Brigham Young University Studies
C O N T

Antonio Lebolo: Excavator of the Book of Abraham
H. Donl Peterson, 5

Night Jogging in the City
A POEM
Susan Elizabeth Howe, 30

The Gospel of Jesus Christ as Taught by the Nephite Prophets
Noel B. Reynolds, 31

A Sophic and a Mantic People
H. Curtis Wright, 51

Mormon Bibliography, 1990
Ellen Copley and Scott H. Duvall, 87

J. Roman Andrus: Extending the Senses
D. R. Dant, 128
ENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

Dan Vogel, ed.,
_The Word of God: Essays on Mormon Scripture_
REVIEWED BY Steven Epperson, 66

David S. Hoopes and Roy Hoopes,
_The Making of a Mormon Apostle: The Story of Rudger Clawson_
REVIEWED BY Ronald W. Walker, 74

Gerald N. Lund,
_Pillar of Light: A Historical Novel_
REVIEWED BY Richard H. Cracroft, 77

Linda Sillitoe,
_Windows on the Sea and Other Stories_
REVIEWED BY Karin Anderson England, 82
Front cover

Don't Speak by J. Roman Andrus
Lithograph print, 23" x 14"

Brigham Young University Studies is a quarterly journal dedicated to the correlation of revealed and discovered truth and to the conviction that the spiritual and intellectual are complementary avenues of knowledge. Contributions from all fields of learning are welcome. Articles should reflect a Latter-day Saint point of view while conforming to high scholarly standards and should be written for the informed nonspecialist. Quality fiction, poetry, drama, and personal essays are also welcome.

Contributions should not exceed five thousand words in length. Manuscripts must be typed, double-spaced, and should conform to the latest edition of The Chicago Manual of Style. They should be submitted in duplicate, with stamped and self-addressed return envelope. Each author will receive three copies of the issue in which his or her contribution appears. Send manuscripts to: Edward A. Geary, editor, Brigham Young University Studies, 1102 JKHB, BYU, Provo, Utah 84602.

Brigham Young University Studies is abstracted in Current Contents: Behavioral, Social, and Management Sciences; indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals (articles) and Index to Book Reviews in Religion; and listed in Historical Abstracts, Arts and Humanities Citation Index, American History and Life Annual Index, and MLA International Bibliography. Member, Council of Editors of Learned Journals.

SUBSCRIBERS' NOTICE

Subscription is $10.00 for four issues, $19.00 for eight issues, and $27.00 for twelve issues. Single issues are $4.00. All subscriptions begin with the current issue unless otherwise requested. Send subscriptions to BYU Studies, 1102 JKHB, BYU, Provo, Utah 84602. If you move, please let us know four weeks before changing your address.

Brigham Young University Studies is published quarterly at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602.

©1991 by Brigham Young University Studies
All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America
4-90-46359-3.3M ISSN 0007-0106

Opinions and statements expressed by contributors to Brigham Young University Studies are their own and do not necessarily reflect views of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Brigham Young University, the editors, or the editorial board.
Antonio Lebolo: 
Excavator of the Book of Abraham

H. Donl Peterson

When I began teaching classes in the Pearl of Great Price in 1965 at Brigham Young University, I spent little class time discussing the historical background of this book of scripture because only limited information was available, particularly about the Book of Abraham. It was commonly believed that the mummies and papyri that came from Egypt via Ireland were sold to the early Church leaders by a Michael H. Chandler, a nephew of the excavator. Joseph Smith had translated some of the papyrus manuscripts; then all were reportedly burned in the great Chicago fire of 1871. Little more was known. This much I had learned in a graduate class on the Pearl of Great Price taught by James R. Clark, author of The Story of the Pearl of Great Price. He had meticulously detailed all that was known in those days relative to the Abrahamic history. He was ploughing new ground and establishing a solid foundation upon which others could build.

The Latter-day Saint community was startled by an announcement in November 1967 that the Church had obtained from the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City eleven fragments of Egyptian papyri that had once been in the hands of the prophet Joseph Smith. This announcement piqued the interest of students and soon the number of young people who registered for Pearl of Great Price classes skyrocketed. I, along with my colleagues, was unprepared to field the many questions that were forthcoming because of the find. We didn’t know even the most basic things about the historical background of the Book of Abraham as indicated by these typical questions and answers:

1. Since all the papyri did not burn in the Chicago fire, is it possible that more papyri may be in existence?

Answer: I don’t know.

H. Donl Peterson is a professor of ancient scripture at Brigham Young University. An earlier version of this paper was presented at Brigham Young University on 13 July 1989.
2. Who was Sebolo or Lebolo or whatever his name was? Where was he from? Why was he in Egypt?
Answer: I don’t know.

3. Where were the mummies and papyri exhumed in Egypt?
Answer: I don’t know.

4. How did the mummies get to the United States?
Answer: I don’t know.

5. How accurate is the Michael H. Chandler account of the origin of the mummies and papyri as recorded in the History of the Church?
Answer: I don’t know.

6. Where is Sebolo’s or Lebolo’s will? Does it detail his giving the antiquities to his Irish nephew Michael H. Chandler?
Answer: I don’t know.

My lectures were filled with too many “I don’t knows.” The sudden fervor of student interest and questions stirred me to probe for answers to questions that previously had not even been asked. I was very uncomfortable with the void in our understanding, and because we were caught without facts, controversy flourished among various factions.

Jay M. Todd, then an editorial associate on the Improvement Era staff, wrote an excellent article which appeared in January 1968. It detailed Dr. Aziz Atiya’s find of the eleven papyri fragments and the bill of sale between the buyer, A. Combs, and the owners—Emma Smith Bidamon, the prophet’s widow; Lewis C. Bidamon; and Joseph Smith III.¹ Jay’s article intrigued me as did other events that year. During that summer, I attended a BYU Land of the Scriptures Workshop led by Dr. Daniel H. Ludlow, during which we visited Pit Tomb 33 on the west bank of the Nile by Luxor, Egypt. This tomb, Dr. Ross Christensen of Brigham Young University had hypothesized, was where Lebolo had exhumed the eleven mummies.² The tour concluded in Florence, Italy, so I stopped at the Latter-day Saint mission home there and visited with Elder R. Brent Bentley, who had researched the Antonio Lebolo story. Jay Todd had written to the mission president, President Duns, to ascertain what information could be located about Antonio Lebolo. In response, President Duns, who was unable to go himself, sent Elder Bentley and two other elders to Lebolo’s birthplace, Castellamonte. The elders had found Lebolo’s birth recorded in the parish register of the local Catholic Church, and they had also located Lebolo’s large home. Although I was unable to leave the tour to go to Castellamonte myself, my interest was further stirred to follow up on the elders’ findings.

I was hooked by the intrigue of this story and began to plan how I might untangle the details of this saga. I began by corresponding with anyone who might know something about Lebolo. Occasionally, as I directed Travel Study tours to Israel, Europe, and the Middle East, I would bid the participants farewell in Rome or Athens and then hurry to Northern Italy, Paris, or Dublin to continue the research.

In 1982 I was appointed the Pearl of Great Price Director in the Religious Studies Center at Brigham Young University, which had funds for research. In the fall of 1984, I was granted a professional development leave. Having both time and funds, I traveled in company with a research assistant to Philadelphia, New York, Dublin, London, Paris, Turin, Castellamonte, Venice, Trieste, and, briefly, Egypt to continue research. In addition, Jay Todd, as a friend, generously shared his files on his Book of Abraham research. His book accompanied me on nearly every research journey, and it has greatly influenced my efforts.

Thanks to all the research carried out, the questions answered with an “I don’t know” are less numerous today than they were twenty years ago. Allow me to introduce you to Antonio Lebolo as I now know him.

What is the excavator’s name—Sebolo or Lebolo?

The excavator’s full name in the Latin church records in Castellamonte is Joannes Petrus Antonius Lebolo. In Italian his name is Giovanni Pietro Antonio Lebolo, and in English it is John Peter Anthony Lebolo. When the mummies were first exhibited in Philadelphia in April 1833, at least two newspapers ran advertisements containing his name. One paper spelled his name correctly while the other spelled it Lebolo. When the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia purchased a mummy from Michael H. Chandler in 1833, their accession book spelled Lebolo’s name correctly. Lebolo’s name is also printed correctly in an Academy publication in an 1849 book. The Church newspaper, The Times and Seasons, spelled it correctly in its 2 May 1842 reprint of Chandler’s placards. Where then did the misspelling Sebolo come from? It was due to a typographical or writing error recorded in both the Comprehensive History of the Church and the History of the Church edited by B. H. Roberts. Because of the wide acceptance and circulation of these books, the spelling error has persisted. I have photographs and copies of many documents from Egypt and
Italy that bear Lebolo’s name and signature. There is no question whatever that his name was Lebolo.9

What is known of Lebolo’s early years?

Antonio Lebolo was born in 1781 to Pietro and Marianna Meuta Lebolo10 in Castellamonte, which is located approximately twenty-five miles north of Turin in what was known as Piedmont, then ruled by the king of Sardinia. His father was a community leader and a prominent grocer.11

On 26 February 1797 Antonio, age sixteen, married Maria Pollino Marchetto, who was twenty-one.12 She, like Antonio, came from a prominent family in Castellamonte. A baby boy, named Pietro Giovanni Enrici, was born to the couple in Castellamonte on 17 July 1800; the boy lived but thirteen days.13 Ten years later, on 20 May 1810, another son, Michael Pietro Antonio, was born.14

Antonio had married and started a family in the midst of political turmoil. Napoleon, in a conquest for world power, invaded the Piedmont in 1796. Most Piedmontese welcomed Napoleon’s invasion since he drove the unwelcome Austrians out of their lands. However, the Piedmontese soon realized that Napoleon was not a liberator as he had promised, but only another conqueror with a different accent. In September of 1802, Piedmont was incorporated into the French Republic. Charles Emmanuel IV, under duress, abdicated and retired to Sardinia in 1798. Napoleon’s invasion and eventual defeat influenced Lebolo’s life for the next two decades.

Several years ago in a biographical history of the prominent people of the Canavese, I noticed that an Antonio Lebolo was mentioned as having received a military pension in 1805.15 I initially assumed that this entry either was a mistake or concerned another man since Antonio would have been only in his early twenties at the time. Later, however, I discovered that Lebolo, like many other young men in the occupied territories, had the option of either serving under Napoleon or being considered disloyal. Lebolo chose to enlist in Napoleon’s army, where he was assigned to serve on the home front. Apparently capitalizing on the skills he had learned from his father, he became a quartermaster in Piedmont.16 In various documents he is also called a gendarme, a brigadier, and a carabiniere (police officer). Lebolo was wounded on 22 March 1801; his father petitioned the town council to pay a pension of thirty-five lira “in behalf of the citizen Antonio Lebolo for provisions and convalescence pending his wound received in his assignment as Brigadiere Foriere [billeting officer] in the Gendarmerie on occasion of the revolt of S. Agostino against the rebels of Valle D’aosta.”17 The nature and extent of his injury is
not mentioned. Even though Antonio was dismissed from the service on 6 January 1802 for infirmity, he continued to have ties with law enforcement. Giovanni Marro, an authority about one of Lebolo’s associates, Drovetti, pointed out, “We came to know that he [Lebolo] was an officer of the French police after he was a Piedmont policeman.”

Lebolo was a respected man in his hometown, often being called upon to serve as a witness for legal documents. He lived in Castellamonte in 1800 and early 1801 and again from 1809 to 1811, but his whereabouts between 1801–1808 and between 1811–1813 are unknown. One account refers to him as a gendarme in Milan. This possibility may have some merit in explaining his absence from Castellamonte, but military records listing Lebolo in Milan have not been located. According to the records we have, the only occupation that Lebolo had prior to moving to Egypt around 1817 seems to be connected with military and police work.

By 1810 Napoleon ruled as emperor at Rome, controlling all of continental Italy. But, protected by England’s supremacy of the seas, the island of Sardinia was still ruled by the House of Savoy. After Napoleon abdicated in April 1814, the Piedmontese who had served under him were considered disloyal by the reemerging Sardinian monarchy. The king of Sardinia recovered his ancestral dominions of Savoy, Nice, and Piedmont and received, in addition, the territory of the Genoese Republic. To avoid prosecution, Lebolo and many other “Bonapartists” fled to safer climes. Lebolo, exiled from Maria, his young son Pietro, and his extended family, sailed to Egypt to begin a new career.

Why did Lebolo choose to go to Egypt?

After the war, when people were seeking new frontiers and fortunes, Egypt held a magnetic attraction. When Napoleon invaded Egypt in 1798, he took 167 scientists, artists, and craftsmen along to explore, sketch, and document their findings. Their marvelous sketches and intriguing articles were published between 1809 and 1813 in the twenty-four-volume masterpiece Description de l’Égypte. This encyclopedic work introduced Europeans to the exotic land of the Nile, with its myriad pyramids, temples, tombs, obelisks, and mummies waiting to be explored, savored, and, sadly, plundered. Many hundreds of Europeans traveled to Egypt—tourists, promoters, and schemers alike. The pasha of Egypt, Mohamed Ali, was anxious to industrialize his country and upgrade his antiquated military machine, which lagged far behind that of his European neighbors. In exchange for modernization, he traded the multitudinous mummies, obelisks, and other antiquities that caught
the fancy of the Europeans. Ali considered the exchange acceptable; after all, mummies and monuments were commonplace and very expendable—ideal items to swap for modern weapons and such modern inventions as ice machines, cloth factories, a rum distillery, a sugar refinery, and cotton mills.

Lebolo had an important contact in Egypt—Bernardino Drovetti. Drovetti had held the rank of lieutenant colonel in the French army and had served with distinction in Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt. Drovetti had a mutilated hand as a momento of saving the life of Napoleon’s brother-in-law, General Joachim Murat, during his military service under the French flag. After the Egyptian campaign, Drovetti served in the first Piedmontese brigade, where he was in charge of the general staff of the reserve army. He was then assigned to organize a new Piedmontese army. In February 1801, at age twenty-five, he was “nominated head of the general staff in the Piedmontese division.” From 9 October 1801 to 22 March 1803, he served as an appointed judge in the special military tribunal established in Turin. Following his distinguished military career, Drovetti was selected by Napoleon Bonaparte to return to Egypt in 1803 to serve as vice consul general. But when Napoleon fell, Drovetti was labeled a Bonapartist and was dismissed by Louis XVIII in 1814.

Like Lebolo, Drovetti was Piedmontese. He came from Barbania, a small town about seven miles from Castellamonte, Lebolo’s hometown, and it is likely that the families knew each other. When Lebolo arrived in Egypt, probably in 1817, Drovetti was a trusted confidant and advisor to Mohamed Ali. Drovetti assisted Ali in establishing commercial enterprises and governmental policies and was also involved in the antiquities business, including the excavation of tombs. Drovetti employed Lebolo to excavate in the tombs in the Valley of the Kings on the west bank of the Nile near the ancient city of Thebes.

**What was it like in Upper Egypt when Lebolo was there?**

In the early nineteenth century Egypt had the spirit and the morals of a gold rush, for the sale of antiquities was a lucrative and competitive business. In addition, the antagonism between the pacesetting arch rivals—France and England—continued in the digs, and dividing lines were drawn through the ancient ruins and burial grounds. These demarcations helped the rival claimants to distinguish their own real estate and in addition prevented flagrant bloodletting. Natives were hired for one piastre per diem to uncover the buried treasures. Those men like Lebolo, who were in charge of the digs, often lived in the tombs of the ancient pharaohs or in adobe houses nearby. When exhumed, items of worth were
stored in these tombs or houses for safekeeping until the artifacts were shipped down the Nile to Cairo or Alexandria and beyond. In the sale of antiquities, both the natives around Luxor and their European counterparts were unscrupulous in their dealings. The temperature was unbearable in the heat of the summer days, often reaching over 130 degrees. On the west bank the inhabitants lived underground, sharing their caves with cows, goats, dogs, and corpses. Poverty, insects, rats, and diseases were wide-spread. Human life was cheap. Caravan after caravan of blacks, shackled in chains, some carrying tiny babies, were marched through the cities of the Nile to the slave auction blocks. Many of these blacks had been forced to walk hundreds of miles from their homes in Sudan, Nubia, and other central African locations. Whites were also commonly auctioned in the markets. The sheikhs had extravagant harems; Ali’s harem accommodated eight hundred women. Young men were emasculated to serve as eunuchs in the harems of the sheikhs, and many died as a result of the surgery. While residing in Egypt, many Europeans purchased black mistresses and, upon leaving, sold them or gave them to a friend.

In fear of Mohamed Ali’s power and justifiable reputation for cruel, quick justice, the local sheikhs respected his orders. Punishments were numerous, brutal, varied, and rapid. Thieves’ hands were severed, some violators were impaled, and others were bastinadoed (a process of beating the bottom of the feet with a rhino strap; the punishment often leaves permanent damage). The setting for this bedlam was in the shadows of some of the greatest monuments on the face of the earth.

Belzoni reported that Lebolo and some French ruffians attempted to kill him. Is this account factual?

Giovanni Battista Belzoni from Padua, Italy, was a large man, 6’8” tall, and very muscular. He performed as a circus strong man and had displayed great feats of strength on the entertainment circuits of England. He married an English wife and went to Egypt to promote a hydraulic water pumping machine. There he was unsuccessful and, in dire need of employment, hired out to Henry Salt, consul general of England, to work in Salt’s excavations. According to his account, he was attacked by two of Drovetti’s agents, Lebolo and Rosignani, over a dispute about excavation claims. His account, a very popular, two-volume work that he published in England, praised the author’s courageous spirit and superior accomplishments but was uncomplimentary about Lebolo, portraying him as a troublemaker.
Unfortunately, some Latter-day Saint writers quote Belzoni’s report about Lebolo and assume that this muscle man, referred to in his earlier billings as the “Patagonion Samson” and the “French Hercules,”33 was an unbiased reporter. In several books, those who knew Belzoni best are not as complimentary about Belzoni as Belzoni himself is. For example, Belzoni’s co-worker in the excavations, Giovanni D’Athanasi, reports that Belzoni had “an impatient and intractable temperament.”34 He detailed the first meeting between Lebolo and Belzoni:

Having completed our arrangements we set out in the month of March, 1817, and arrived at Menia at the same time with two men from M. Drovetti, the Consul General of France, who were going to Thebes for the purpose of exploring. On seeing these two gentlemen Mr. Belzoni became furious, and would have given all he possessed of in the world to have been able to reach Thebes that very night, and mark out all the ground, in order that M. Drovetti’s men, when they arrived, might not find a neutral spot to explore, nor even place sufficient to sit down on. Such was the length to which Mr. Belzoni’s ambition had driven him.35

D’Athanasi further wrote of Belzoni:

If he had been a conscientious and a sincere man, as he boasted himself to be, he ought to have put forth the naked truth, without garbling the facts. As it turns out, however, he has preferred to be viewed culpable of the blackest ingratitude. His memory cannot but suffer from it; for truth never long holds back from exposing and stigmatizing falsehood.36

Yet another time D’Athanasi states:

I have already made allusion once or twice to Mr. Belzoni; it must not be supposed that in undertaking to publish this little work, my object was to set myself up as the refuter of Mr. Belzoni’s statements; though I confess I do feel it to be impossible for me to preserve a religious silence on the subject, and abstain from refuting some passages in his works, in which he actually contradicts himself . . . and perverts the best established facts.37

John J. Halls, the biographer of Henry Salt, Belzoni’s former employer, wrote of Belzoni’s two-volume work that “the insidious attacks directed against Mr. Salt in that [Belzoni’s] publication, and through other channels, at length induced him [Henry Salt] to draw up, for the information of his friends in England, an account of the real circumstances in the case.”38 Salt set the record straight by publishing a twenty-eight-page document entitled “A Plain Statement of Facts.”39 This small work is decidedly uncomplimentary of Belzoni.
Belzoni published; Lebolo did not. The power of the pen ruled that day and still influences the present.

Where did Lebolo exhume the eleven mummies?

Drovetti spent little time in Luxor, remaining most of the time in Cairo close to the pasha. For some time his foreman on the west bank of the Nile, across the river from Luxor, was Lebolo, who was responsible for overseeing two to four hundred natives digging in various locations.40 Lebolo probably discovered several hundred mummies in numerous sites while he administered Drovetti’s affairs.

