

Letters



Editor:

I wish to applaud the review of BRIGHAM! and HERE'S BROTHER BRIGHAM which appeared in *Sunstone*, Summer 1976 issue. I have attended many of the theatrical productions at BYU, including BRIGHAM! and HERE'S BROTHER BRIGHAM. If BYU-sponsored productions are representative of Mormon theatre in general, then *Sunstone's* review was quite perceptive in identifying BRIGHAM! and HERE'S BROTHER BRIGHAM as examples of two directions being taken in contemporary Mormon theatre, viz., shallow, roadshow-esque entertainment versus moving, artistic theatre. As Bliss and Gump pointed out so adeptly, James Arrington's HERE'S BROTHER BRIGHAM gave us his best in research, writing, and performance, thereby awakening the best within us, emotionally and intellectually. How can we be satisfied with productions such as BRIGHAM! which merely awed us with spectacular advertising, huge sets, and casts of thousands, and touched our easiest emotions with cute in-jokes and sentimentality, while "our deepest selves slept on" (p. 93).

For your honest, intelligent, and thought-provoking review I say, "Bravo!" Frederick Bliss and P.Q. Gump, whoever you are.

Lori Winder
Provo, Utah

I enjoy reading *Sunstone*, but I hope your editing is generally im-

proving and that the transcription errors in the William Stafford interview represent only a momentary lapse. On page 37 you give the title of Stafford's recent book, *Someday, Maybe* as *Sunday Maybe*; on page 41 Robert Bly has become Robert Bligh, and Galway Kinnell is almost unrecognizable as Galwood Canal.

Also, though I haven't checked carefully, I believe you have miscaptioned the facsimiles on pp. 44 and 48. . . .

Finally, since I've been a David Wright fan since seeing *Still the Mountain Wind* at Southern Utah State College in 1968 or 69 and have been collecting his published (and some unpublished) writings since about 1971, I'm delighted (albeit mildly envious that you got to it first) that you have "reprinted" Wright's story "A Summer in the Country."

However, out of respect for Wright's integrity and for scholarly and critical accuracy, I think you should have indicated that you were reprinting not the *Mutiny* text of the story (which is divided into five numbered sections, and in which LaMar is called Alvin) but a presumably later and somewhat altered version (as near as I can tell, the one Wright submitted as part of his MFA thesis at Iowa)—and bowdlerized at that. At least one of your silent emendations (aimed, I understand, at making Wright's language more acceptable to Mormons), the phrase "bad name" on page 61, seriously weakens the thematic dimensions of the story: the name LaMar called Rich denies (from the

writer's and reader's point of view, though perhaps not consciously from LaMar's) that Rich is his brother; since in part the story is about LaMar's grief and guilt at his brother's death, your emendation prevents us from seeing that as clearly as we should. Such are the perils of censorship. And the case seems only ludicrously sad, since the word Wright used was rather innocuous in the first place.

In helpfulness to some of your readers who may become interested in Wright, you might have indicated that *Dialogue* initiated the "rediscovery" in 1969 by publishing portions of *River Saints*.

I do hope you will reprint (or even publish for the first time) more of Wright's work, but even more I hope that your editing of his and others' work will become more careful and responsible.

Bruce W. Jorgensen
Department of English
Brigham Young University

The Book of Mormon photo switch was a sleight of hand by the printer, not the editors. Our apologies to author Stan Larson and Sunstone readers. For the Stafford interview errors, we rest a weak defense on tight deadlines and the inopportune absence of the interviewer/editor.

Mr. Jorgensen's comments on the Wright bowdlerization are well taken. The publisher's vantage point, however, is necessarily different from that of the writer and critic. Which point of view is more "responsible" we hesitate to say. For curious but still unenlightened readers, the guilty word was bastard. Readers may decide for themselves how distracting it is.

I noticed a copy of your quarterly in the library yesterday and sat down and devoured it from cover to cover. . . . I am impressed with the stimulating literary quality of your magazine. There is a sophistication here I had not expected.

Julia E. Barrett
Lewiston, Utah