), s.v. "ANTINOMIAN, noun [--] One of a sect who maintain, that, under the gospel dispensation, the law is of no use or obligation; or who hold doctrines which supersede the necessity of good works and a virtuous life."

299. Hales, "Puzzlement of `Polyandry,'" 119, 125, 147, 148; Hales, "Joseph Smith's Personal Polygamy," 215.

300. Smith, et al., History of The Church, 4: 445-46.

Concerning this publicly stated announcement, Bergera, "Vox Joseph Vox Dei: Regarding Some of the Moral and Ethical Aspects of Joseph Smith's Practice of Plural Marriage," 36 ("Among the `superstitions' Smith wanted to `break down' was monogamy, which he believed fundamentally undermined God's purposes and human happiness"), 43 ("Smith's seemingly transcendent encounter with what he believed was God's revelation left him grappling with the confining strictures of conventional morality, sometimes responding in ways that seem to be at cross-purposes with the `higher' moral sensibilities usually ascribed to God's holy prophets"). I agree with those assessments, even though I take exception to some of Bergera's views about early Mormon polygamy. See my Note 285 (7th para., beginning: "Dismissing all claims of a marital ceremony for Joseph and Fanny").

301. Journal of Discourses, 2: 14 (J.M. Grant/1854). For Rachel Ivins, Joseph Smith, and Jedediah M. Grant, see Walker, "Rachel R. Grant," 23-24, 27.

302. Ludlow, Encyclopedia of Mormonism, 4: 1637.

303. Journal of Discourses, 4: 78 (B. Young/1856).

304. Richard Lyman Bushman "with" Jed Woodworth, Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 437 ("In the next two and a half years, Joseph married about thirty additional women, ten of them already married to other men. ... What lay behind this

egregious transgression of conventional morality?"), 645nn10-11: "The number rises to eleven married women if the debated marriage to Lucinda Pendleton (Harris) is included. ... Compton believes sexual relations were likely part of all these marriages."

Bushman has remained a devout believer in Mormonism and in the divine calling of Joseph Smith as God's latter-day Prophet, which Rough Stone Rolling expressed on the first page of its Preface as "a believing historian like myself ... What I can do is to look frankly at all sides of Joseph Smith, facing up to his mistakes and flaws. Covering up errors makes no sense in any case."

Page xx of his biography acknowledged: "Joseph Smith did not offer himself as an exemplar of virtue." Bushman's approach is a combination of academic honesty and spiritual testimony that is consistent with the "faith" that Brigham Young proclaimed in 1856.

305. Richard Lyman Bushman, "After the Golden Age," Journal of Mormon History 38 (Summer 2012): 227.