Only one site on the west bank of the Nile has been confirmed as a tomb where Lebolo is known to have dug; that is Pit Tomb 32. Lebolo’s name, chiseled on the wall of that tomb, was located by Laszlo Kakosy, professor of Egyptology at Eotvos University in Budapest, Hungary. Kakosy confirmed his find in a lecture given at Brigham Young University on 6 November 1990.41

Ross Christensen, professor emeritus of anthropology at Brigham Young University, has proposed that Tomb 33 fits the description reported in the History of the Church.42 The tomb certainly is large enough and may be the very site. However, several brick-lined tombs were torn down by the excavators; one of these tombs may have been the tomb where Lebolo discovered the papyrus scrolls and the eleven mummies.43

What evidence do we have that Lebolo was anything more than a grave robber?

In 1984 I was privileged to travel to Turin to study in the Accademia Delle Scienze Di Torino Library, which houses Professor Giovanni Marro’s collection. This collection includes a file of hundreds of letters sent and received by Drovetti. Aided by Bruce Porter, my research assistant, and Patrizia Piania, a native of Turin and a convert to the Church, I spent nearly a week perusing these letters in the beautiful old historic library, seated at a table by a window, our only available source of light. The letters were stored in a wall cabinet in several large bundles wrapped in brown paper and tied with string. Marro had published on Drovetti and was planning a second volume when he passed away. We were very pleased that we were allowed to personally utilize his collection.44

This paper does not allow many examples, but the following will suffice to point out that Lebolo was an amiable man who hosted Drovetti’s guests with care and efficiency. Carlo Vidua, a prominent and affluent Piedmontese from Turin, wrote in a letter to his father:
But, among so many marvelous things, that are possible to be admired at Thebes, the most curious one of all is the valley where the kings' sepulchers lay. It is rather a lonely valley, arid, horrible, in which some holes like caverns are seen. Entering these caverns, long galleries, halls, chambers, and cabinets are found, in short, they are underground palaces, all covered with painted bas-relieves; and it is very marvelous. It is wonderful the preservation of the colors, the amount of the works, the scrupulous attention used to make them. Lately, a new one was discovered which surpasses all the others in beauty, in the perfection of the work, and in execution. I visited it two times. The second time I spent the whole day there, examining everything; it was already late evening, and I couldn't move myself away from there.

I dined inside there in a beautiful hall, much more elegant than our ballrooms. Also, I believe that, considering all, this sepulcher of the king of Thebes is a much more sumptuous dwelling than the dwellings of our living European kings. Who, do you think, gave me the honor of those sepulchers, and who reigns in Thebes in exchange of the dead king? A Piedmontese. Mr. Lebolo from Canavese, formerly a police officer in service of France, came to Egypt and was employed by Mr. Drovetti in the excavations, which he does continuously in Thebes. Our Piedmonteses really have a ready spirit, and are capable of succeeding in everything; from police work to antiquities is a big jump. . . In those ten days that I lived in Thebes, Mr. Lebolo accompanied me, took me everywhere, had me come to dinner at his house, which is among monuments and half embedded in tombs, all filled with mummies, papyruses, and little statues. An Egyptian bas-relief was the top of the door; we made fire with pieces of mummies' coffins, Mr. Lebolo commands those Arabs; sometimes he has about 200 or 300 at his command; the Turkish commander respects him for fear of Mr. Drovetti. Oh, if Sesostri had lifted his head up, and had seen a Piedmontese commanding in the city with one hundred doors! When you see count Lodi, tell him that we drank to his health among the ruins of Thebes. Mr. Lebolo served for some time in Piedmont with the carabineers and spoke very highly of his leader. He was also under count of Agliano in Savoy. To show my gratitude to such courtesy of this Canavese-Theban man, I took the task of sending a letter to his family; which I include here, praying you to make sure that it will reach its destination.35

An Englishman, M. D. Brine, who was proprietor of a hotel at Radamon that catered to Europeans, wrote to Drovetti about Lebolo: "I am persuaded that Mr. Lebolo is not guilty of any crime; when the Cascifff was going to beat the peasant, he [Lebolo] went to another room saying that he would rather lose all the antiquities of this world, provided that none would be beaten."346 John Hyde, an English gentleman, sent Drovetti this comment: "When you next write to Mr. Lobilau [Lebolo] may I . . . obtrude upon your indulgence as to request you will remember me kindly to him, and reiterate my thanks for the kindly hospitalities I received from him.
during my stay at Gourna." F. Brouzet, a retired elder majeur officer of the Royal Gendarmerie, wrote to Drovetti: "If the good Mr. Lebolo is still with you in Alexandria, please give him our regards. We wish him the best in his work."

Finally, Frederic Cailliaud, a French traveler, author, and mineralogist, wrote to the consul general: "When we arrived in Gourna Mr. Lebolo brought me to his house where together we opened the tomb where he had collected the antiquities, I have personally broken off the seal of the trunk containing the papyri and one after the other one I inspected them . . . I found 3 of them with hieratic and Greek characters which nonetheless will be of great interest for the knowledge of hieroglyphics."

A history of the prominent men of Canavese states that Lebolo squandered a fortune through his eccentric oriental lifestyle. How did he amass any wealth if his only source of income was from working as Drovetti's foreman?

Lebolo did become moderately wealthy. Count Carlo Vidua explained how: "Mr. Lebolo works successfully in his new career; he found beautiful pieces for the Drovetti museum; and since he was allowed by him to do some excavations of his own, he gathered for himself a small collection, which will bring him a moderate fortune."

While in Egypt, Antonio pursued interests other than excavation. He was involved with buying and selling ostriches, whose plumes were in great demand to enhance the apparel of the rich and famous of Europe. He also bought and sold exotic animals.

Lebolo seems to have stopped excavating in 1821. He moved to Alexandria, where he started selling artifacts. In answer to my inquiry about this activity, Helmut Satzinger from Vienna wrote:

I confirm receiving your letter dated 26 January [1977]. In response I share the following with you: The Egyptian collection of the Historical Art Museum is one of the best of its kind, the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York is the only collection in the United States that is better. A portion of the objects come from the collection of Antonio Lebolo of Alexandria.

I refer you to the book by Egon Komorzsinski: Das Erbe Des Alten Agypten [The Inheritance of the Old Egyptians], H. Bauer, Vienna, 1965, he writes the following on page 65:

"In every instance, the further additions of that collection are considered old Egyptian memorials that the Austrian doctor, Ernst August Burghart, under the direction of the emperor, king, court and state council, collected in Egypt during 1821. The largest share was bought by Burghart from a collector by the name of Antonio Lebolo in Alexandria, and the remainder was probably purchased from art dealers. He did not undertake to do his own archaeological digging."
What happened to Lebolo after he left Egypt?

Lebolo’s wife Maria, whom he had not seen for several years, died in Castellamonte in 1821, while Lebolo was still in exile in Egypt. Lebolo left Egypt and moved to Venice, Italy, where he was involved in selling Egyptian antiquities and “exotic animals.” By 1822, Lebolo had new family interests, a young black woman called Anna Mora (Italian for black), also known as Donna Africana (African woman). Sponsored by Lebolo, Anna and her two young daughters entered catechumenal training in Venice to prepare for their Christian baptism. Anna stated that she did not know who her parents were, nor what her background was. She is referred to as a black from Darfouir, which is in western Sudan, but little else is known of her family. Her two young daughters were baptized with her, although one daughter, Maria, did not receive all of the Catholic rites in Venice since she had received some prior to her baptism in Trieste. Anna Mora was given the Christian name of Anna Marie, and the little girls were given the Christian names of Rosa Maria and Maria Catterina at their baptisms. I have wondered if this incident is a significant source for the report that Chandler gave to Joseph Smith that Lebolo died in Trieste. Was little Maria ill and given the last rites while in Trieste, along with Antonio, who according to Chandler’s account made out his will in Trieste during an illness?

Following the baptisms, Anna Marie and Antonio Lebolo were married in Venice on 12 June 1824. Bertolotti stated that Lebolo “married a black woman, whom Drovetti gave him as a gift, after he provided her with civil and religious education.” On the marriage documents Lebolo’s residence was listed as Alexandria, Egypt. A son was born to them, whom they named Guiseppe, while they were living in the Venice-Trieste area.

In the latter part of 1824, Lebolo returned to Egypt and then, acting as the viceroy of Egypt’s representative, went to Monaco to present to the sovereign there a gift of two ostriches: “The above-mentioned Mr. Lebolo coming from Cairo, was passing through Bassano towards the end of 1824, and then went to Monaco, commissioned by the viceroy of Egypt to present to that sovereign two ostriches of extraordinary beauty.”

In 1826 Lebolo, along with his twenty-three-year-old black wife and their three young children, moved to Castellamonte. Pietro, Lebolo’s son by his first wife, was sixteen years old. Unfortunately, records indicate that a black, illiterate wife who married into a prominent family in cloistered Castellamonte was not readily received: black slavery was still practiced in many parts of the western world in the 1820s. Two more sons were added to Antonio
and Anna Marie’s family while they lived in Castellamonte—Joannes Antonio in 1826 and Joannes Tomas in 1827.\textsuperscript{64}

In 1973, President Dan C. Jorgensen, former president of the Italian mission, reported that Lebolo died in Castellamonte in 1830 and not in Trieste in 1832. Which facts are correct?

An Italian Latter-day Saint, Adriano Comollo from Turin, whom I met following a Church meeting in Turin in 1984 and with whom I conversed relative to the Lebolo story, stated that he had located in the state archives in Turin a year or two before a legal document bearing Lebolo’s signature. I asked him to return to the archives and photograph the document for me. I also explained that the notary who had prepared the document may have assisted Lebolo relative to other legal matters and it might prove valuable to peruse the notary’s other papers while Adriano was there. I would have searched with him, but I was scheduled to fly to Egypt to continue my research on Lebolo’s life story. I had been in Cairo about a week when I received a middle-of-the-night phone call from Adriano, who excitedly announced that he had located Lebolo’s will and many other of Lebolo’s legal papers in the state archives. My assistant Bruce and I changed our plans and returned to Turin posthaste to study and photograph Lebolo’s long-sought-after will and other legal papers. I asked Adriano to record the details of his discovery. His account reads:

How I came in contact with Dr. Peterson was a kind of coincidence. In October ’84 my wife, Jerri Lynn, our little Sam and I were visiting the “Centro” branch. Sam escaped in a sudden race into a classroom where Dr. Peterson was talking about his Lebolo project. Jerri ran to catch Sam and on that occasion she heard the name of Lebolo. She remembered that I had once told her that I was involved in a research concerning Lebolo’s parish records and she told that to Dr. Peterson. So, we met and since Dr. Peterson was leaving for Cairo he encouraged me to do research to find Lebolo’s will. “We have to find that will!” he stressed.

At first Jerri and I chose to search, in a file of the notaries of the Ivrea area, the notaries of Castellamonte who worked around 1830 and there we started to look for Lebolo. Fortunately there were only 6 or 7 notaries there, but we didn’t find any trace of Lebolo. We realized that Lebolo, even though he lived in Castellamonte, probably could go to a notary in some surrounding hamlet or town, or even to Ivrea. We counted the possible notaries to be about 90 and we felt we were seeking a needle in a haystack.

Providentially we found an indication that Lebolo was a friend of the notary of Colleretto Parella (a hamlet near Castellamonte) whose name was Giacomo Buffa. So we looked in his books and there it was: not only the will but also the inventories and the news
that Lebolo delivered eleven mummies to a certain Albano Oblassa [sic] of Trieste to sell them.

Dr. Peterson soon returned from Cairo and said that they certainly were the mummies of Michael Chandler. Now we had to find a connection between Italy and America to prove that those mummies were the mummies of Michael Chandler. 65

I learned that Lebolo made out his will on 19 November 1829, while, he reported, he was “sound of mind, and in perfect control of my senses although ill in my body.” Two paragraphs in the will reflect the internal problems the family was facing because of his eccentric marriage to Anna Marie. Lebolo willed the following to Anna:

I give and I leave to my wife Anna, because of her chaste and honest condition of a widow, the usufruct of my goods and real estates, but in such usufruct living together with my universal heirs and with my parents Pietro and Marianna Lebolo.

And if my aforementioned wife would not or could not live with them, in such a circumstance, I give and leave to her for her alimony and clothing, the yearly amount of 240 lire, which will be paid by my heirs or for them by their guardian, otherwise in advance, and I want that my mentioned wife be satisfied and content for such yearly amount, without requiring anything else from my heirs, under the law of the “quarta uxoria,” that she might want to claim. 66

Of his eldest son, Lebolo wrote:

If my said firstborn son [Pietro] would not carry out such task and obligation, in such case, not to force him against his will to live with his other brothers, my universal coheirs, . . . I give to such son as a title of division the following . . . [several parcels of ground are mentioned] 67

About two weeks later, Lebolo rescinded the previous stipulation regarding Pietro’s relationship with his half brothers with an addendum which reads:

 Said Mr. Lebolo, who writes the addendum has revoked and revokes the prohibition and obligation to his first born son both for the division of his possessions and for the dowry of his late mother Maria Pollino Marchetto; he [Mr. Lebolo] wants that his mentioned son Pietro Lebolo can, as he pleases, determine the division of the inheritance, even without his brothers and coheirs having yet reached their legal age, provided that said first born son will take care of all expenses that will be necessary to such division, and if the division will be postponed until the legal age of the aforementioned heirs, the expenses will be equally divided among the coheirs. And as for the said dowry of his mother, said Mr. Lebolo, who is writing this addendum, wants that his aforementioned son Pietro can dispose of it as he pleases, and use as he will see fit. 68
On the night of 18–19 February 1830, Lebolo died in his home in Castellamonte at the age of 49.\textsuperscript{69}

Just a brief postscript about Anna Marie’s life after Antonio died. Unable to live with her in-laws, she left her two daughters and three sons behind in Castellamonte and moved to Turin. A year and a half later, accompanied by an attorney, she returned to Castellamonte to petition the family to release to her some of her personal property. The document reads:

The Year of the Lord 1831 October the 10th... On 18th of February 1830, Antonio Lebolo died... He has given the usufruct of all his goods, real estate and personal property, to his wife Anna and to all sole heirs who are: Pietro, Giuseppe, Tommaso, and Giovanni, all his sons. If by chance, his wife Anna cannot or will not live with them he has provided for her for food and clothes 240 lire every year without claiming anything more. Since that Anna, Lebolo’s widow, does not want to live with her sons and having already a new residence in Torino, after having made known her decision to Mr. Giovanni... Meuta attorney and guardian of Lebolo’s heirs, she asks of the same guardian to give to her some personal property to be determined and systematically pay the sum due. The above-mentioned Mr. Meuta agrees to submit to Mrs. Anna all personal belongings, identified as personal property, and he will pay to her the sum of 240 lire with the implied condition that Mrs. Anna asks nothing more from the heirs and that the above mentioned sum will depend on her conduct as a widow and on her chastity and honesty as the will indicated... We came to the agreement to return to Mrs. Anna the following belongings: “the gold ring with the inscription “amour” listed as number 211 valued at seven lire; the gold collier [necklace] valued at seventy lire listed as number 213 and also the cornel trimmed in gold listed as number 216.”... There is, in my presence, Mrs. Anna, Lebolo’s widow, who came from an African nation, as she says from [Nubia] or Nigrigia is black and uninstructed by her parents about the place where she was born and emigrated at an infantile age.\textsuperscript{70}

Signing her name with a cross because of her illiteracy, Anna consented to the arrangements.

What does the will say about the mummies?

Following Lebolo’s death, Francesco Bertola and other friends of the family were called upon to inventory Lebolo’s holdings. This was no small task because Lebolo had been involved in several business ventures, including the grocery business, since his return to Castellamonte. The inventory took nine days to complete and is eighty-eight pages in length. Lebolo, contrary to some cursory and inaccurate statements, did not die a poor man. He had considerable land holdings, a large home, and many assets. Although he had loaned large sums of money and much was outstanding when he died, the family was not wanting.
I discovered many fascinating details concerning Lebolo's life-style and interests by studying his will but was very disappointed that no reference was made pertaining to the mummies to verify the report Chandler gave to Joseph Smith. In fact, had I not seen listed in the inventory a picture of Drovetti located in the room where Lebolo died, I would have almost believed I was tracking the wrong man.71

Possibly other documents that could have answered some questions were burned. President Dan C. Jorgensen, former Italian Mission President, interviewed Francesco Morozzo, who presently lives in Lebolo's house in Castellamonte. Morozzo remembers, "as a boy . . . playing in the attic which was filled with boxes of old letters, keepsakes, etc. He remembers much foreign correspondence with strange non-Italian stamps. Unfortunately, as time passed and he inherited the home, the attics were cleaned and all the 'junk' was burned."72 I have personally heard Mr. Morozzo confirm this account.

What documentation is available to connect Lebolo with the eleven mummies that Chandler displayed in the United States, the last four of which he sold to Joseph Smith?

The Comollos located Lebolo's will, the inventory, and other legal documents in the state archives in Turin. True, neither the will nor the inventory mentioned any mummies, but another notarial record they located did: a document that authorized Antonio's son Pietro, then twenty-one years old, to go to Trieste to represent his three little brothers, the family, and himself in transacting these matters of business:

1. Collect 2150 fiorini from Giovan Batista Gauttier and Rosa Gauttier for payments outstanding for a menagerie of foreign animals.
2. Collect from Gustavo Bourlet 1800 fiorini on a loan and 300 fiorini for a woman's scarf he was to have sold for Lebolo.73
3. Contact Albano Oblassa, a shipping magnate, to see why he had not sent to the Lebolo family money for the sale of eleven mummies that Lebolo had entrusted to him to sell.74

If these debtors did not make recompense, Pietro was authorized to start legal proceedings against them. (See figures 1a–1d.) It is my assumption that about seventeen months after Lebolo's death, his family discovered a ledger book of his business dealings in Trieste that prompted them to authorize Pietro to travel to Trieste to complete unfinished business there.

When I returned home from my professional development leave in November 1984, I had not found a single document to tie Antonio Lebolo's eleven mummies to the United States. I did know that shipping owner Albano Oblassa in Trieste had been authorized
by Antonio Lebolo to sell the mummies and send the payment to the Lebolos. But the search didn’t end.

Adriano Comollo continues his story:

At the beginning of March ’85 we received a letter from Professor Peterson: “. . . we need to find . . .” It struck me as a divine order, so back to work!

At first Jerri and I conjectured that any other news concerning the destiny of those mummies could only be found in Trieste. However, just for thoroughness, we decided to cast one last glance in the Archives of Torino. I felt an inspiration, after I had expressly prayed for that problem, to seek among the notaries of Torino, not among those of Ivrea, and there we found the line connecting Italy with America.73

The Comollos discovered that on 5 October 1833 a document was sent by the Lebolo heirs to a Francesco Bertola, a veterinarian formerly of Castellamonte, who had moved to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (Bertola’s father, also named Francesco, was Antonio’s long-time friend and one who helped inventory Lebolo’s personal possessions.) The document in part states:

Special Power of Attorney from Pietro Lebolo in favor of Francesco Bertola, Professor of Veterinary Medicine.

. . . Pietro Lebolo has called and calls as his special procurator Francesco Bertola son of the living Francesco also born in Castellamonte-Piedmont and living in Philadelphia, Professor of Veterinary Medicine who accepts me here, myself Notary undersigned, acting as a public official accepting for him, therefore he receives the authority to claim the 11 mummies and other antique objects located in various boxes belonging to the deceased Antonio Lebolo who sent them to Albano Oblasser of Trieste. Albano Oblasser sent them to New York to the house of Mr. M’Led [M’Leod] and Quellerspie [Gillespie] of Meetland [Maitland] and Kennedy. Mr. Bertola has authority to sell them to whomever he thinks will fulfill the conditions, pay the amount that the procurator will decide and he will send the same through quittance, and in case of dispute he will protect the interests of the Misters constituents and he will take care of all the problems that might come up in order to obtain a quick liquidation of such objects. In other words he will do whatever the constituent[s] would do if they were to conduct the transaction themselves.76

Another rendition of the same document further explained that Antonio Lebolo had left the eleven mummies in the custody of Albano Oblasser of Trieste, “who sent them to New York to the house of Mr. M’led [M’Leod] and Guellerspie [Gillespie].”77 There the mummies were supposed to be sold to anybody that would pay the sum M’Leod and Gillespie thought appropriate; the two were
then to send quittance in any possible way. Since the Lebolos did not pursue the matter, I assume they received quittance from the four New York maritime merchants or some other party.

The ancient papyri, including some writings of Abraham and Joseph, secure in Egyptian sarcophagi, arrived safely in the United States in the winter or early spring of 1833. These writings, which speak of holy things relevant to man’s salvation, were brought to Joseph Smith the last of June 1835, a time that their sacred message could be consequential to the restored Church: the Kirtland Temple was nearing completion, and some of these writings speak of temple-related matters.

Much has been discovered about Lebolo and the mummies, but much remains to be discovered.
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10 See Peterson, *Antonio Lebolo,* His Roots and Branches, 133.
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15 A. Bertolotti, *Passeggiate nei Canavesi O.C.* (1871), 5:456, cited in Michelangelo Giorda. *La storia civile religiosa ed economica di Castellamonte Canavesi* (Ivrea, Italy, 1953), 337: “Among the documents of 1805, we notice two certificates issued to a fellow citizen Antonio Lebolo to give him a
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says from Nubia or Nigrigia, is black and uninstructed by her parents about the place where she was born and emigrated at an infantile age” (notary records of Giacomo Buffa, unpublished, 227–29, 10 October 1831, State Archives, Turin, Italy).
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FIGURE 1a. A notarial record authorizing Antonio's son Pietro to represent the family and himself in transacting some business regarding, among other things, eleven mummies (manuscript page 163). The translation follows:

Special power of attorney from Mr. Giovanni Meuta, guardian of the children Giuseppe, Giovanni and Tomaso Lebolo to the head of Mr. Pietro Lebolo from Castellamonte.

In the year of our Lord 1831, on July 30, after 12 o'clock A.M., in Castellamonte and in the house of said Mr. Meuta, there, I, the undersigned notary, being present and the doctor Tomaso Pollino son of the late architect Giacinto, and Tomaso Norma son of Pietro, both born and residing in Castellamonte, they are suitable witnesses in this matter, undersigning with me and the said Mr. Meuta and they are fully known by me, the notary.

Having personally decided, Mr. Giovanni Meuta, son of the late Bernardino born and residing in Castellamonte as the guardian of the brothers Giuseppe, Giovanni and Tomaso Lebolo sons of the late Antonio, chosen as such with a document dated February 19, 1830, written by me, the undersigned notary, signed in Castellamonte on the 23 of said month, file #330 in the volume 1, sheet 535, with the payment of 6 Lire and 30 cents, and

FIGURE 1b, Manuscript Page 163a

in good faith on said day the undersigned Parish Officer, the guardian and coparent, desiring to award, as it depends on him, all the interests of his said administered children Lebolo, and procured for them the liquidation of the following belongings left them by the said late Antonio Lebolo, their common father, that is 1) Eleven mummies given by him to Mr. Albano Oblassa,† so that he [Mr. Oblassa] would arrange to sell them. 2) As of Mr. Gustavo Bourlet,‡ debtor of 1800 fiorini, to be exchanged with said Mr. Lebolo, with also a woman's large scarf, referred to as the Turkish scarf, worth 300 fiorini also given to said Mr. Bourlet, so that he [Mr. Bourlet] would arrange to sell it. 3) And finally as of Mr. Giovan Batista Gauttier and Rosa Gauttier, without a fixed residence, owners of a menagerie of foreign animals, both debtors to said Mr. Lebolo for 2,150 fiorini [recorded] in six promissory notes written in favor of [Mr. Lebolo] himself, in order to take care
of the accounts concerning the above mentioned matters and credits and to obtain the cash from them, [Mr. Meuta] has decided and has been nominated as guardian of said Lebolo children, as he determines and nomintaes in this present document, Mr. Pietro Lebolo, first born son of said Antonio, born and residing in Castellamont, and presently living in the aforementioned city of Trieste, here I, the undersigned notary, am accepting for him, as functioning "ex officio publico," so that said Mr. Meuta, according to his position, has given and gives to Mr. Pietro Lebolo all and complete power to summon to any court or Magistrate said Oblassa, Bourlet and Gauttier, and propose against them all the reasons he might believe as necessary, in order to receive said credits, to deal with them and receive any amount of which they might be in debt, either [if they pay] spontaneously or by verdict, in favor of the [people] mentioned for any amount until final and general satisfaction is reached. Also with authority given to said Mr. Lebolo to delegate, in the name of the principal and for the interest of said Lebolo children in relation the the above specified credits, one or more proxies to whom he would also give all necessary and opportune authority, with maximum power to said Mr. Pietro Lebolo to do, for the above specified credits, all that the principal could do, with the clause *cum libera et ut alter ego*.

I, the undersigned notary having been required to to all this, have received the present document, which was read and made public by me, with a clear knowledge of said Mr. Meuta, being present the above mentioned witnesses, and with them under-signing, the rights of signature, according to the regular price [is] three lire and eighty five cents, that is 3.85.

†residing in Trieste
*already residing in Trieste
The two recorded footnotes are approved
Signatures Meuta, Giovanni; Cav. Pollino; Norma, Tomaso

The present note, written by the hand of myself the undersigned notary on official paper, containing four written pages.

Giacomo Buffa
Night Jogging in the City

No stars, but there is weather
To convince me of the mortal limits
Of these streets, taut as underground cable
That gives us the capacity to talk.
Passage through the night is a thrust into absence,
The pull of emptiness ahead, the risk
I'll throw myself at darkness once
Too often, and finally it will catch.
My body never knows what will take it, butcher
Shop doorway between barred windows,
Gaping driveway of the vacant garage,
Or the stretch of blocks becoming time.
Or maybe the dream of the old man
Lying in his bathtub after the fall
Behind the third floor frosted glass,
And no one to see the universe
Slipping through his eyes.
Out here, it is all image, and I am
Neither privileged nor blessed:
I promise myself I won't do this any more.
Still the pavement is the swimming place
Of knowledge, dark or lighted, each window
Somebody's womb against time.

—Susan Elizabeth Howe
The Gospel of Jesus Christ as Taught by the Nephite Prophets

Noel B. Reynolds

The Book of Mormon and other Latter-day Saint scriptures define the term gospel precisely as the way or means by which an individual can come to Christ. In these scriptures, the gospel or doctrine of Christ is the teaching that if people will (1) believe in Christ, (2) repent of their sins, and (3) submit to baptism in water as a witness of their willingness to take his name upon them and keep his commandments, he will (4) pour out his Spirit upon them and cleanse them of their sins. All who receive this baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost and (5) endure to the end in faith, hope, and charity will (6) be found guiltless at the last day and enter into the kingdom of God (Alma 7:14–16, 24–25).

The Book of Mormon uses the terms gospel and doctrine interchangeably in a way that is consistent with New Testament usage. The New Testament term doctrine is a translation of the Greek word didaskalia, which means “teaching.” It can be used with positive or negative implications, referring either to the doctrines of Christ or to the vain teachings of people or devils. The Book of Mormon uses both gospel and doctrine to refer to a message or teaching that can be reduced to a set of statements or “points of . . . doctrine” (1 Ne. 15:14), as does the New Testament. While all the elements of the gospel as it is defined in the Book of Mormon occur in the New Testament, the formulaic relationship the Book of Mormon ascribes to them is not so obvious. Yet, once the Book of Mormon definition is understood, there is little difficulty accommodating New Testament usages to it.

BASIC ELEMENTS

The Lord has repeatedly stated that the Book of Mormon contains “the fulness of the gospel” (D&C 20:9; 27:5; 42:12). On three separate occasions reported in the Book of Mormon, the basic.
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elements of the gospel are explained by either a prophet or Jesus himself. In each case six central elements are repeated several times in language that is varied to enrich their meaning (2 Ne. 31:2–32:6; 3 Ne. 11:31–41; 27:13–21). Each of these long passages is framed by affirmations that “this is my gospel” or “this is my doctrine.”

These core texts present the gospel message as a six-point formula, which Joseph Smith abbreviated as the “first principle and ordinances of the Gospel” (History of the Church 4:541). The function of this formula is primarily explanatory and pedagogical, as it does not tell converts to Christ “all things [they] should do” (2 Ne. 32:5). Rather, this is the function of the Holy Ghost, whose guidance the follower of Christ must constantly seek (2 Ne. 32:1–5). The formula merely spells out the larger relationship of Christians to their God and provides them the verbal essentials for communicating with one another about that relationship. The formulaic character of this list of points is suggested directly in the record of Aaron’s teachings to the Lamanite king, where it simply says that “the sufferings and death of Christ atone for [people’s] sins, through faith and repentance, and so forth” (Alma 22:14).

1. Repentance. As presented in the Book of Mormon, the formula usually begins with the call to repentance. People must forsake their sins and offer up “a sacrifice . . . [of] a broken heart and a contrite spirit” (3 Ne. 9:20).

2. Baptism. Book of Mormon accounts of the gospel emphasize the importance of baptism. This essential ordinance constitutes a public witness to the Father that the repentant individuals, following the example of Adam and Abraham, have covenanted with God to take upon themselves the name of Christ and to keep his commandments.

3. Holy Ghost. While baptism ritually symbolizes purification and rising from death to life, the actual cleansing or remission of sins comes as a gift from God through the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost (2 Ne. 31:17). Upon reception of the Holy Ghost, the individual is “born again” or “born of God,” having become a new creature (Mosiah 27:24–26). This spiritual experience constitutes a witness to the convert from the Father and the Son that the sacrifice of the penitent has been accepted.

4. Faith. Although contemporary Latter-day Saint teaching emphasizes faith in Jesus Christ as the first principle of the gospel, Book of Mormon prophets often introduce it as the link between what one does to begin the process of salvation and what one must do thereafter. Faith in Christ means doing what the Holy Ghost tells one to do, showing thereby “a steadfastness in Christ,” and, in this manner, enduring to the end (2 Ne. 31:20).

5. Endurance to the End. “Enduring to the end” is the scriptural phrase describing the subsequent life of a member of Christ’s church who has embraced the first four elements of the gospel formula and has entered the gate that leads to eternal life. Once on this strait and narrow path, the new member must press forward in faith. Thus, faith is necessary both
to begin the process and to continue in a life of obedience to all the commandments of God. At this level, faith is also linked with hope and charity.

6. *Eternal Life.* In addition to the daily blessings that come from following the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the gospel of Jesus Christ promises that those who comply with the preceding five points will be saved, which means that they will receive *eternal life* by entering into the kingdom of God. As revealed to the prophet Joseph Smith, this salvation entails becoming heirs to the celestial kingdom (D&C 76:50–70).

The gospel of Jesus Christ is not synonymous with the plan of salvation (or plan of redemption), but is a key part thereof. Brigham Young stated that the “Gospel of the Son of God that has been revealed is a plan or system of laws and ordinances, by strict obedience to which the people who inhabit this earth are assured that they may return again into the presence of the Father and the Son.” While the plan of salvation is what God and Christ have done for mortals in the creation, the fall, the atonement, the final judgment, and the salvation of the world, the gospel contains the instructions—the laws and ordinances—that enable human beings to make the atonement effective in their lives and thereby gain salvation. The plan of salvation, therefore, forms the larger context for all scriptural references to the gospel of Jesus Christ (3 Ne. 27:13–15; Moses 6:62; D&C 20:17–25; 76:40–53). The gospel message makes no sense apart from an understanding of the historical reality of the fall, the atonement of Christ, and a final judgment for each person.

**THE GOSPEL IN THE BOOK OF MORMON**

Jacob, one of the first Nephite prophets, used the phrases “doctrine of Christ” and “gospel of Christ” interchangeably. In speaking to Jacob, Sherem, who denied anyone could know that Christ would come, said that Jacob went about “preaching that which [he called] the gospel, or the doctrine of Christ” (Jacob 7:6). Nephi seems to have also interchanged the two terms. Shortly after leaving Jerusalem, he had prophesied to his brothers that “the fulness of the gospel of the Messiah” would come to the Gentiles (1 Ne. 15:13). Speaking to his brothers further of a future restoration to their seed, Nephi said that their descendants would come to “the knowledge of *the gospel of their Redeemer*” (1 Ne. 15:14, italics added; compare 2 Ne. 30:5). This statement implies not only that they would come to know their Redeemer, but also that they would have knowledge of “the very points of his doctrine.” And it would be by knowing these points of doctrine that they would “know how
to come unto him and be saved” (1 Ne. 15:14, italics added). The gospel contains points of doctrine that teach people how to come unto Christ. It will be demonstrated below that the two Book of Mormon chapters that define the “doctrine of Christ” and the one chapter that defines “the gospel of Christ” all say essentially the same things.

THE GOSPEL AS TAUGHT BY NEPHI

The first comprehensive statement of the gospel or doctrine of Christ in the Book of Mormon occurs in 2 Nephi 31. These twenty-one verses are framed by bookend statements, the first of which says that Nephi will present a few words “concerning the doctrine of Christ” and that he will write “plainly, according to the plainness” of the preceding prophetic summary (2 Ne. 31:2). (In the previous chapter, Nephi had spoken of this same teaching as “the gospel of Jesus Christ” [2 Ne. 30:5].) In chapter 31 Nephi again emphasizes the simplicity of his account, indicating that he will put the matter as plainly as possible, according to human language and understanding (2 Ne. 31:2–3; compare 32:4). The nineteen-verse explication that follows concludes with the reaffirmation that “this is the doctrine of Christ, and the only and true doctrine of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (2 Ne. 31:21). This is a chapter of major importance for the rest of the Book of Mormon, as it establishes a pattern for all later Nephite prophets. It also formulates a complex of ideas that informs every major sermon and gives rich meaning to stories related later in the text. Nephi signalled its importance by prominent placement of this passage at the end of his writings, even though its content is an elaboration of materials presented in undeveloped form much earlier. The importance of Nephi’s formulation was resoundingly emphasized by the Savior himself during his visit to the Nephites five and a half centuries later.

Chapter 31 of 2 Nephi appears to be an amplification of the visions of Lehi and Nephi reported in 1 Nephi 10 and 11, in which each had seen the necessity and mission of the Redeemer. Lehi explained that a redeemer was necessary because “all mankind were in a lost and in a fallen state” (1 Ne. 10:6; see also 1:19). Nephi saw that Jesus was “the Redeemer of the world” (1 Ne. 11:27). Just as Nephi derives from this vision his account of “the doctrine of Christ,” so Lehi uses the vision of Jesus’ baptism as the introduction to his presentation to his sons “concerning the gospel” that Christ preached among the Jews (1 Ne. 10:11). Although Nephi gives only minimal details of Jesus’ baptism in the account summarized in 1 Nephi, there are enough similar details in 2 Nephi 31 that one
can assume this chapter gives a fuller account of what Lehi and Nephi saw in their first camp in the wilderness. For example, Nephi’s first account of Jesus’ baptism is followed by a description of the heavens opening and the Holy Ghost descending in the form of a dove (1 Ne. 11:27). The descent of the Holy Ghost is also repeated in the extended second account (2 Ne. 31:8). Nephi even calls on his readers to remember the earlier account as the context for the additional details he will now report (2 Ne. 31:4). He adds to the second report that Jesus then “said unto the children of men: Follow thou me” (2 Ne. 31:10, 12). The major elaboration in the second account is a set of quotations that Nephi attributes to the voices of the Father and the Son, presumably as narrators explaining the vision to him at the time it was first received. He concludes the chapter with a complex summary that weaves together all the points that have been introduced in the descriptive and narrative sections.

Given the extraordinary significance of Nephi’s presentation of the gospel of Jesus Christ, it is of some interest to know what sources he might have been using. From the text we learn of no definite source beyond the revelation reported in 1 Nephi 11, in which Nephi saw the baptism of Christ in vision and heard the voice of the Son saying to “the children of men: Follow thou me” (2 Ne. 31:10) and “follow me, and do the things which ye have seen me do” (2 Ne. 31:12). Nephi clearly interprets this message to mean that people should follow the example of Jesus Christ. Nephi’s analysis of that example provides him with the formula he uses to teach the doctrine of Christ to his own people and to readers of the Book of Mormon.

The Structure of 2 Nephi 31

The six major points of doctrine, noted above, emerge clearly in this nineteen-verse presentation. Nephi develops these points of doctrine through a complex presentation that advances five versions of his central message, each of which contains some instructive variation:

Variation 1. The example of Christ is given as a first explanation of the gospel (2 Ne. 31:4–10). By humbling himself before the Father, being baptized by water, witnessing unto the Father that he would be obedient in keeping his commandments, and receiving the Holy Ghost, Christ showed the “straitness of the path, and narrowness of the gate, by which they should enter” (2 Ne. 31:9).

Variation 2. The voices of both the Father and the Son are heard identifying the aspects of Christ’s example that are expected
of all individuals—repentance and baptism in order to receive the Holy Ghost (2 Ne. 31:11–12).

Variation 3. Nephi offers his personal testimony to his brothers (2 Ne. 31:13). If they will follow the Son sincerely, repenting of their sins and witnessing to the Father by baptism that they are willing to take upon them the name of Christ, then they will receive the Holy Ghost and “the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost.”

Variation 4. The voices of the Father and Son are invoked again to repeat and explain the central elements of the formula (2 Ne. 31:14–15). The voice of the Son repeats each of these points and warns that those who follow this formula but then deny him will be in a worse condition than before. The voice of the Father endorses the words of the Son as “true and faithful” and adds the promise that those who endure to the end will be saved.

Variation 5. Nephi gives a final summary: people cannot be saved unless they endure to the end. Repentance and baptism by immersion are the gate by which they must enter the kingdom of God. These steps will be followed by a remission of sins by fire and the Holy Ghost. But individuals must remember that all steps in this process are possible only through faith in Jesus Christ. Finally, Nephi writes that enduring to the end implies pressing forward with steadfastness (faith) in Christ, which is to be complemented by “a perfect brightness of hope, and a love of God and of all men” (2 Ne. 31:16–20).

The Content of Nephi’s Message

Nephi’s five-fold presentation reinforces through repetition, variation, and augmentation. The result is the following enriched account of the six basic points of the doctrine of Christ sketched above.

Repentance. Repentance is always the starting point, part of the gate by which one should enter the strait and narrow path (2 Ne. 31:17). In being the example, Christ did not need to start with repentance because, as Nephi states three times, Jesus was holy. Yet, even being holy, Jesus humbled himself before the Father (2 Ne. 31:5, 7). This example identifies humility and total sincerity as the key to repentance. People must follow the Son “with full purpose of heart, acting no hypocrisy and no deception before God, but with real intent, repenting of [their] sins” (2 Ne. 31:13).

Baptism. Baptism is the other part of the gate. It is by repenting and being baptized that one follows the Son through the gate and enters the strait and narrow path that leads to eternal life (2 Ne. 31:17). Baptism is an external witness to the Father of an internal commitment that individuals are “willing to take upon [themselves]
the name of Christ, by baptism” and that they are “willing to keep [Christ’s] commandments” (2 Ne. 31:13–14).

*Holy Ghost*. Christ promises that “the Father [will] give the Holy Ghost” to any repentant person who is baptized in Christ’s name (2 Ne. 31:12). Using an alternative description of this gift, Nephi explains to his brethren that, only after repentance and baptism “cometh the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost” (2 Ne. 31:13). This gift from the Father appears to have multiple functions.

The first function mentioned is the ability to communicate divine knowledge, the power to speak things not previously possible. In Nephi’s words, “then can ye speak with the tongue of angels, and shout praises unto the Holy One of Israel” (2 Ne. 31:13). After concluding his presentation of the doctrine of Christ, Nephi perceives that this matter has not been understood. In chapter 32 he provides further explanation, indicating that “angels speak by power of the Holy Ghost”; therefore, men need the Holy Ghost to speak with the tongue of angels (2 Ne. 32:2–3).

The language of fire in chapter 31 seems directed at a second function of the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost, that of cleansing the recipient from sin. In the third use of this phrase, Nephi says that the remission of sins comes “by fire and by the Holy Ghost” (2 Ne. 31:17).

The third function is that of giving a witness to the convert from the Father and Son. Just as baptism of water constitutes a witness of the convert to the Father, so the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost is a witness from the Father and the Son to the convert. It “witnesses of the Father and the Son,” thereby fulfilling the promise of the gospel that “if ye entered in by the way [repentance and baptism] ye should receive” (2 Ne. 31:18). Nephi further warns in connection with this spiritual baptism that, if after all this one denies Christ, it would be better not to have known him (2 Ne. 31:14).

*Faith*. Nephi treats faith in Jesus Christ as a fundamental principle which underlies all the others and links them together. This same sense was present in Joseph Smith’s original Wentworth Letter which used the singular “first principle and ordinances of the Gospel,” which is rendered *principles* in the Articles of Faith (A of F 4).

Nephi delays introducing faith until near the end of his presentation, for faith is the link between what one does to enter the gate and what one must do thereafter. One cannot have gotten into the gate “save it were by the word of Christ with unshaken faith in him, relying wholly upon the merits of him who is mighty to save” (2 Ne. 31:19). And after getting onto this path, one cannot attain
salvation except by “press[ing] forward with a steadfastness in Christ” (2 Ne. 31:20).

Endurance to the End. The gift of the Holy Ghost in its revelatory function seems particularly designed to aid converts with the final requirement that they endure to the end (2 Ne. 31:15), for unless men and women endure to the end in following Christ’s example, they cannot be saved (2 Ne. 31:16). But, as Nephí explains later when he expounds on his presentation, for all those who have entered in by the way and received the Holy Ghost, “it will show unto [them] all things what [they] should do” (2 Ne. 32:5). Having reduced the message to its essentials, he emphasizes one last time that “this is the doctrine of Christ, and there will be no more doctrine given until after he shall manifest himself unto you” (2 Ne. 32:6).

Enduring to the end implies pressing forward in faith, hope, and charity. This trio of concepts occurs repeatedly in Book of Mormon sermons in connection with this point of the doctrine of Christ (see Moro. 8:26; 10:20–21; Ether 12:32–34). The three are clearly indicated in Nephí’s closing summary where he instructs people to “endure to the end” and

- “press forward with a steadfastness [faith] in Christ,”
- “having a perfect brightness of hope,” and
- “a love of God and of all men.” (2 Ne. 31:20; italics added)

Eternal Life. The reward promised to those who endure to the end is that they “shall be saved” (2 Ne. 31:15). Nephí supplements the words of the Father by insisting that unless individuals follow Christ in repenting, being baptized, and enduring to the end, they cannot be saved (2 Ne. 31:16). Quoting the Father a second time on this point, Nephí says that all who do these things “shall have eternal life” (2 Ne. 31:20) or “be saved in the kingdom of God” (2 Ne. 31:21). Their assurance that this salvation will indeed come to pass is the gift of the Holy Ghost which they receive and enjoy in the present. It is both a living witness that this future promise will be fulfilled and the means by which they can endure to the end and qualify for eternal life.

CHRIST AMONG THE NEPHITES

The report of the events of the coming of Christ among the Nephites is also constructed around multiple repetitions of this doctrine of Christ. Whereas Nephí asks men and women to follow Christ’s example, the Savior himself invites the people to “come unto me” (3 Ne. 12:20).
The Structure of Christ's Teachings

Interestingly, although the account of Christ's visit to the Nephites gives a more scattered and complex treatment of the doctrine of Christ, this record also presents the doctrine five times, each time with instructive variations and internal repetitions.

**Variation 1.** The first and clearest presentation is given by the voice of Christ as it speaks out of the heaven to all the land (3 Ne. 9:1–16). Four of the six points of the doctrine of Christ as outlined by Nephi are specifically advanced in this passage.

The voice of Christ emphasizes the blessings to those who will receive him, stating first that unto such he has “given to become the sons of God” (3 Ne. 9:17). This point is echoed in the closing injunction to all to repent, come unto him as a little child, and be saved (3 Ne. 9:22). To receive him or to come unto him is explained as believing on his name (faith) and offering for a sacrifice unto him “a broken heart and a contrite spirit” (repentance). The immediate promise to those who do this is that he will baptize them “with fire and with the Holy Ghost.” The Lamanites received this baptism because of their faith (3 Ne. 9:20).

**Variation 2.** Baptism of water is the focus of the second and most complete declaration of his doctrine (3 Ne. 11:23–39). Detailed instructions on baptism are given explicitly to settle some earlier (and unreported) disputations (3 Ne. 11:28). All people are to believe in Christ and be baptized, if they will be saved (3 Ne. 11:33). Two repetitions of this point emphasize that men and women must repent, become as little children, and be baptized in his name. Several times Christ emphasizes that he is presenting his doctrine, which the Father has given him (3 Ne. 11:28, 30–32, 39).

**Variation 3.** Jesus then turns to the multitude and gives a briefer version of the same instructions as an introduction to the sermon at the temple (3 Ne. 12:1–2). The message is repeated three times with some variations:

- Those who heed the words of the Twelve and are baptized with water will be baptized by the Lord with fire and the Holy Ghost (3 Ne. 12:1a).
- The people will be blessed if they will believe in Jesus and be baptized (3 Ne. 12:1b).
- All who (1) believe the words of those people who have seen and followed Christ, (2) humble themselves, and (3) are baptized will likewise be visited with fire and the Holy Ghost and will receive a remission of their sins (3 Ne. 12:2).
Variation 4. The sermon at the temple also invokes the language of these instructions at several points. Enduring to the end is finally introduced and then emphasized: Jesus says, “I am the law, and the light. Look unto me, and endure to the end, and ye shall live; for unto him that endureth to the end will I give eternal life” (3 Ne. 15:9).

Variation 5. Following these presentations, the reporter describes in detail the baptism of the Nephites and, in so doing, brings out again the points of this doctrine (3 Ne. 19:7–28). The people pray for the Holy Ghost (3 Ne. 19:7–10). Then they are baptized, the Holy Ghost falls upon them, and they are “filled with the Holy Ghost and with fire” (3 Ne. 19:11–14). Praying in thanksgiving to the Father, Jesus indicates they have been purified because of their faith (3 Ne. 19:28).

The Content of Christ’s Teachings

These passages in 3 Nephi report the doctrine of Christ in the most authoritative setting, as it is the voice of Christ himself that delivers it publicly to all the people. All six of the points of this doctrine as introduced by Nephi are here, though there are several significant variations of phraseology that enrich and enlarge the meaning even further.

Faith. Belief on Christ’s name often comes first and is usually included in every statement about his doctrine, whereas Nephi incorporated faith only once as a unifying link at the end of his sermon (3 Ne. 9:17, 20; 11:32–33; 12:1–2, 19; 19:20, 28). Jesus commands the people to believe in him (3 Ne. 12:1, 19). He says that he chooses his people because of their faith or belief in him (3 Ne. 19:20, 28).

Repentance. Repentance is emphasized, occurring again in almost every restatement or repetition of the points of doctrine. It is here phrased in Isaiah’s terminology of a new sacrifice of a broken heart and a contrite spirit (3 Ne. 9:20; 12:19). It is a commandment that all people repent. As did Nephi, Christ links repentance with the depths of humility (3 Ne. 12:2) but more often with becoming “as a little child” (3 Ne. 9:22; 11:37, 38).

Baptism. Baptism is described by the Savior in terms that are virtually indistinguishable from Nephi’s. The Savior provides the entire baptismal prayer, which indicates that one is baptized by a person holding the authority from Christ to perform this ordinance, such as the twelve disciples who received these instructions. The prayer also explicitly states that immersion is required (3 Ne. 11:23–26).
Holy Ghost. The baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost described by Christ in the first 3 Nephi account is also the same as that presented earlier by Nephi. Jesus indicates that it comes "because of . . . faith." He also says that the converted Lamanites experienced this confirmation without knowing it had happened (3 Ne. 9:20). As in Nephi’s account, this baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost is the means by which the Father bears record of the Son to believers (3 Ne. 11:35); the Holy Ghost bears record of both the Father and the Son. In addressing the multitude, Jesus, like Nephi, links this spiritual baptism, which follows repentance and baptism in water, with the gift of a remission of sins (3 Ne. 12:2). The most important extension of the reader’s understanding of this point of doctrine is provided by the report of the actual event in which the Nephites, taught by Christ, are themselves baptized. After all had been baptized, “the Holy Ghost did fall upon them, and they were filled with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” The people actually saw, as a group, the fire as it came down from heaven and encircled them; the sight dramatized the divine origins of this gift and its purifying effect (3 Ne. 19:13–14).

Endurance to the End. Enduring to the end is also taught to the Nephites in these passages. But it is not elaborated or emphasized nearly as much here as it was by Nephi. The principle is stated clearly and strongly in only one passage (3 Ne. 15:9) and without any elaborations referring explicitly to faith, hope, or charity.

Eternal Life. The final reward of those who come unto Christ by obeying these commandments is, as earlier in Nephi, that they will be saved; they will receive eternal life (3 Ne. 15:9). But this promise is expanded to include the idea that to them it will be “given to become the sons of God” (3 Ne. 9:17), and in the sermon at the temple, they are promised “the kingdom of heaven” (3 Ne. 12:3; 14:21).

CHRIST AMONG THE DISCIPLES

The Savior’s first teachings to the Nephites as described above were aimed at settling disputations about the points of his doctrine (3 Ne. 11:28). His later and undated visit to the disciples focuses similarly on a disputation among the people, this time regarding the name of the Church (3 Ne. 27:3). The Savior’s first response is to point to the gospel. The scriptures instruct people to take upon them the name of Christ, “for by this name shall ye be called at the last day.” The scriptures also promise that whoever does so and endures to the end “shall be saved at the last day.” Similarly, the Church will be Christ’s church if it is called in his name and “if it so be that they
are built upon my [Christ’s] gospel.” The necessity of being built upon his gospel is stated four times, after which he reminds his disciples that he has already given them his gospel (he is apparently referring to 3 Nephi 11 [3 Ne. 27:5–13]).

But the explanation of the gospel is not left to memory, as the Lord launches directly into another definition beginning with the announcement that “this is the gospel” (3 Ne. 27:13). This time the term used is “gospel” rather than “doctrine.” But again, no difference seems to be implied. The one significant difference in this presentation is that it is prefaced with a statement which invokes the larger context of the plan of salvation. Although the full plan of salvation is not spelled out, the atonement of Christ is mentioned as the reason why all men and women will be brought to stand before Christ to be judged (3 Ne. 27:14–16).

Structure of Christ’s Message to the Disciples

The brief presentation in 3 Nephi 27 is based on three repetitions. The first articulation discusses who will be saved. The answer is whoever repents, is baptized, and is filled (with the Holy Ghost [see 3 Ne. 12:6]), and if the person endures to the end, he or she will be held guiltless at the day of judgment. Those who do not endure to the end will be cast into the fire (3 Ne. 27:16–17; compare 3 Ne. 12:2, 6). In one brief sentence, the Lord articulates five of the six points of his gospel. Enduring to the end is emphasized by being mentioned twice while faith is left unstated.

The second articulation remedies the omission by emphasizing the role of faith: “Nothing entereth into his rest save it be those who have washed their garments in my blood, because of their faith, and the repentance of all their sins, and their faithfulness unto the end” (3 Ne. 27:19). This version does not explicitly mention baptism of water or the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost, but they are implied in the idea of washing one’s garments in his blood.

The third articulation clarifies even this point: “Repent, . . . come unto me and be baptized in my name, that ye may be sanctified by the reception of the Holy Ghost, that ye may stand spotless before me at the last day” (3 Ne. 27:20). The context of the judgment is retained throughout.

Content of Christ’s Message to the Disciples

This series of brief definitional statements is framed by verse 13 and the similar concluding reaffirmation in verse 21: “Verily, verily, . . . this is my gospel.” As brief as these statements are, further insights on the individual points of doctrine emerge.
Faith. Faith leads to baptism of water and fire, by which people wash their garments in the blood of Christ. And faith is the key to endurance or “faithfulness unto the end” (3 Ne. 27:19).

Repentance. Repentance is mentioned three times, but elaborated only at one point where Christ indicates that washing one’s garments in his blood requires “repentance of all [one’s] sins” (3 Ne. 27:19).

Baptism. In this sermon, Christ mentions baptism two times with the only elaboration being its implicit inclusion in the concept of washing garments clean in his blood (3 Ne. 27:19).

Holy Ghost. The baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost is mentioned or implied three times but in different terms. The promise that those who are baptized will be filled (3 Ne. 27:16) must, in light of 3 Nephi 12:6, refer to the Holy Ghost. One statement, that those who come unto Christ and are baptized will be “sanctified by the reception of the Holy Ghost,” elaborates on the cleansing power of the baptism of fire and its implicit inclusion in the washing of garments in the blood of Christ (3 Ne. 27:20).

Endurance to the End. Endurance to the end and failure to endure to the end are explicitly mentioned (3 Ne. 27:16). In the second articulation, this phrase becomes “faithfulness unto the end” (3 Ne. 27:19).

Eternal Life. With the focus on judgment in this chapter, it is not surprising that the rewards of the faithful are first stated in terms of being held “guiltless” at the judgment day (3 Ne. 27:16). But the Savior quickly returns to the traditional language of entering his kingdom or entering into his rest (3 Ne. 27:19). The judgment context reasserts itself in the final articulation as the faithful will be able to “stand spotless before [him] at the last day” (3 Ne. 27:20).

ABBREVIATED STATEMENTS OF THE GOSPEL (MERISMS)

To this point this paper has been concerned with an analysis of the three major statements in the Book of Mormon that provide complete definitions of the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Taken together, the three provide the reader with a clear concept of the gospel of Jesus Christ, as the Nephites understood it, as well as a rich abundance of explanatory and metaphorical insights into the individual points of doctrine.

Although the three statements constitute the clearest and fullest definitions of the gospel, they are only a small portion of the total Book of Mormon statements on this subject. The same pattern appears in the teachings of all the Book of Mormon prophets in the form of injunctions to the people to believe in Christ, to repent, to
be baptized that they might be cleansed by reception of the Holy Ghost, and to endure to the end and be saved. As in the definitional chapters, these many statements of the gospel contain instructive variations on terminology. But individually these statements are often elliptical, leaving out one or more of the six points. However, for an audience familiar with the basic pattern in the three defining statements, the reference is perfectly clear.

These elliptical references by Book of Mormon prophets often take the form of merismus, a classical rhetorical device in which the division of an important topic or statement into component parts allowed for its full invocation by explicit listing of selected parts only. In the Hebrew Bible, merismus occurs as concise or condensed expressions which, by mentioning the first and last or more prominent elements of a series, implicitly invoke the larger entity: “Symbolically expressed, merismus is the brachylogous use of A+Y or A+B+Y or A+X+Y in place of the complete series A+B+C . . . +X+Y to represent the collective Z of which the individuals A to Y are members.”

Understood as a formula composed of a list of ordered elements, the gospel lends itself well to this rhetorical device. By mentioning two or more elements, usually including the last element, a writer can invoke all components of the formula even though they are not each mentioned explicitly. A typical Book of Mormon example of a merism states that believing in Jesus and enduring to the end is life eternal (2 Ne. 33:4). A conservative count of gospel-related merisms in the Book of Mormon, including the multiple presentations summarized below, gives at least 130 fairly clear statements of the gospel or doctrine of Christ (see Appendix).

The pattern found in Nephi’s early definitional statement of the gospel shows up immediately in the teaching of Nephi’s brother, Jacob (unless Nephi actually derives it from Jacob) and throughout the teaching of later Book of Mormon prophets. Almost every doctrinal teacher and writer in the Book of Mormon witnesses to the same set of teachings, sometimes with distinctive terminology, but always with the same logical structure of ideas. The pattern is set by Lehi, Nephi, and Jacob. Others who carry on the tradition include Amaleki, Benjamin, Alma, Mosiah, Alma the Younger, Amulek, Amnon, Aaron, Helaman and his sons, Nephi and Lehi, Samuel the Lamanite, Mormon, and Moroni. Ether is reported by Moroni to have taught the same gospel pattern to the Jaredites in their decline. The greatest emphasis of all occurs in the record of Christ’s teachings to the Nephites. There can be no doubt that this was a conceptual pattern of the first importance to the Nephites in their teachings about God and his children.
Most of these passages are quite clear and use the same basic language developed in the definitional chapters. For example, in his comments about the future Gentiles, the Savior commands the Nephites to record his words for the benefit of the Gentiles, for whoever "will hearken unto my words" (have faith) and repent and be baptized "shall be saved" (3 Ne. 23:5). It would be difficult to state a majority of the points of the doctrine of Christ in fewer words. In a similar appeal, Mormon invites the Gentiles to repent, come unto Christ, and be baptized in his name, that they may receive a remission of their sins, be filled with the Holy Ghost, and be numbered with his people (3 Ne. 30:2). Jacob is just as clear and economical in stating the whole formula negatively. In his great sermon on redemption he warns all people that "if they will not repent and believe in [Christ's] name, and be baptized in his name, and endure to the end, they must be damned" (2 Ne. 9:24).

In some cases it seems we have what amounts to a merism within a merism. As has been indicated above, enduring to the end was explained by Nephi in terms of faith, hope, and charity (2 Ne. 31:20). Like his father, Moroni also emphasized these principles, perhaps using them singly to invoke the trio. (See for example, Ether 12:32 and 34, where hope and charity respectively seem to invoke enduring to the end.)

Other passages say the same things with a more complex vocabulary. Nephi ends his writings by appealing to the Gentiles, indicating that there is no hope for them except "they shall be reconciled unto Christ, and enter into the narrow gate, and walk the strait path which leads to life, and continue in the path until the end of the day of probation" (2 Ne. 33:9). Moroni's final farewell invites all people to come unto Christ and be perfected in him by denying themselves all ungodliness. Then they will be sanctified "through the shedding of the blood of Christ, which is in the covenant of the Father unto the remission of sins, that [they] become holy, without spot" (Moro. 10:32–33).

Many passages present fuller versions of the gospel, exhibiting unique emphases and phrasings. In his summary of the Jaredite record, Moroni inserts another appeal from the Lord to the future Gentiles, an appeal which is built on repeated urgings to believe and to come unto the Lord. The time will come when they will rend the veil of unbelief and call upon the Father in the name of Christ, with broken hearts and contrite spirits. All must repent and come unto Christ, believe in his gospel, and be baptized in his name. All who do this will be saved, if they are found faithful at the last day, and they will be lifted up to dwell in the kingdom Christ has prepared for them (Ether 4:10–19).
Because the gospel formula is so clearly established and understood among Book of Mormon peoples, it frequently provides the implicit interpretive or explanatory framework for reports of actual historical experiences. The description of the baptism of the Nephites by Christ’s disciples has already been mentioned above (see 3 Ne. 19). But there are numerous other examples, including the description in Mosiah of the response of Benjamin’s people to his great sermon (Mosiah 5), the account of Limhi’s people and their hope of forming a church based on Alma’s principles (Mosiah 21:30–35), the efforts of Alma to organize a church among the Nephites (Mosiah 25), Alma the Younger’s account of his conversion (Mosiah 27), the confrontation of Nephi and Lehi with their captors in the prison (Hel. 5), Samuel’s description of the conversion of the Lamanites (Hel. 15), and Mormon’s description of the establishment of the church among the Nephites by the disciples of Christ (4 Ne. 1). In these reports, the details of what happened and what people did make sense only in terms of the doctrine of Christ and its basic elements. These experiences illustrate the process of sinful people coming to Christ and partaking of his saving power through his gospel. The assumed background teaching of the gospel informs the accounts and gives them meaning far beyond the actual descriptions in the text.

Book of Mormon discussions of ordinances are almost all stated in such a way as to invoke most of the elements of the doctrine of Christ. Salient examples include the baptismal instructions and prayer of Alma at the waters of Mormon (Mosiah 18:7–13), of Christ among the Nephites (3 Ne. 11), and of Moroni (Moro. 6), as well as the introduction of the sacrament (3 Ne. 20) and the pattern for ordaining priests and teachers as reported by Moroni (Moro. 3). For example, this last reference records the actual prayer of ordination used by the Nephites. The ordainer speaks “in the name of Jesus Christ” and ordains the candidate to preach repentance and remission of sins through Jesus Christ by the “endurance of faith on his name to the end” (Moro. 3:3). Moroni further explains that they ordained men by the power of the Holy Ghost (Moro. 3:4). This discussion is soon followed by an account of the procedures for baptism (Moro. 6). Again, faith in Jesus Christ, the most obvious element, is omitted.

One of the main contexts in which Book of Mormon prophets invoked the gospel of Jesus Christ explicitly and implicitly was in their sermons on redemption, rebirth, priesthood, Israel, and other subjects. The language and logic of many such sermons would be unintelligible without implicit awareness of the various elements of the gospel. Examples include Jacob’s sermon on redemption
(2 Ne. 9); Zenos’s allegory of the olive tree (Jacob 5); Benjamin’s valedictory sermon (Mosiah 2–5); Alma’s discourse on priesthood (Alma 13); Moroni’s discourse on faith, hope, and charity (Moro. 7); and Mormon’s discussion of the baptism of children (Moro. 8).

The other LDS scriptures contain similar formulations of the gospel of Jesus Christ, many of which also include merisms. (See D&C 10:63–70; 11:9–24; 19:29–32; 20:37; 33:10–13; 39:6; 68:25; Moses 5:14–15, 58; 6:50–53.) Drawing on this perspective, Latter-day Saints can see the same concept behind more succinct New Testament passages (Matt. 3:11; 24:13–14; Acts 2:38; 19:4–6; Rom. 1:16). For example, Paul’s statement to the Ephesians that “by grace are ye saved through faith” can be read as a merism, implicitly invoking all elements of the gospel even though only faith and salvation, the first and last, are mentioned (Eph. 2:8).

CONCLUSION

Three Book of Mormon passages provide extended definitions of the gospel or doctrine of Jesus Christ. In each case the definition is a six-point formula that is repeated in varied ways. Numerous additional passages and merisms assume these definitions in a way that indicates the definitions were both normative and paradigmatic for all Book of Mormon writers. Their gospel message can be understood only in terms of a larger context, that of the plan of salvation, which includes accounts of the creation, the fall, the atonement of Jesus Christ, and a future judgment. Given that context, the gospel taught by Nephi and the Savior tells us that anyone who has faith in Jesus Christ, repents, is baptized, receives the Holy Ghost, and endures to the end will be saved in the kingdom of heaven.
APPENDIX

Gospel Merisms in the Book of Mormon

Key:
1: Faith or belief in Christ.
2: Repentance.
3: Baptism and obedience to the commandments.
4: Receiving the Holy Ghost.
5: Enduring to the end, sometimes indicated meristically by mention of only one distinctive element, hope or charity.
6: Gaining salvation or eternal life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Nephi</th>
<th>Mosiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:4 (6)</td>
<td>2:41 (3, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15–30 (5, 6)</td>
<td>3:21 (1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:18 (2)</td>
<td>4:30 (3, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:37 (4, 5, 6)</td>
<td>5:15 (5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:5 (2, 6)</td>
<td>12:33 (3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:14 (6)</td>
<td>15:11 (1, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:31 (3, 5, 6)</td>
<td>15:22 (1, 3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:13 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nephi</td>
<td>18:7 (1, 2, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9 (1, 6)</td>
<td>18:9 (5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:12 (2, 6)</td>
<td>18:13 (3, 4, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:23 (1, 2, 3, 6)</td>
<td>18:20 (1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:24 (1, 2, 3, 5, 6)</td>
<td>21:31 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:2 (1, 2)</td>
<td>23:22 (1, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:7 (1)</td>
<td>26:22 (1, 2, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:7–15 (2, 3, 4, 5, 6)</td>
<td>26:23 (1, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:16 (5, 6)</td>
<td>26:32 (2, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:17 (2, 3, 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:20 (5, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:5 (1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:4 (1, 5, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:9 (1, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11–13 (1, 5, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:51 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:62 (2, 3, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:14 (1, 2, 3, 4, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4 (1, 6)</td>
<td>9:12 (2, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:11 (2, 3, 5, 6)</td>
<td>9:27 (1, 2, 3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40 (1, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 (1, 2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:33 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Gospel of Jesus Christ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:34 (2, 6)</td>
<td>14:21 (3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35 (2, 6)</td>
<td>15:1 (3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:37 (2, 6)</td>
<td>15:9 (1, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:13 (2, 6)</td>
<td>16:13 (2, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:28–29 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)</td>
<td>18:32 (2, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:36 (1, 2, 6)</td>
<td>19:28 (1, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:6 (2, 6)</td>
<td>23:5 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:2 (2)</td>
<td>26:17 (3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:13 (2, 5, 6)</td>
<td>27:6 (1, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:15 (2, 5)</td>
<td>27:16 (2, 3, 4, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:41–42 (1, 6)</td>
<td>27:17 (5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:23 (1, 6)</td>
<td>27:19 (1, 2, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:31 (2, 6)</td>
<td>27:20 (2, 3, 4, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:24 (2, 4)</td>
<td>30:2 (2, 3, 4, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:2 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:6 (2, 5, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:31 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helaman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:28 (1, 6)</td>
<td>7:10 (1, 3, 4, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11 (2, 6)</td>
<td>9:6 (1, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:41 (1, 2)</td>
<td>9:23 (1, 3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:47 (1)</td>
<td>9:29 (3, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:28 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:22 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:14 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:6 (1, 2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:11 (1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:13 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13 (1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:29 (1, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:7 (1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ether**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:14 (1, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:18 (1, 2, 3, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:5 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:4 (1, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:9 (1, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:32 (5, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:34 (5, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3 Nephi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:16 (1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25 (2, 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:17 (1, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:22 (2, 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:31–33 (1, 2, 3, 6)</td>
<td>7:44 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:37 (2, 3, 6)</td>
<td>8:3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:38 (2, 3, 6)</td>
<td>8:25–26 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:2 (1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
<td>10:21 (5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20 (3, 6)</td>
<td>10:32–33 (1, 2, 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moroni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:3 (2, 4, 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1–4 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>7:26 (1, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:34 (1, 2, 3, 6)</td>
<td>7:38 (1, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25–26 (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)</td>
<td>10:21 (5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:32–33 (1, 2, 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES

1 Brigham Young, *Discourses of Brigham Young: Second President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, arr. John A. Widtsoe (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1983), 1.

2 Some readers might wonder if the formula reported here as the "gospel" is not overly restricted. It does not mention missionary work, temple marriage, genealogy, or home teaching. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the term as used in the Book of Mormon only. No attention is given to the much broader meanings one encounters in contemporary Latter-day Saint discourse.

One might ask why it is that a baptizer needs authority if, following Nephi, baptism is only the outward evidence one gives of an internal covenant. Why is not baptism simply an act initiated by the convert? Nephi’s brother Jacob teaches that there is a keeper that minds the gate by which a person enters into the straight and narrow way (2 Ne. 9:41). Minimally, the authorized baptizer represents the Holy One of Israel, bringing the repentant applicant through the true gate. Other gates may lead to other places. Furthermore, in submitting to baptism by particularly authorized agents, individuals indicate publicly and to the Lord that it is the gospel taught by those agents that they wish to obey.

I am indebted to Paul Y. Hoskisson for calling my attention to this phenomenon and its possible significance for this study. Professor Hoskisson is conducting a comprehensive study of merismus in the Book of Mormon, which, when published, will provide a valuable perspective for the present analysis.


A Sophic and a Mantic People

H. Curtis Wright

In the early sixties the manuscripts for what are now the last two chapters of Hugh Nibley's *The Ancient State: The Rulers and the Ruled* came into my possession. In them Nibley describes the ancient conflict between Western naturalism and Eastern supernaturalism, a conflict which has given rise to modern civilization with its polluted atmosphere of secular righteousness and split-level churches and which pits the academic religion of culture against the prophetic culture of revealed religion. This paper is a response to those chapters.

The fundamental ambivalence of Western civilization consists of a permanent conflict of spiritualities derived from the human condition itself. The assumptions underlying this conflict have created the mantic world view of vertical supernaturalism, a dualistic metaphysic that includes not only the natural order, but also another world order which transcends it, and the sophic world view of horizontal naturalism, a monistic metaphysic that confines all realities to the natural order. The antithetical spiritualities implicit in these disparate perspectives became explicit at the dawn of human existence, when our first parents, following their expulsion from Eden, taught the revealed word of God to their children, only to face formidable opposition when "Satan came among them, saying: . . . Believe it not; and they believed it not." Thus, unbelief arose as a counter to faith in anything that is not experienced naturally, for Adam witnessed in his immediate family the decisive split between skepticism and belief which has since polarized the human race. The issue exercising unbelievers, therefore, has always been their refusal to accept any kind of information revealed by God to the faithful. This issue is clearly seen in the contrast between the mantic Abel and the sophic Cain, who were born after the gospel and antigospel traditions were both in place. Thus, "Abel hearkened unto the voice of the Lord" as a man
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of faith, but Cain was a skeptic who “rejected the greater counsel which was had from God” and “hearkened not [to the words of the Lord], saying: Who is the Lord that I should know him?” When the Lord subsequently rejected Cain’s sacrifice, which was prompted not by the revealed spirit of faith, but by the natural spirit of unbelief, “Cain was wroth, and listened not any more to the voice of the Lord, neither to Abel, his brother,” nor to anyone else “who walked in holiness before the Lord,” and he was “shut out from the presence of the Lord”—not because the Lord rejected him, but because he rejected the Lord.4

The sophic and mantic spiritualities are thoroughly confused in modern life, but they are regarded as ontologically distinct and logically separate by all of the ancient and most of the modern prophets. The saints of God are the holy ones (hoi hagioi), people who are sanctified by a revealed spirituality because they live by the supernatural gift of faith, whereas the natural man, who lives solely by reason and the senses, is any person whose spirituality is naturalistic. The Greek text of 1 Corinthians 2:12-14 and its Latin translation are explicit as to these two kinds of spirituality. Since psychikos anthropos (animalis homo) refers to the spiritual psyche of a human being and not to the physical body, the “natural man” constitutes the secular version of the spiritual man, which Paul compares to the pneumatikos [anthropos] (spiritualis [homo])—the Christian version of the spiritual man whose spirit (pneuma, spiritus) descends from above as a charismatic gift. The natural man is thus a spiritual man, the human being as psyche (anima), not as soma (corpus). We confirm this distinction every day by discussing sophic manifestations of the human “spirit” in the liberal arts and elsewhere without referring in any way at all to the mantic spirit of revealed religion. A “full” translation of this text which incorporates forgotten subtleties like these into itself might read as follows:

We are not animated by the natural spirit of the cosmos, but by the Spirit that comes from God, so that we may distinguish God’s free gifts to us [from the provisions of nature]. We speak openly of God’s gifts, but not in words that generate instruction from humanly originated wisdom: we use instead the words that communicate information derived from the Holy Spirit; and we also utilize the Holy Spirit as a criterion for determining what is and is not revealed. But the man whose spirituality is naturalistic rejects as absurd everything derived from the Spirit of God: he is incapable of experiencing such things himself, and has no means of evaluating them in others in the absence of revelation.5

The spiritual conflict of naturalism and revealed religion permeates the scriptures of the Latter-day Saints and as Hugh
Nibley’s writings have shown, is attested in one guise or another in virtually all of the world’s cultures. It has created the head-on collisions of Athens with Jerusalem, for example, which pervade the whole of Western intellectual history. The sophic view, which eventually prevailed in Greece, has thus given birth to Greco-Roman naturalism, whereas the Egypto-Mesopotamian supernaturalism which produced the Judeo-Christian tradition is the issue of the mantic outlook. The radically different perspectives on reality which underlie this clash of spiritualities cannot be held at the same time by a rational human being. It is possible to vacillate between them because vacillation is sequential, not simultaneous, but it remains forever impossible to believe simultaneously that the natural order is all there is and that there is something other than the natural order.

These conflicting world views, however, are not the simple opposites of one another. The Judeo-Christian view is perforce inclusionary, for example, because no one can believe in a supernatural order that transcends the natural order without also believing in the natural order. But the Greco-Roman view is intentionally exclusionary because intellectuals in the sixth century B.C., who despised the presence of Oriental mystery religions in Greece, made a determined effort to exclude all forms of Near Eastern supernaturalism from their cultural traditions. They were not completely successful in the short run, but how well they succeeded in the long run may be inferred from a study of Occidental irreligion significantly entitled The Alternative Tradition. The title is purposely suggestive, for naturalism is indeed a reactive tradition which must be studied in relation to the tradition it reacts against. Thus, the instances of naturalism, such as the recurring conflicts of science with religion, “can be understood only against the background of the religious belief . . . [they] question or deny.” The influence of the religious and skeptical traditions on each other, moreover, has never been identical. The overall tendency of their interaction is always one-sided—toward the naturalization of religion, not toward the supernaturalizing of science or scholarship—since naturalism is committed to the extermination of supernaturalism (something it can never hope to accomplish) and reacts only negatively to religious criticism. Supernaturalists, on the other hand, have always seen some value—and often great value—in naturalism: the monastic preservation of the classical heritage through the perils of the early middle ages is sufficient proof of that. The story of Western civilization would have been very different if the great skeptics of the alternative tradition had been given an opportunity to let Christianity sink into oblivion.
Thrower says about the uneven nature of the responses of naturalism and religion to each other that much of the ongoing development of religion has been in response to the critique which naturalism has brought against it. Rarely, however, has the reverse been the case. Naturalism has developed almost entirely by its own momentum, conditioned only by . . . the external world; for naturalism holds the meaning of the world to lie—in all spheres—within itself. It makes no reference to those "powers" . . . beyond space and time . . . which . . . [religions] hold to be operative in history determining the destiny of men. The whole meaning of man's life is, for naturalism, to be found . . . within this world. Herein lies the crux of the ongoing argument between a religious and a non-religious response to . . . [reality].

In studying "the growth of a . . . naturalistic view of the world," Thrower also had to study "the outlook on the world which naturalism seeks to supplant." That outlook is exemplified, according to Nibley, by an Egyptian pharaoh who was known to his contemporaries as a sophos kai mantikos aner, "a sophic and a mantic man." But the religious attitudes of people like the pharaoh, who combine natural and supernatural realities in a single world view, have always been repugnant to the naturalists, who describe them as mythological since "the premises upon which they base their whole response to the world are different from the premises upon which . . . [we] base our understanding of the world today." In fact, "much contemporary religious language is still mythological . . . in that events . . ., both past and present, are interpreted in terms of a mixed, natural/supernatural language."

The sticking point for the secular mentality is the mix, which, no matter how minute the mantic element, contaminates the sophic point of view.

The question remains "whether events in the world are to be understood as resulting from natural causes . . . or whether we can discern in events, and in the world process, divine activity and purpose." The Judeo-Christian tradition, says Thrower, "has answered this question in the affirmative," since it has always claimed that "there is . . . divine purpose and providence in the world," and that at least "some events are the outcome of direct divine intervention." But Thrower, himself, is not convinced, for "the whole . . . development of our understanding of both the world and of history has . . . since the sixteenth century, been away from this response to the world." This "modern" attitude has been institutionalized in Bultmann's Formgeschichte, which has discredited the older source criticism and its naive belief in the historicity of scripture:
The whole conception of the world which is presupposed in the preaching of Jesus as in the New Testament generally is mythological. . . . We call [it] mythological because it is different from the conception of the world . . . developed by science since its inception in ancient Greece and which has been accepted by all modern men. . . . Modern science does not believe that the course of nature can be interrupted . . . by supernatural powers. The same is true of the modern study of history, which does not take into account any intervention of God . . . or of demons in the [historical process] . . . Modern men take it for granted that the course of nature and of history . . . is nowhere interrupted by the intervention of supernatural powers. . . . For modern man the mythological conception of the world, the conceptions of eschatology, of redeemer and of redemption, are over and done with.17

The traditions of naturalism and revealed religion have always divided “those who saw the world as created and directed by a transcendent God and those who did not.”18 But straddling this great divide in order to counterpose these two traditions for the critical study of skepticism and faith is no easy task, as “the growth of this juxtaposition is long and complex,” as old as humanity itself. The sophic spirit, like its mantic counterpart, “can be found from the time of man’s earliest recorded speculations; . . . always it has been there, in all cultures and at all times—for it is one polarity of the questing human spirit.”19 Thus, the ambitious purpose of Thrower’s study is to delineate the beginnings and subsequent growth of the natural tradition throughout antiquity “in contradistinction to the . . . religious tradition.”20

Greek culture moves from religion through mythology to philosophy, where it splits into *matter philosophy*, which creates the natural and physical sciences, and *form philosophy*, which creates humanistic scholarship.21 It was the “new” world view of the Ionian materialists that triggered the shift from mythology to philosophy—a shift that radically altered Western thought by interrupting its fascination with the “old” world view of Oriental supernaturalism and by diverting its attention to the natural order: “The ‘new understanding of the world’ consisted in the substitution of natural for mythological causes. . . . ['Nature’ is thenceforth seen as] something essentially internal and intrinsic to the world, the [operating] principle of its growth and present organization, [which is] identified at this early stage with its material constituent.”22 Philosophy was therefore born when the old mythological beliefs (which personified the forces of nature as suprahuman agents) were overthrown by a new metaphysical conviction “that the apparent chaos of events” conceals an “underlying order” of its own “and that this order is the product of impersonal forces.”23
This conviction consigns all conceivable causes and their effects throughout the whole of reality to the natural order itself; beyond the natural order, if this conviction is taken seriously, there is absolutely nothing that exists or is real. Thus, the seedlings of empiricism, with its dogged refusal to tolerate transcendent propositions of any kind, were sown in the sixth century B.C., for without “systematic enquiry into the workings of the [physical] world,” coupled with “a [conceptual] grasp of the fundamental unity of natural processes” and “their independence of supernatural interference,” the rise of modern science would have been impossible. This whole scenario, moreover, was reenacted on a grand scale in early modern times, when “the ‘new philosophy’ of nature . . . was to undermine the . . . Christian mythico-religious understanding of the world on just such an account,” and it is therefore “the gradual recovery of this outlook . . . that brings to fruition the . . . naturalism of our own time.” The sophic spirituality of Greek naturalism, in other words, which was obscured by the sophic-mantic confusions of neoplatonism and Christianity for more than a millennium, “will be revived and developed in Western Europe from the sixteenth century onwards,” and “the issues which it raises for religion are . . . very much alive today.”

The twentieth-century breakdown of religion, according to Thrower, has led to the widespread conviction that we “live today in a post-religious age, and are . . . the first persons in . . . history . . . to do so.” The modern horizontalists, certainly, have been relentless in their criticism of the vertical tradition. They have launched a devastating attack on Christianity and on “the . . . mythico-religious response to which it is allied. . . . which sees the world as admixed with . . . supernatural forces.” Their frontal assaults on revealed religion, “combined with positive speculation into the origin of the world and into natural processes,” have produced “the first glimmerings of the alternative tradition” in modern times, “which . . . finally reaches fruition in our own day”—and does so “only within Western culture.” This sophic tradition has subsequently emasculated Occidental revelationism and, as noted by Karl Marx, secularized its mantic institutions:

All criticism is derived from the criticism of religion. . . . Criticism, accordingly, has removed the imaginary flowers [of Christianity] from the chain [of the supernatural tradition], thus enabling man to throw off the cheerless drudgery of his shackles and pluck the living flower [of naturalism]. The criticism of religion disillusioned man, causing him to think, to act, and to construct his reality like a disillusioned man who has come to his senses; and he thenceforth revolves around himself, his true sun, since religion is merely the illusion of a sun that revolves around man only if man does not
revolve around himself. Once the other world of [supposititious] truth has been discredited, furthermore, the function of history is to establish the truth of this world; and the most basic function of philosophy, which serves as the hierodule of history, is to expose the secular forms of human self-alienation, once its religious form has been exposed. The criticism of heaven therefore descends to earth, where [primary] criticisms of religion and theology are transmuted into the [secondary] criticisms of legal and political institutions.30

The process of horizontalizing the vertical tradition, "needless to say, is not, as yet, complete."31 The "as yet" makes it clear, however, that the naturalists can never rest until it is complete.

This incompleteness poses a fundamental problem for intellectual history. Thrower focuses the problem by making the seemingly arrogant claim that his account of metaphysical naturalism constitutes "the first . . . attempt [ever] made to survey this field."32 That claim, surely, is not sensu stricto true. Or is it? My own attempts to locate accounts like Thrower's had been systematically frustrated for at least thirty years before I stumbled onto a Festschrift edited by Warren Wagar, which identified Franklin L. Baumer of Yale University as an intellectual historian who had devoted his entire academic career to this very problem.33 The Baumer Festschrift underscores the problem posed above: whereas everyone seems to realize that "the axial themes of religious and antireligious thought relate somehow to fundamental human needs,"34 says Wagar, it is very difficult to study either of those themes as a whole, to say nothing of studying their complex interactions. Thus, Baumer, writing in the late fifties, found a formidable dearth of information on this problem, a dearth which has persisted into the nineties. The horizontal scholars, it seems, whose idea of "objectivity" is to criticize everybody else's assumptions, have produced the critical histories of everything in sight, including Christianity, with one important exception—they have not produced a single critical history of their own tradition:

[The skeptical tradition] is clearly one of the most important traditions in modern European history—and one of the most neglected. Other traditions, such as the classical tradition, the romantic tradition, the Christian tradition, the humanistic tradition, the scientific tradition, the conservative, liberal, democratic, and socialist traditions, have found their historians. To my knowledge, however, no one has properly identified and charted the course of the sceptical tradition down to the present.35

I was stunned to learn this fact from Baumer, for it means that scholarly naturalists, whatever their disciplines, have been free to criticize the assumptions of the Judeo-Christian tradition, whereas
the assumptions of the Greco-Roman tradition have never been seriously challenged in modern times. A large part of the reason for this oversight, it seems to me, is that the ruling ideas of the scientific revolt against metaphysical dualism have favored the world view of the Greco-Roman tradition, which rejects the supernatural realities of Judeo-Christian revelation. To cite one example from Western thought: the burden of proving the existence of God has always fallen on the believer, and the unbeliever has never been confronted with the necessity of proving the nonexistence of God. This is unmistakably a lopsided situation. It obtains because all of the arguments both for and against the existence or nonexistence of transcendent realities are derived from the axiomatic assumptions which underlie the ancient quarrel of naturalism with supernaturalism. But axioms are not things we think about: they are assumptions we think with, the deep gut reactions to the inscrutable mystery of our own existence which constitute the metaphysical starting points that determine how we think about everything. They can neither be proven nor disproven, to be sure, because they lurk somewhere in the darkest recesses of the human mind, where they govern all of its brilliant demonstrations of rational logic and systematic evaluations of empirical evidence. If the ground assumptions and root metaphors of the horizontal tradition are hidden from view today, it is not because they constitute the only fountainheads of truth or falsity: it is because the "nimbly shifting Zeitgeist," as someone has called the prevailing spirit of the times, has exposed the foundations of the vertical tradition to critical examination while protecting those of the horizontal tradition from scrutiny.

There is a crucially important risk which inheres in ignoring such a glaring omission, for "the contemporary religious problem is simply unintelligible," and may indeed be unsolvable, "without full awareness of it."35 The unbelievers, however, are not to blame for this problem, for the believers, who have been put on the defensive by the rise of skepticism, have not done their homework: they should be thoroughly familiar, even fascinated, with the dynamics of unbelief, more interested in their opponents, perhaps, than in anything except revealed religion itself. This neglect has always been one of the greatest weaknesses of believers: they simply do not know the history of the Western intellect, with all of its perversions and weaknesses; and they are therefore constantly wandering unawares into its blind alleys and dead ends, marvelling that strange things are happening to them, wondering how they got into the messes they are in, and speechless as to why things should be this way.
Baumer launched a determined effort to begin closing this “gap,” as he calls it, by tracing the modern development of the horizontal tradition in order “to show how and by whom it was generated, and how it grew and gained momentum up to and including the present ‘crisis’ which Jung, Tillich, Joad, and others so vividly describe.”37 The result is illuminating, for it shows, without whitewashing the excesses of the religious camp in any way, how desperately the naturalist needs the supernaturalist as a kind of straight man or whipping boy to play against. Unlike Thrower, however, whose naturalistic bias is blatantly transparent, Baumer withdraws from both traditions in order to study their mutual interactions, but he really belongs to both of them, and he struggles to understand the “why” and the “how” of this belonging. He reminds us of Barbara Ward’s warning that “faith will not be restored in the West because people believe it to be useful. It will return only when they find that it is true.”38 And Baumer follows that warning with a searching question of his own: “In view of the rise of scepticism during the last four hundred years,” is “modern man” really no longer capable of accepting even the slightest possibility that there might be some truth, however meager, in religion?39 This question, Baumer points out, is the real nub of the problem. . . . “Modern man” . . . is the heir of a great tradition, . . . the sceptical tradition, which at crucial points challenges another great tradition, the . . . Judaeo-Christian tradition. . . . In the present epoch a large . . . number of Europeans have expressed a desire to return . . . to “the sheltering womb” of the religious tradition, or at least to something approximating it—partly for reasons of psychic health, partly because they suspect that it may be essential to “civilization” to do so. . . . [But] this new “will to believe” . . . conflicts with their [modern] world view. Whenever they take it into their heads to “return,” the shades of all the great sceptics, Pierre Bayle and Voltaire, Ernest Renan and Sigmund Freud and the rest, rise up around them and persuade them . . . that they cannot go back. This is the religious dilemma of “modern man,” and it cannot be solved . . . by utilitarian arguments.40

Baumer is onto something here, for the conflict of disparate spiritualities caused by the infiltration of each by the other is both intricate and paradoxical, raising the eyebrows of naturalists and supernaturalists alike. But the either-or disjunction is definitely out, because no one can live either with nothing but religion or completely without religion. The naturalists have tried the latter, only to create “what Baumer calls the ‘humanistic faith’ of the Enlightenment and its heirs, the ‘ersatz-religions’ of the nineteenth century”41 (with their deification of such “gods” as Science, Mankind, Society, Nature, History, and Culture), which subsequently
failed miserably to perform the functions of religion; and the supernaturalists have proven the former by demonstrating the folly of regarding our involvement with the two traditions as “the melodrama of a war to the death between implacable foes.”42 Western cultural history, as a matter of fact, is fairly permeated with paradoxes of this kind. For example, the Reformers, driven by an immense desire to bring religion down to earth, “sacrificed otherworldliness for a holy secularity”43 which, by its essential worldliness, transformed their followers into apostles of self-aggrandizement and commercial opportunism: because “good works” were the only means of manifesting their faith to the world, they learned to produce as much as possible, because industry was a virtue and indolence was sinful: to consume as little as possible, since waste was a vice and gluttony was one of the seven deadly sins; and to lay up the difference, for obscure reasons having something to do with “righteousness.”

The ambitious overachievers of Christianity, by virtue of their thrift and industry, have created the very capital which has drastically altered the social and economic institutions of the West and driven almost everybody into the modern secular city—the most worldly place on the face of this planet—where the accumulation of capital is widely interpreted as a symptom of “spirituality” and “most of the best minds in Christendom have learned to manage quite well without the Christian faith.”44 That faith has always suffered more in urban centers than in rural settings, for the city dweller “is everywhere the most secularized citizen of a modern state, and the least secularized are the people who remain tied to the land . . . in areas least affected by modernizing forces.”45 The rest of us “are citizens of the secular city. No yearning for past simplicities, which are mostly imaginary [anyway] . . . , can call more than a few of us back to the sacred village of our fathers . . . We can be bombed out of our city, and perhaps we shall be.”46 We can build a bigger and better city, and we may have to do that, too. But “the city is our home,” and the city belongs to the skeptical tradition, whose advocates include the “twentieth-century sociologists and anthropologists of religion” who say that “man can live without this or that particular . . . religious belief and practice . . . but not without religion of any kind.”47

Thus the paradoxical relations between these two traditions are neither simple nor simplistic. How could it be otherwise when “the absence of God in a Kafka novel or a Beckett play is . . . so conspicuous and overwhelming . . . that it can do more to awaken religious consciousness than whole libraries of theology”?48 There is no escaping Wagar’s argument that “religious faith has both
influenced, and been influenced by, the growth of secular belief systems and institutions." Wagar adds, "The interaction in modern Western history between religion (however defined) and secularity (however defined) cannot be reduced to a struggle between sharply opposed and clearly distinguishable forces. The degree of interpenetration is astonishing, and . . . both ‘sides’ have undergone . . . [remarkable] transformations."

It is surely time to examine our "religion of culture" by exposing the ground assumptions of its sophic world view to critical evaluation. Some naturalists are actually beginning to do this, while the Latter-day Saints, who have more intellectual freedom to question their secular heritage than any people on earth, return time and again from the world’s universities as apologists for the great skeptics, openly advocating their skeptical views in academic circles, even—perhaps even especially—at Brigham Young University, instead of offering gospel alternatives to them. The reason for this tendency is unfortunately clear: the greatest sins of the Latter-day Saints, according to the Lord himself, are the vanity of misplaced faith, or believing more in themselves than in the things they have received by revelation—taking all of the wrong things seriously, as Hugh Nibley would say, and just plain unbelief, or the fact that they simply do not have the faith they ought to have. These sins of vanity and unbelief, which are more basic and far more deadly than the behavioral sins which follow in their wake, have brought the whole Church under a condemnation that has never been lifted and will persist until the children of Zion repent and remember the New and Everlasting Covenant, which not only binds the Father and the Son to the conditions of their redemption, but also constitutes the subject matter of the Book of Mormon. The Lord has issued a solemn warning to the world that includes a pointed reference to unbelievers in his church who prefer the murky wisdom of man to the revealed light of redemptive truth.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, darkness covereth the earth, and gross darkness the minds of the people, and all flesh has become corrupt before my face.

Behold, vengeance cometh speedily upon the inhabitants of the earth, a day of wrath, . . . a day of desolation, of weeping, of mourning, of lamentation; and as a whirlwind it shall come upon all the face of the earth.

. . . upon my house shall it begin, and from my house shall it go forth . . . ;

First among those among you . . . who have professed to know my name and have not known me, and have blasphemed against me in the midst of my house, saith the Lord."
Those are harsh words; they plainly mean that the Latter-day Saints cannot contribute significantly to, much less orchestrate, the critical evaluation of unbelief unless they become a sophic and a mantic people who have overcome their own lack of faith. Hugh Nibley, meanwhile, comes closer than any Latter-day Saint I have ever known personally to the ideal of a sophos kai mantikos aner.

Dr. Nibley’s little corpus of sophic-mantic studies may constitute the most insightful thing he has ever done. The great importance of his larger works cannot be minimized, but the sophic-mantic principle, which informs virtually all of his researches, lies at the feeling heart of human thought and action, where the whole of history is generated: it is assuredly far more basic than the epistemological disjunction of reason and the senses which underlies the classic world view of ancient Greece. The spiritual outlooks of the world’s axial civilizations, for example, are thereby characterized as essentially sophic in China and the West, as predominantly mantic in India, and as a sophic-mantic confluence of irreconcilable Sino-Occidental and Asianic spiritualities in the mesothetic cultures of the Near East—that strange medley of variegated territories stretching from the Nile River to the Óxus Basin. The sophic-mantic principle also clarifies the recurring confrontations of natural and revealed wisdom in human history generally, illuminates a fundamental creative influence in the formation and maintenance of all cultural institutions, and especially if not exclusively in Europe, isolates the major sources of antagonism between the philosophical and theological traditions of Western intellectual history. The history of Western intellection can admittedly be written from various points of view, but the sophic-mantic principle is omnipresent in Baumer’s kind of intellectual history and is indispensable to anyone who wants to understand the complex interactions of Greco-Roman naturalism with Judeo-Christian supernaturalism and to preserve the best of both traditions.

I recognized the essential timelessness of Dr. Nibley’s sophic-mantic studies in the early sixties, when his rather casual attitude toward what he had already written, together with his powerful sense of urgency in relation to his current researches, threatened the loss of something too valuable to lose. I therefore secured his reluctant permission to copy any manuscripts I could still locate, and others made similar attempts to preserve whatever they could. I also obtained his permission to edit these manuscripts for publication, but I left Provo shortly thereafter to pursue doctoral studies in Ohio and returned four years later to the new improved Brigham Young University, where I soon discovered that I would
never be allowed time for the "unimportant" labor of working on another man's work. I therefore showed copies of these manuscripts to Gary Gillum, who made copies of my copies for the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (F.A.R.M.S.); though these manuscripts were (and still are) a disheveled mess, I am very pleased to know that F.A.R.M.S., at long last, has edited and published them. "For the study of 'Sophic and Mantic,'" Dr. Nibley told us belatedly in 1964, "the patient reader must await forthcoming publication of the delinquent writer. It is quite a subject." It is indeed, and for his patient readers it has also been quite a wait. But F.A.R.M.S. has finally brought forth a publication that is long overdue, and the wait has been worth it, as Hugh Nibley's sophic-mantic studies have both retained their perennial appeal and will continue to interest readers a hundred years from now.

NOTES


Moses 5:17, 25, 16.

Moses 5:26, 41.

1 Corinthians 2:12–14, adding in verses 15–16 that people whose spirituality is actually revealed make critical judgments about all things, both natural and supernatural, without being subjected to judgment themselves, because they possess the mind of Christ. More on the natural man in 1 Corinthians 15:42–46; Ephesians 2:3; 2 Peter 1:4, 2:12; Jude 10, 18–19; Ether 3:2; Enos 20; Mosiah 3:16–19, 16:1–5; Alma 19:6, 26:21, 41:4, 11–12, 42:9–10, etc.

This realization stems largely from Gershom Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, 3d ed. (New York: Schocken Books, 1961), who disclosed in the 1940s the existence of a previously unknown kind of Judaism that differed radically from both the Halachic Judaism created by the Rabbis and presented in standard histories of the Jews and from the thirteen-volume study of ritual by Erwin R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953–68), which holds that vertical and horizontal religions are the only religions possible for human beings. See also Frank Moore Cross, "New Directions in the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," Brigham Young University Studies 25 (Summer 1985): 9; "Scholem shocked our generation by his demonstration of the survivals of apocalyptic mysticism in the era of Rabbi Akiba [late first and early second centuries C.E.], and in the coming generation . . . these insights into the importance of apocalypticism for both primitive Christianity and early Judaism will be confirmed and extended." Later instances of similar problems in Islam and China are discussed by Marshall G. S. Hodgson, "Speculation: Falsafah [philosophy] and Kalam [theology]," c. 750–945," in his The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in World Civilization, 3 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 1:410–43; and by Benjamin A. Elman, From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China (Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1984), who describes the sophic-mantic chaos caused by text-critical methods brought into Chinese scholarship by the Jesuits. The impact on human history of the sophic and mantic outlooks, according to Nibley, "completely dominates the world" ("A Conversation with Hugh Nibley," Dialogue 12 [Winter 1979]: 19).

University Press, 1982). But the symbolism of Athens and Jerusalem, as Nibley once remarked, easily breaks down in the sophic scholars, who, unlike Steshov, rarely seem to realize that “the Hebrews themselves were often naturalistic,” especially if influenced by the cultural spirituality of Alexandria (“A Conversation with Hugh Nibley,” 20), and that Jerusalem, far from being a mantic city, was if anything more sophic than Athens throughout most of its history. Prophets were hated in Athens as in Jerusalem, for example, but they were not stoned to death in Athens.

The mystery religions of the sixth century B.C., which brought Greek thought to a fork in the road where it had to go one way or the other, are discussed by Eduard Zeller. Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy, trans. L. R. Palmer, 13th ed., rev. by W. Nestle (New York: Dover, 1980), 12–19.


Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 9; italics added.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 15.

Josephus, Contra Apionem 1.236. Nibley has converted this phrase, which occurs in the accusative as ton sophon kai mantikon andra, to the nominative case. See also Josephus, Contra Apionem 1.256, where the same terms refer to a seer consulted by the pharaoh.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 21.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 229.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 229.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 229.


Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 35. Thrower adds that even among the Hindus “the great monistic tradition of the advaita (or nondualistic) Vedanta . . . denied the existence of a transcendent God” as did “Jainism and Buddhism, which broke . . . from Hinduism in the sixth century B.C.”

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 9.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 8.

I have discussed the philosophical aspect of this development in “The Symbol and Its Referent,” Library Trends 34 (Spring 1986): 730–37.

W. K. C. Guthrie, A History of Greek Philosophy. 6 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962–1981), 1:83. Guthrie adds that “the primary assumption is not simply that it [the world] consists of a single material substance, but that the diversity of its present order is not from eternity, but has evolved from something radically simpler . . . in time.”


Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 114.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 19, 114.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 229. Thrower adds that “the origins of the alternative . . . approach lie . . . in the Classical period of European thought.”

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 8.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 253.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 253, 137; italics added. Thrower adds that “the naturalistic approach comes to systematic fruition” in Western thought, where it actually “supercedes the . . . religious outlook on life.”


Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 254.

Thrower, Alternative Tradition, 10.


Wagar, The Secular Mind, 1.

Franklin L. Baumer, Religion and the Rise of Scepticism (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1960), 21; italics added. Baumer consistently employed “skepticism” as a synonym for “secularism, or religious scepticism” (Baumer, Religion and the Rise of Scepticism, 9), and I have followed his usage throughout this paper. I nevertheless recommend a healthier form of skepticism (see skeptomai, “look over carefully”) which implies the close observation of anything from all angles in order to avoid the pitfalls of either religious or intellectual gullibility.

Baumer, Religion and the Rise of Scepticism, 22.

Baumer, Religion and the Rise of Scepticism, 22.


Wagar, The Secular Mind, 4.

Wagar, The Secular Mind, 9.
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44Wagar, The Secular Mind, 9.

45Wagar, The Secular Mind, 7. This tendency was also true throughout antiquity, when the landed aristocracies, who were fiercely protective of their holdings in the plains and valleys, were always squabbling with the freewheeling monied aristocrats in the coastal areas.


47Wagar, The Secular Mind, 10, 4.


49Wagar, The Secular Mind, 5.

50Wagar, The Secular Mind, 5.

51A term for “the spirit of classical paganism” used by C. N. Cochrane in Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 29, where the natural “religion of culture” and “the culture of [revealed] religion” are compared.

52See statements by Stan Albrecht and Dallin Oaks in Wright, “The Sophic-Mantic Problem at BYU,” 75–76.

53See Doctrine and Covenants 84:54–59; and Ezra Taft Benson, A Witness and a Warning: A Modern-day Prophet Testifies of the Book of Mormon (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1988), vii–viii, 6–7, 9, 17, 22, 75, 79, etc.


56Hugh Nibley, An Approach to the Book of Mormon, 2d ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1964), xii n. 2.
Book Reviews


Reviewed by Steven Epperson, a curator at the Museum of Church History and Art. Epperson has degrees from Brown University, Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and Temple University. He is also a former fellow of the Shalom Hartman Institute for Advanced Judaic Thought in Jerusalem.

This recent imprint by Signature Books contains fifteen essays which critically examine aspects of the standard works of the LDS and RLDS scriptural canon. Each author has paid attention to the cultural and environmental setting for the creation of the “written word of God.” In the words of the editor, the essayists are convinced that “the essential requirement for interpretation for a text is to read it in context” because “the written word of God does not come to us direct but through human intermediaries” (viii). Therefore, each essay employs or exhorts the use of scholarly, historical-critical tools to illuminate “the problem of the human and the divine in scripture” (ix). These convictions accord well with the collection’s explicit program: to “challenge ... simplistic assumptions about the nature of revelation” in order to arrive at a “more refined ... definition of revelation and scripture” (ix).

This program of confrontation and refinement fails to succeed fully, however, due to numerous difficulties in the use of historical and literary tools and sources in reasoning and theology. In addition, two principal assumptions woven throughout *The Word of God*—that LDS and RLDS are scriptural literalists and that Joseph Smith was the author of the latter-day scriptural canon—are not well served by the collection’s shortcomings (to be discussed below).

Nevertheless, *The Word of God* has its achievements and insights. In particular, James Lancaster’s and Kevin Barney’s essays stand out in this collection that favors the concise examination of a particular text or event. Both essays encourage the reader to sympathetically encounter either eyewitness reports of the media and settings for the Book of Mormon translation (Lancaster) or the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible as a
midrash, or commentary, rather than a “literal restoration” (157) of lost original manuscripts (Barney).

Another important contribution, made by Melodie Moench Charles and others, underlines those tendentious interpretations of the Hebrew Bible made by modern Latter-day Saint exegetes that simultaneously wrest sacred writ from its historical and cultural moorings, lay claim to exclusive and univocally correct readings of those texts, and thus produce an incomplete and fragmented interpretation of those texts. Finally, by pursuing a contextual mode of interpretation, the reader comes away, for example in Lester Bush’s article on the Word of Wisdom, with a better understanding, if not of the sacred text and its author, then at least of the spatial, temporal, and ideational terrain wherein the text appeared. But here the problems begin.

HISTORICAL-CRITICAL METHOD AND LOGIC

The contextual terrain of scripture may be sketched in and accounted for by historical inquiry to an astonishing degree, and still one may misinterpret the text. For example, Doctrine and Covenants 89 has not been dealt with (pace Bush) in its sensus plenior, “the plenitudinous sense of the entire text,” when it is reduced to a code of health. In Bush’s essay, an unnecessary level of background noise (i.e., early nineteenth-century American medical culture) has been dialed in at the expense of the internal relations of the text. This fact is evident by the essay’s silence regarding the section’s opening and closing sets of verses, the verses that constitute the very prerequisite for a more compelling interpretation of the text.

A majority of the writers of The Word of God have invested an unwarranted degree of confidence in the ability of the sitz-im-leben, the “life world,” of the production of scripture, re-created by the historical-critical method, to enable a person to adequately and sufficiently read the text. Edward Ashment’s assertion that historical methodology “faithfully portrays and interprets religious phenomena in their original setting” and “seeks to develop safeguards against imposing modern categories on ancient data” (251; italics added) invests the tentative findings of scholarly historical research with a burden of certitude his assertion cannot bear.

This unguarded enthusiasm for the historical-critical method leads numerous essayists to commit fallacies of genetic (or environmental) and post hoc ergo propter hoc reasoning. Citations of Unitarian controversies, deistic cosmologies, Quetzalcoatl, the Creed of Chalcedon, and the Protestant work ethic may provide for
some readers an imposing body of circumstantial evidence to account for the environmental derivation of Latter-day Saint scripture. But for the critical student, the arguments are not persuasive, considering the lack of more concrete linkage and the eminent possibility that a text “stands apart from its genesis” and contains its own meaning. Nor is the attentive reader swayed by post-hoc argumentation from temporal sequence to causal relations (if b follows a, a is the cause of b); such logic appears to be a shortcut in reasoning that we, as a scholarly community, are in too much haste to commit. Just find an assumed temporal sequence—for example, a fourth-century ecumenical confession or eighteenth-century Christological formulation preceding Abinadi, Amulek, and Ether—and Voilà! We’ve discovered the causal source for yet one more Book of Mormon passage and added one more testimony to Joseph Smith’s eclectic authorial genius.

The most egregious example of these fallacies is found in Susan Curtis’s essay, wherein she contends, among other things, that “exemplary characters in Smith’s Book of Mormon were fundamentally market capitalists” driven by “assumptions about hard work, regularity, commerce, and accumulation sustained by a Victorian sensibility” (Curtis, 87). This assertion would be incomprehensible were the reader not to extend the charity of assuming that its author had only a superficial acquaintance with the text (the reader might also suggest beginning to correct the assessment by reading 3 Nephi 6:4–14). Before closing our minds with pronouncements such as “paraphrase,” “influence,” “borrowing,” and “eclecticism,” allow us to look seriously at the complex language that is literature, at the text in its own terms, and at its internal relationships.

A NECESSARY DIGRESSION

“For the record,” knowledge of the scholarly tools and tentative findings of historical-critical, as well as literary-critical, scriptural inquiry is a nonnegotiable prerequisite for students and teachers who study scripture seriously, academically, worshipfully. It is scandalous that we Latter-day Saints do so little to familiarize students with this field of inquiry, no matter how well intentioned our motives may be. Subsequently, students, teachers, and lay people alike are left unprepared to deal thoughtfully with the methods, arguments, and propositions of scriptural scholars (and hacks) whose work dominates the academic fields and even popular literature (for example, the yearly December issues of Time magazine and U. S. News and World Report, which deal with
scriptural authorship and meanings). Our silence and our inelegant
disdain only lead those entrusted to us in Sunday Schools,
seminaries, and religion classes to seek out or passively receive
"wisdom" from others who may be either ill-equipped in the field
or unsympathetic to our most deeply felt beliefs.

Unfortunately, both the exhortation to employ historical-
critical tools and their actual implementation suffer further in The
Word of God from some authors' inadequate familiarity with
primary and secondary literature. Where arguing from historical
data is so important, factual errors and superficial acquaintance with
the temporal and ideational "career" of a subject undermine the
persuasiveness of numerous essays. Limited space allows only a
few examples.

It is difficult to respond to George D. Smith's call to update
Isaiah (113) when, contrary to his assertions, (a) the so-called
Council at Jamnia (Javneh) may not only have decided nothing
about the Hebrew canon, it may not have even taken place; (b) the
"Jerusalem branch of the Church" was not destroyed by the Romans
in 70 A.D. (113), rather, most of the community removed to the city
of Pella in 66 A.D.; and (c) most "early Christians" were Jews and,
therefore, regarded marital "sexual gratification" in positive terms
(even as a theurgical undertaking) and not "the work of Satan"
(116). Furthermore, it is difficult to "update Isaiah" when the
essayist has not engaged in serious argument with single-author
proponents of Isaiah (Christian and Jewish) because he lacks the
requisite linguistic and philological tools to do so.

Similarly, the reader has difficulty accepting Edward
Ashment's unqualified contention that the P strata in Genesis is "a
late account" (242). Ashment begs the question of what is "a late
account," and he doesn't seem to be conversant with the literary/critical
hypothesis that posits just the opposite: "Granted the
possibility of intertextuality . . . [the] J [strata] can be better
appreciated by supposing a prevenient text, or body of texts"; P and/or
E may have been "available as text to a midrashically imaginative
revisionist [J]."

Ashment's essay, "Making the Scriptures 'Indeed One in Our
Hands,'" indicts tendentious and ill-informed Latter-day Saint
scriptural interpretation. He points out the numerous difficulties of
relying on the King James Version of the Bible as a textual source
for scholarly, critical inquiry (and problems there are!) but fails to
acknowledge that, minimally, the King James Bible "is still
arguably the version that best preserves the literary effects of the
original languages." His argument suffers, furthermore, where he
asserts, without qualification, that "there is no biblical basis for the
Mormon doctrine of Ante-mortal Existence” (238; italics added). Ashment may want to read the text of Genesis 1:26 and then examine its extraordinary career in Jewish midrashic literature. That literature wrestled seriously and imaginatively with the perplexing plural forms of address in the creation account, forms of address that assume a preexistant heavenly court or host. In addition, an interdisciplinary examination of the history of the Proverbs 8 text and its personification of a preexistent “Wisdom” may be similarly enlightening. The point is, there have been a number of Jews, and Christians, who felt that there was a biblical basis for positing and speculating about an antemortal existence.

Melodie Moench Charles and George A. Smith discount any belief in Judaism of substitutionary suffering (“no Jew expected his messiah to atone for anyone’s sins” [138]). This proposition is part of the argument which disengages Hebrew prophets from prescient gifts and defines prophets primarily as commentators of the contemporary scene. Setting the argument of foreknowledge aside, an example of vicarious suffering stands out in one readily available Jewish text, the martyrdom of Eleazar in 4 Maccabees 6:28–29: “Be merciful unto thy people, and let our punishment be a satisfaction in their behalf. Make my blood their purification, and take my soul to ransom their souls.”

Dan Vogel and Brent Metcalfe’s essay, though admirably researched and written, also suffers from the “genetic” fallacy. Because they focus on external cosmological debates from the seventeenth through early nineteenth centuries, the authors unfortunately bypass what the expectant reader anticipates: a discussion of the ancient and medieval concept of cosmology as a philosophical/theological science, of cosmology’s internal rationality (which might at least have helped Vogel and Metcalfe make some sense of “fixed,” “governing,” and “subordinate” celestial bodies), and of its eventual breakdown. Such an examination would have underlined the point that a function of the prophetic metaphysical (not literal and material, pace Vogel and Metcalfe) poetry of Doctrine and Covenants 88 is to reaffirm the divine source, nature, and goal of the cosmos.

In sum, the program of confronting and refining Latter-day Saint definitions of revelation and scripture pursued in The Word of God falls prey to the exactions of the very tools employed by its authors. On the one hand, the reader sorely misses a sense of circumspection, of measure, even of skepticism and an awareness of the tentative and provisional, that would, in more able hands, qualify dogmatic propositions about the context and interpretation of God’s word as mediated through his human agents. On the other
hand, historical scholarship expects a more profound familiarity and fluency with the history, "the career," of a text, and of its meaning on its own terms, than is manifested in this collection.

THEOLOGY

In view of the preceding observations, the critical reader, unfortunately, encounters numerous interpretive and theological problems in The Word of God. Geoffrey Spencer and William Russell’s unimaginative description of the so-called scriptural literalism of the Latter-day Saint communities renders justice neither to the human complexity of those communities nor to the distinguished history and theological accomplishments of rabbinic, patristic, medieval, and early modern scriptural commentary and analysis. It would speak well for the maturity of our scholarship and the generosity of our souls if we were to recognize that for the great practitioners of traditional biblical hermeneutics “unlocking . . . the Bible’s secret mystery was their enterprise, the very holiness of the text is what allowed them to let their imaginations roam . . . [and] to state radical or controversial ideas.”

Similarly, imaginative and compelling accounts of revelation and of the authority of the Book of Mormon should offer us more than Spencer’s misleading commonplace that “[revelation is] an event in our history which brings rationality and wholeness” (25) (it can bring just the opposite) and Russell’s reductionist assertion that the book’s authority “stems from containing the thought of the founding prophet just prior to the organization of the church” (51). Two non-Mormon descriptions of revelation and of Joseph Smith (Avery Dulles’s Models of Revelation and Harold Bloom’s The American Religion: Analysis and Prophecy respectively) display welcome levels of sophistication, critical acumen, and sympathetic scholarship that are lacking in the essays at hand.

In addition, in spite of Thomas’s (73), Smith’s (122), Charles’s (135), and Ashment’s (243) assertions to the contrary, there are Christologies (plural) in the Book of Mormon and in Mormonism. One essayist after another has conflated the speculations and mythic narratives of Abinadi, Amulek, Benjamin, and Ether and made them not only equivalent in weight to the extended statements ascribed to Jesus Christ about himself, his mission, and his relationship to the Father, but also superior to Christ’s own self-proclamation. These preincarnational Christologies are not sufficient and compelling authorities to warrant the simple identification of Jesus Christ as the God of the Old Testament. In 3 Nephi, Jesus consistently portrays God the Father as the divine author and partner of Israel’s covenant: “Ye are of the
covenant which the Father made with your fathers” (3 Ne. 20:25). Jesus tells the Nephites it is the Father who rewards, knows, forgives, sees, clothes, responds, gathers, and leads. The Son defers, prays, and is subordinate to his Father, the God of Israel. This role is the doctrine and work given by the Father to the Son (3 Ne. 11:31–32).

The theological persuasiveness of the essays is weakened by mistaken assertions (a) that the Jewish people have somehow been provisionally unchosen as God’s covenant people (124); (b) that we exhaust the definition of Redeemer in the Hebrew Bible with the terms kinsman, witness, or umpire (118, 239); (c) that prophetic foreknowledge is, in fact, only “anachronistic contamination” by later redactors and readers (40); and (d) that the scriptures’ normative and authoritative status derives principally from their role as initiator, “a common point for the beginning” of theological discourse (60). Actually, the scriptures’ normative status is derived from far more than just an agreed beginning for discourse.

Finally, this collection furthers (unwittingly?) a tendentious, “protestant” reading of the word of God in three ways: it draws the unwarranted conclusion that Latter-day Saint scriptures teach that the Mosaic law was only “an oppressive punishment imposed by an angry God” (135); it assumes that the solely authentic meaning of the text is prior to or given within it rather than connected, as two early links, in a complex chain of the text’s career or tradition; and it asserts that the “inspiration” of a scriptural passage “must always remain purely individualistic” (212).

CONCLUSION

In his essay, “Beyond Literalism,” William Russell makes an observation which begs a question and an answer: “Frequently the most liberal church members, while accepting biblical scholarship, nevertheless do not take it seriously” (49). Why that scholarship is not taken seriously by more Latter-day Saints is answered, in part, by the shortcomings of these essays. This reader looks to some future Signature Books imprint that will display the scholarly rigor and imaginative reading of history and theology sufficient to make a compelling case to modify the way we read the word of God.

NOTES


See Hegiseppus, Eusebius, Robert M. Grant, etc.


See Vogel and Metcalf’s puzzlement (208, 218–19 n. 78).

Holtz, Back to the Sources, 189, 194.

Avery Dulles, Models of Revelation (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983).


Reviewed by Ronald W. Walker, professor of history, Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Church History, Brigham Young University.

It is a biographer’s maxim that good lives seldom make good biography. According to this view, a saintly life lacks the human tension, contradiction, and dramatic color for a sustained narrative. If this is an accurate generalization, Roy and David Hoopes’s biography of their maternal grandfather, Rudger Clawson, provides a well-written exception to the rule.

Elder Clawson, of course, was a long-time Latter-day Saint Apostle who was appointed to the Quorum in 1898 and rose by seniority to become President of the Twelve. He died serving in that capacity in 1943. Not given to flourish, Elder Clawson lived a life of devotion and dedication. As the Hoopeses repeatedly remind the reader, he was by temperament and early profession a bookkeeper, given to system, calculation, and precision. The authors suggest their subject was a quintessential Latter-day Saint, a conclusion that is not necessarily flattering to either Elder Clawson or to Latter-day Saints generally. As one who inherited his religion rather than having been emotionally converted to it, Elder Clawson was, argue the authors, loyal, dutiful, and hard working. But in their view he was also narrow, he was literal to a fault, and he often appeared to be without introspection—at least on matters of life and religion. Such a description will bring a mild protest. We Latter-day Saints hope, we fervently pray, our religion involves more than unquestioning, cramped, routine devotion.

How can such a character be made biographically interesting? Fortunately Elder Clawson was one of those people who always seemed at the center of things. His missionary companion, Joseph Standing, was brutally shot in northwest Georgia as Elder Clawson stood helplessly by. Both at the time of the murder and later at the trial of the “mobocrats,” Elder Clawson courageously looked his persecutors in the eye. He was at Brigham Young’s bedside when that Church leader died. Circumstances also placed him at the start of the federal crusade against plural marriage. Among the first polygamists to be convicted, he defended religion and conscience at his trial and once more became a Latter-day Saint hero. He was one of the first “cohabs” to be jailed at the infamous Salt Lake “hotel,” the territorial prison at present-day Sugar House Park. Still later he presided during a difficult time over the Box Elder Stake in
Brigham City, lent his accounting skills to the Church in the financially troubled Lorenzo Snow era, and again faced unruly persecutors during his European Mission presidency from 1910 to 1913. Here the Hoopeses end their story, providing only a brief epilogue for the final three decades of Elder Clawson’s life—the very years of his highest Church responsibility. The authors justify their emphasis by their inability to secure material at the LDS Church Archives. They do not seem overly wrought about the restriction. They sense, perhaps rightly, the difficulty of constructing a dramatic life in the final years. There are no more “dramatic” events to tell.

The book is designed not to give offence, though perhaps it will. What is presented is honest, “warts and all,” biography, something not always essayed for the Church’s leading men. Placed beside Elder Clawson’s virtues is his sometimes groping humanity. He seems naïvely unaware that his mother apparently stage sets his first marriage. Indeed, two of his three marriages fail, supposedly in part due to his insensitivity. His sexuality, heightened by prison restriction, flares openly in love letters to second wife Lydia Spencer: “Ere you realize it, my beloved sweetheart, I shall be a free man, full of life and vigor and all the fire of an ardent and overwhelming lover” (117). In contrast, their later relationship seems distant. The two eventually consummate a legal-sounding financial agreement that gave Rudger an apparently inactive role; perhaps the document accurately measured their mature relationship. Grandchildren later recalled Lydia filling a room with her presence, while Rudger was quietly unobtrusive. Allowing Church concerns to overwhelm family life, he apparently was not an active father, grandfather, or even husband.

Elder Clawson was stubbornly insistent about the “Principle.” Almost half of the Twelve took plural wives after the Woodruff Manifesto, choosing to interpret the document narrowly and legalistically. But after President Joseph F. Smith’s Smoot Hearings testimony, the First Presidency issued a second, and what was meant to be a binding, manifesto. Nevertheless, Elder Clawson, a born-and-bred and utterly convinced polygamist, rebelliously took a third wife. Though the Hoopeses treat the episode gingerly, it had all the particulars of an incendiary disaster—for Elder Clawson and for his church. If it had become publicly known, Elder Clawson at the very least would have been removed from office and probably disfellowshipped, while the Church’s enemies would have railed at its perfidy and unrepentant polygamy. The Church’s delicately balanced attempts at national reconciliation were thus put at risk. The bookkeeper could surprise!
Here the book best succeeds. We sense character and personality, striving and failing, and courage and foolishness—qualities, as Elder Clawson’s conduct suggests, that are often mirrored distortions of the other. In short, we get the inner sense of a very human, striving man.

The authors’ background and experience serve them well. Both are professional writers and editors, though Hoopes’s experience in the popular press apparently dominates the final draft. Moreover, they are simultaneously “insiders” and “outsiders.” Bred within the Church setting, they are sensitive to cultural nuance. But because of their Latter-day Saint disbelief, they also have the necessary distance to provide insights that are too infrequent to Latter-day Saint biography.

But, while sensitivity and distance aid the portraitist, the historian requires more. The narrative steps less securely when placing Elder Clawson within the complicated texture of his times. There are pesky errors of fact. While unannounced in Utah, the 1857 Federal expedition was hardly a “secret” (34). The “massive” Salt Lake Theater did not seat 7,500 or anything like that amount (39). Angus Cannon was never a member of the Twelve (79). Lorenzo Snow’s aphorism, “As God once was, man may become . . .”, probably antedated instead of summarized Joseph Smith’s teaching on the subject (121). The authors are either too terse or they misread two incidents: President Lorenzo Snow’s unwillingness to fund the Bullion, Beck Mine (192) and the Moses Thatcher episode, when the fiery apostle from Logan found himself at odds with his colleagues in the Quorum (208). Finally, while Elder Clawson no doubt performed a great service auditing Church finances after President Woodruff’s death, it is certainly too much to say he was the “man of the hour” (176). Almost at the moment of Woodruff’s demise, a large majority of the Twelve, led by President Snow, determinedly worked to set the Church on a new financial course.

The difficulty probably lies in the authors’ scope. They are content to tell their story largely by using family papers, aided by a few dozen secondary works. Accordingly, they mine neither the larger body of secondary literature nor the primary materials available outside the LDS Church Archives. Both sources might have given their work additional depth. But we should be grateful for what is given. The Hoopeses present a narrative built around the dramatic episodes that readily emerge from Elder Clawson’s life and papers. Theirs is vignette biography, fixed in scope and modest in endeavor. And it succeeds. That it does so is a reminder that any life ably and honestly told has interest. And there is a corollary: perhaps, after all, even the saint has unexpected dimension.


Writing from a deep-seated belief in the divinity of the Church’s origins, Gerald N. Lund has crafted a well-written and often moving Latter-day Saint historical novel—a genre in which there are many proclaiming “Lo, here,” but in which there are few works about which readers can cry, “Lo, there!” Pillar of Light is a “lo there!” kind of accomplishment, a good novel which I recommend to Latter-day Saint readers. Some Modern-day Saints will doubtless wince about its being so unabashedly grounded in the Mormon cosmos, but most will see that grounding as a refreshing point of departure, grant Mr. Lund his donnée, and hail this novel as the solid contribution to the literature of the Latter-day Saints which it undoubtedly is.

Pillar of Light is a faithful recounting of the historical and religious events of the Restoration from March 1827 through April 1830, often as told by the young Prophet Joseph, the primary figure of the Restoration but only a secondary character in the novel. The book is a fictional conversion story celebrating the nascent Church’s impact upon Benjamin and Mary Ann Morgan Steed and upon their sons, the rebellious Joshua (age 20) and his younger and believing brother, Nathan (age 18); and, less directly, upon Melissa (age 16), Rebecca (age 9), and Matthew (age 7).

Mingling fiction and history in the tradition of Nephi Anderson’s better conversion novels—but much more skillfully—Lund poses in the preface his controlling dramatic question, “If I had been living back then, how would I have reacted? What would I have done? Would I have believed?” He explores the implications of that question for each of the Steeds, focusing, in this first volume of a projected multi-volume saga, on Nathan Steed’s very personal response to Joseph’s account of the First Vision and the remarkable events which crowded upon each other in the years 1827–1830.

Upon this carefully presented historical framework of dramatic events and figures, Lund imposes the fictional Steed family’s individual struggles with young Joseph Smith’s claims. Representing Everyperson in their gropings with faith and doubt, the Steeds respond according to their individual faith: Nathan hears, struggles, and believes; his mother, Mary Ann (and the other children), responds likewise—seeing the Restoration as the
realization of an earlier spiritual presentiment. But Benjamin, an
impulsive free-thinker who has been disappointed by
institutionalized faith, vigorously rejects Joseph Smith and the
Book of Mormon and forbids his wife and children from having
anything to do with the Church—until the strain on his family and
his marriage causes him to relent. Recoiling from his headstrong
father, Joshua falls into dissolute ways, leaves home, is shamed by
his complicity in the attempt to steal the plates from his one-time
friend, Joseph, and leaves Palmyra and his beloved Lydia McBride
(18) to flee to Independence, Missouri. There, learning he has lost
Lydia to his brother Nathan, he marries Jessica Roundy on a
drunken rebound. Doubtless, we will hear much more from this
western branch of the Steed clan.

The love story of Lydia and Nathan is complicated when
Nathan, giving in to the very traits of gentleness, faith, and love
which originally deflected Lydia’s interest from Joshua to him, is
forced to choose the Church over her and becomes one of the first
converts to the faith. The dramatic events leading to Lydia’s
conversion and a happy ending are complicated by her being
disowned by her outraged parents. Volume one draws to a
breathless pause following the organization of the Church, having
recounted the conversion stories of Nathan, Lydia, Mary Ann, and
Melissa (and Rebecca and Matthew), but leaving unfinished the
conversion of father Benjamin and the hard-drinking and unhappy
Joshua and his sympathetic wife, Jessica.

Volume two therefore beckons the reader with the prospects
of following the Steed family through the Kirtland and Missouri and
westering years, as the Steeds complete their conversions and
undergo hardships, persecutions, and sacrifices as members of the
dynamic and demanding young Church.

The predictability of such conversions raises one of the
literary problems inherent in conversion fiction—in all faithful
fiction, for that matter: because the purpose of faithful fiction is to
instruct, to caution, to warn, and to demonstrate how God touches
the individual lives of his children to effect their salvation and
exaltation, the reader of such fiction knows that the characters will
transcend doubt and despair and every kind of obstacle to achieve
testimony and conversion.

The challenge for the writer of faithful (as opposed to
maverick) fiction is, then, to make his or her fiction credible by both
a transcendent, spiritual—vertical—standard and a realistic, earth-
bound—horizontal—literary standard. Judged against the
standards of modern literature, any kind of Latter-day Saint fiction
must seem quaint and naive. Thus the writer of faithful fiction must
find ways to render a God-centered Weltanschauung believable in a fictional genre which is decidedly human. Lund has made a respectable effort in meeting this challenge, delving convincingly into the psychological and spiritual motivations of his characters. He makes credible Lydia’s and the Steeds’s centrifugal vs. centripetal struggles with self and faith and doubt, struggles typical of those experienced by converts from the beginning of the Restoration to the present, by men and women who were and are, as Maurine Whipple says in her preface to The Giant Joshua, “human beings by birth and only saints by adoption.”

Testimony comes to various characters in believable ways ranging from quiet and peaceful assurance to dramatic personal revelation. Mary Ann, about to hear Joseph read from the newly printed Book of Mormon, prays, “O Lord, if this be thy word, help me to know it without question. Open my heart to thy feelings, Heavenly Father, I pray in Jesus’ name.” After Joseph reads from 3 Nephi of Christ’s ministration to the Nephites, she comes to quiet testimony: “Mary Ann did not move, barely aware of what was going on around her. Hosanna! Blessed be the name of the Most High God! Thus had the people [of Zarahemla] cried. So now did her own heart cry out. It was enough. This was the anchor she had been seeking” (331).

While Lund’s characters are well-developed and organic, they keep Time the Latter-day Saint way—with an ear to Eternity, ever aware of a spiritual dimension to their lives. This sense of human purpose and divine destiny sets Lund’s kind of faithful fiction at odds with our fin-de-siècle real and fictional mentality, devoid as it often is of transcendent meaning or suggestion of divine control or intervention and favoring as it does “minimalist” depictions of unshaped and unresolved lives, lives without transcendent purpose or meaning or the willingness to see possibilities for conclusions (“closure”) in the human condition. Such literature is certainly a philosophical remove from the belief in an all-knowing Heavenly Father, whose work and glory (the title of Lund’s saga) is to “bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man” (Moses 1:39).

In centering the novel on the Steeds and their various responses to the incipient Church, Lund wisely avoids the problem which Vardis Fisher confronts in Children of God and Orson Scott Card encounters in Saints (1984)—that of featuring protagonists Joseph Smith, Jr., and Brigham Young in their most intimate, human moments, much to the discomfiture of some readers, who prefer their prophets on unassailable pedestals—not using bedpans or bedding their plural wives. In Lund’s novel it is through Nathan—via Joseph—that we learn about the major events of the
Restoration. The Joseph we are permitted to see is warm, believable, charismatic, and approachable, but he remains at a dignified and comfortable distance—even while besting Nathan at stick-pulling—which allows the reader to keep his or her own conception of the Prophet—and thus Lund’s message about divine origins—intact.

Some will disagree, but for a related reason I believe that Lund was wise in choosing to have Joseph recount his first vision in the language of his canonized 1838 account (even though Joseph tells the vision to Nathan eleven years earlier, in 1827, a time much nearer to the other, earlier accounts in our possession). Emblazoned as the 1838 account is in the souls of the Saints, taking fictional liberties with the words would jar many readers’ sensibilities—as does Vardis Fisher’s rendering of the First Vision. Lund couches the account of the First Vision in a dialogue between Joseph and Nathan, achieving a natural and refreshing variation on familiar words without meddling with Holy Writ:

“When the light rested upon me, I saw two personages—” He stopped, noting the expression on Nathan’s face. “I saw two personages,” he continued firmly, “whose glory and brightness defy all description. They were standing above me in the air.”

Now it was Nathan who involuntarily passed a hand across his eyes. A pillar of light? Two personages?

“The one spoke,” Joseph continued, softly now, and more slowly, as though giving Nathan time to digest the words. “He called me by name. ‘Joseph,’ he said, ‘this is My Beloved Son. Hear Him!’ ”

He stopped, watching Nathan closely.

Nathan’s mind was reeling. “Are you saying ...” He faltered, overwhelmed. “You mean you saw ...” He could not bring himself to say it.

Joseph nodded with the utmost solemnity. “I saw God and I saw his Son, Jesus Christ.” He sighed, suddenly weary. “I know how that must sound to you. But I say again, Nathan, and I say it with all the power of my soul: I saw the Father and I saw his Son.” ...

Nathan leaned back, totally astonished. He could only nod. (56–57)

In this manner, Joseph Smith, Jr., teaches Nathan, who in turn teaches his own mother and sister, the truths of the Restoration. The Steeds struggle with doubt and belief and thereby become representatives of millions of men and women who will follow similar patterns in coming to testimony. Repeatedly, Lund answers the questions he poses in his preface, affirming that, had the reader been there, he or she, too, would have been convinced.
Eager to anchor his spiritual account to an authentic time and place, Lund has taken pains to fold into the novel considerable detail about soapmaking; the Erie Canal's sociological and physical impact on Palmyra; querns (a refinement on the hand mill); ice cutting and storage; and life in early Palmyra and frontier Independence. Unlike Maurine Whipple, who integrated a rich collection of local lore and color throughout *The Giant Joshua* (1940), however, Lund supplies his enrichment in excellent chunk-style descriptive passages found primarily in the first chapters of the book but does not sustain this meaty detail and turns, almost abruptly, to telling the story without such enrichment. The shift is marked.

For the most part, however, Lund succeeds in bringing the era of the late 1820s to life, along with his characters. He soars in frequent, excellent descriptive passages and throughout spins a strong and well-paced narrative, replete with lively and realistic dialogue which contains just enough interspersed dialect and homespun to make it credible. And though he has evoked enough well-worn plot devices to edge the novel toward, horror of horrors, popular fiction, he kindles and sustains the reader's curiosity and involvement. No doubt, some will fault Lund's sunny handling of the darker side of the Prophet Joseph's life—from his reputation among neighbors in upstate New York to his courtship of Emma or his treasure-hunting interlude—but handle them Lund does, capable scholar-apologist that he is, and in believable and soundly historic ways which enhance Joseph's reputation without becoming hagiographic.

Without trivializing, sentimentalizing, or sensationalizing an important subject which has often been manhandled on all counts, Lund treats the events surrounding the Restoration realistically yet reverently, showing at once a thorough grasp of his subject and a literary finesse in transforming those familiar events into fresh and moving fiction. The effect is telling and bodes well for future volumes in *The Work and the Glory*, as well as for the promise of faithful Latter-day Saint fiction.

Reviewed by Karin Anderson England, a member of the English faculty at Utah Valley Community College.

Possibly due to her journalistic background, Linda Sillitoe is a master of situation. Her novel, *Sideways to the Sun*, traps readers from the first lines and, like a good mystery, releases them only at the final page. Sillitoe’s collection of short stories, *Windows on the Sea*, does it again—nearly coaxes the reader into turning the pages, reading “one more” story, and then another, until the back cover appears.

Such enticement can be downright annoying to those of us who tend to malign mainstream Wasatch Front culture and define Utah’s literary characteristics with more elemental, western motifs. We are not happily drawn into stories of the too-common-for-literature suburbanites we often dismiss as “Utah Mormons.” But Sillitoe catches us with compelling, believable situations, and, in her best stories, draws us into the minds of her characters before we can stop her.

Some of the characters in *Windows on the Sea* gain little identity outside of their situations. For example, Leah and Karen, in “A String of Intersections,” feel incomplete in their creation, unsatisfying, as do their peripheral husbands. We are left wanting to know more, not necessarily about how they will get past their respective marital crises, but about the women themselves. Why did Leah, the once passionate, compassionate co-ed, marry the vain, worldly Skip? How does she rationalize her glitzy lifestyle? We suspect that Skip will eventually prove disastrous, but when he is caught in a long-running jewelry scam, we want to know Leah better, well enough to bear with her the full shock, the irretrievability of earlier values. Karen is slightly more real, maybe because she lives a more common life-style, but she too is lost in the abruptness of the narrative. We gain glimpses of her through her thoughts, as the point of view shifts, but more subtle revelations, possibly given through the lunchtime conversation, would give us more. Sillitoe tells more than she shows in this story, and we feel cheated when characters so potentially rich are placed in such compelling situations but are not developed.

The second story, “The Last Day of Spring,” has more engrossing characterizations, especially in Laurie, a young adolescent faced with a beloved aunt’s disease and premature death. With this story, Sillitoe begins a pattern which gains significance
and creativity as the collection continues: she is willing to make extraordinary leaps into unusual points of view. We come to understand that Laurie’s aunt, Jennifer, is dying only as we look past Laurie’s limited perceptions and pick up the clues dropped by the well-meaning adults who have neither the courage nor the insight to explain a painful situation. The story gains emotion, not simply through the loss of a young, charismatic woman we see only obliquely, but through the sympathy we feel for the niece who wants to understand as an adult yet is bitterly hurt by the harshness of adult reality when she confronts it. Laurie is not only losing her Aunt Jennifer, but is also losing her trust in the adults whom she has viewed with respect; is losing her innocence, the belief that everything will work out with enough Sunday School faith; and is losing her assurance that the universe is essentially benevolent.

We leave Laurie crying on her bed, too young and upset to articulate the complex emotions she is feeling. But we have been given enough to understand. Sillitoe should have left us there with the heartbroken girl and resisted the final lines that take us out of Laurie’s mind and explain what we already know. Sillitoe has handled point-of-view persuasively until this point, which is why these lines of the story are a small letdown.

Sillitoe takes us, quite daringly and with more control, into entirely different personas in such pieces as “Coyote Tracks,” “Bishop Ted,” and “Windows on the Sea.” “Coyote Tracks” places us in an unusual setting, for Sillitoe’s fiction; a young Salt Lake City woman named Shannon has moved herself and her preteenage daughter Marci to Monument Valley, where she teaches at the high school. Shannon and her husband, Don, lost a baby boy to crib death a few years before the story takes place, and now Shannon is working to stabilize her feelings about her husband leaving her for another woman. Divorce is uncertain. Don is simultaneously patronizing, authoritarian, and conciliatory; his frequent telephone calls make it clear that he is beginning to regret the losses caused by his infidelity.

In this story Sillitoe takes her most “un-Mormonly” perspective, and it is tempting to forget that Shannon, not Sillitoe, is the governing psyche. Shannon has moved from a Platonic to a sexual relationship with a Navajo colleague, a healthier relationship than she previously had with her husband. It is ironic, at least from a Latter-day Saint perspective, that the first seeds of healing and reconciliation with her husband come from violating the sacred Latter-day Saint principle of chastity:

[Shannon] stayed awake a long time after Stan slept, watching the moonlight, broken into panes by the window, move across their
bodies. She recalled how Stan had defended Don the other night even while holding her, Don’s wife, in his arms—and by defending Don had shielded her from Don’s perceived blame. Some of her guilt was gone, she realized. She considered whether Heidi, once her friend, had ever taken her part with Don. Most likely she had, a woman in Don’s arms who, through him, sensed Shannon’s grief. Once that surprising conclusion settled like certainty in her solar plexus, Shannon imagined Don and Heidi together, as she and Stan were now, and for the first time felt no pain. If Don had found solace even temporarily—a possibility that had struck her as terribly unfair at the time—she could almost be happy someone had given him what she could not. Not then. (63)

The story ends with Shannon and Stan both leaving Monument Valley to visit their respective spouses, Shannon in Salt Lake City, where the people and culture are part of her, and Stan to Navajo Mountain, a remote settlement nearly unknown to whites. We are left wondering if either will return, and, more significantly, we are left to ponder the commandments of Shannon’s faith versus the contingencies of her situation. This time, admirably, Sillitoe does not comment.

At the outset, “Bishop Ted” looks like the most predictable story in the collection, but it leads into surprising territory. The story is written as the journal of a woman named Cheryl, whose husband was killed a couple of years before in a car accident, leaving her with three rowdy, apparently homely, children. Cheryl seems to be in a particularly good position now to sympathize with an old friend, Ellen, who has never married. Ellen was recently engaged to a man who has also died suddenly, leaving her, well into her thirties, unwed and pregnant. “Bishop Ted,” as Cheryl calls their new bishop, has just been called to authority. It is difficult for Cheryl to adjust to his new authority, as up until now he has been merely a fond acquaintance in the ward. Cheryl is shocked when he decides to excommunicate Ellen, and we expect the story to continue in its law-vs.-situation, justice-vs.-mercy theme. We are surprised, though. Ellen nearly disappears from the story, as Cheryl rationalizes her dilemma and becomes obsessed with the bishop himself. We begin to understand the depths of Cheryl’s own loneliness and sexual frustration as she records an ecclesiastical visit from him:

After he left I tried to remember the last conversation I’ve had alone with a man, any man, since Larry died. I don’t think it’s happened. The pediatrician comes closest, and then the kids are always climbing on me. Of course I talked with Bishop Sorenson before Ted became bishop, but that’s different. That’s over a desk, not eye to eye in a room growing soft with the lateness of the hour. (152)
Why Bishop Ted chose to visit, alone, in a widow’s home is not clear. We have only Cheryl’s perspective. But Cheryl interprets every succeeding encounter as a romantic invitation from him. We see her slip more into a world of wishes with every journal entry. She is attracted to his “glow”; she comments on the “polished shaft” he has become since taking the mantle of authority upon him; she catalogues evidence that Sally, Ted’s wife, is not fully worthy of him. The point of view makes it difficult for us to gauge the objectivity of Cheryl’s comments, and for awhile, we want to give them credibility. But it becomes increasingly clear that Cheryl is not in control of her perceptions.

Reading episodes from early Church history, Cheryl comes to a greater “understanding” of polygamy than she has before. It is not hard to predict, after this, that Cheryl goes over the edge. Her journal entries end, at least for us, with her outside the home of the bishop and his wife. Cheryl has left her rambunctious children alone in the park until she returns and has parked in front of Ted and Sally’s home, preparing to move herself and her suitcases out to the front walk, where she will await their happy discovery that she and the children are moving in.

“Bishop Ted” is one of Sillitoe’s finest stories. The journal format allows no narrative commentary; we are caught completely in Cheryl’s consciousness. We are nearly forced to sympathize with a woman who, from any other perspective, would be unattractive and unbalanced. Sillitoe plays with ironies that invite us to consider the complexity of delusion and possibly sin. “Coyote Tracks” brought its protagonist to the beginning of healing, of reconciliation, through what is normally viewed as grave sin. In “Bishop Ted,” the most surprising result is that Cheryl’s deepening delusions allow her to see her children with new appreciation and release her from much of the depression she is feeling as a single mother. She notices the beauty of the natural world around her, probably for the first time in years. We almost hope that Cheryl is right, that the Spirit has told her truth, that the joy she anticipates will materialize.

However, unlike “Coyote Tracks,” “Bishop Ted” leaves us without real hope. Cheryl is not on the verge of finding herself, of reconciling the paradoxes of her situation, or of transcending her own nature. We are left with a sick knowledge of the inevitable, possibly disastrous, results of Cheryl’s delusions. Sillitoe’s central purpose in writing this story may well have been an exercise in pure sympathy, an attempt to understand the manifestations of depression, loneliness, and desperation in a unique cultural setting. The story is one that few Latter-day Saint writers would attempt, partly because
a character like Cheryl is so low on the Wasatch Front social scale that most would dismiss her with derision or, at best, embarrassment.

All of the stories in *Windows on the Sea*, even the weakest, are written skillfully and sensitively enough to bear critical scrutiny. Sillitoe teases us with stereotypes and sometimes is not quite able to escape them, but when she does, she startles us out of comfortable judgmental positions. A bit more editing could have eliminated some confusion, particularly in the opening stories, where pronouns are occasionally vague and introductions too brief for full clarity. But, as a whole, Sillitoe’s fictional style is as straightforward as her journalism, so much so that we can miss her subtleties on a first reading. Second and third times through the book demonstrate that Sillitoe is in control of her craft. Her images and details are carefully chosen. Although settings and situations are dissimilar, a comparison with Willa Cather is not entirely out of place. Sillitoe’s style, like Cather’s, can be deceptively simple, with an almost distracting narrative which catches us off guard and has tremendous impact when complex human experience pushes through.
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J. Roman Andrus: Extending the Senses

D. R. Dant

"In subject matter, from the human head to mountain peaks there is a philosophic penetration, a revelation of the inner character, a certain genre, an acquaintance with the reality hidden beneath the surface. The form and style range from the solidly monumental to the sensuously lyric, accomplished consistently with the abstract and aesthetic elements. The line, color, and order of form communicate the work's purpose and meaning."

—Arts Council of Central Utah, 1 November 1969

A St. George native, J. Roman Andrus took his first art lessons from the "masses and spaces, [the] rhythms and breaks," of the buttes and canyons of southern Utah. Later he received formal training at Brigham Young University, the Otis Art Institute in Los Angeles, the Art League of New York, Columbia University, and the Colorado Springs Fine Arts Center. By the time he joined the Brigham Young University faculty in 1940, he was as interested in print making as in drawing and painting; with a press obtained from Rocky Mountain Banknote, Andrus taught the first university class in block printing offered in the Intermountain area.

As Alex B. Darais stated in a tribute, Andrus is "a man / who loves the sensuous ooze of paint / the quiver of linen under his brush / the fragrance of turpentine / the cool face of a lithograph stone." Certainly the lithograph print which appears on the cover of this issue reveals the quality of that love. Don't Speak is symbolic of a time of realization, an experience too sacred to discuss. The covered heads emphasize the sacredness of the event, and its encompassing nature is indicated by the encircling robes. The strongest light falls on the central figure, who experiences the full force of the truth. The side figures share in this realization to lesser degrees, one catching some but not all of the light, the other partially turning away.

In another sense, Don't Speak—the central figure in particular—expresses Andrus's view of art: "Art is a precious way of life, wanting to see, to extend the senses, to include the unusual and the beautiful."

NOTES

1 Karl E. Young, manuscript in possession of J. Roman Andrus.
2 Alex B. Darais, Tribute, Springville, Utah, 1 November 1969; in possession of J. Roman Andrus.