

BYU

STUDIES

INVOLVING READERS
IN THE LATTER-DAY SAINT
ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE



ARTICLES

- “Lightning Out of Heaven”:
Joseph Smith and the Forging of Community 4
Terry L. Givens
- Are Christians Mormon?
Reassessing Joseph Smith’s Theology in His Bicentennial 35
David L. Paulsen
- A Prologue to Genesis: Moses 1 in Light of Jewish Traditions 129
E. Douglas Clark

DOCUMENT

- An Islander’s View of a Desert Kingdom:
Jonathan Napela Recounts His 1869 Visit to Salt Lake City 22
Fred E. Woods

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Old Testament Bibliography:
Latter-day Saint Publications, 1997–2005 143
David Rolph Seely, W. Kenneth Hamblin, and Erica Lamb Holland

BOOK REVIEWS

David O. McKay and the Rise of Modern Mormonism,

by Gregory A. Prince and William Robert Wright

James B. Allen 172

Utah Historians and the Reconstruction of Western History,

by Gary Topping

Brian Q. Cannon 178

Evolution: The Remarkable History of a Scientific Theory,

by Edward J. Larson

Evolution and Mormonism: A Quest for Understanding,

by Trent D. Stephens and D. Jeffrey Meldrum with Forrest B. Peterson

William E. Evenson 182

The Divine Conspiracy: Rediscovering Our Hidden Life in God,

by Dallas Willard

Godfrey J. Ellis 190



Brian Kershisnik (1962–), *Flight Practice with Instruction*, oil on paper, 1997, 15" x 11". The apparently whimsical images in the Brian Kershisnik paintings featured in this issue are infused with profound meanings. Much of Kershisnik's work focuses on people's relationships with each other and with the divine. The works chosen for this issue address themes of community and mutual dependence discussed in Terryl L. Givens's article. In *Pruners* (front cover), Kershisnik's figures are literally standing on one another's shoulders to achieve the group's goal. The *Flight Practice with Instruction* pieces (back cover and above) show people who, having learned to overcome worldly constraints, are tutoring those just beginning to cast off these burdens.

“Lightning Out of Heaven”

Joseph Smith and the Forging of Community

Terryl L. Givens

Several weeks ago I received an email from someone who identified himself as a BYU student doing a research paper on the Prophet Joseph Smith. He asked, “Would you be kind enough to share with me what you feel the impact of Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon on the world has been?” This was an important question, so I took time framing my reply. I wrote, “It was big.” However, upon reflection, I decided against sending that email. I did not want to do most of his work for him. I thought perhaps I would now revisit that question in a little more depth.

A few months back I was visiting with a foreign scholar of religion who had a related question for me: “To what do you attribute the remarkable growth of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints?” Many people have been asking this question for a few years now. The bicentennial of the Prophet’s birth has given many scholars an opportunity to ask these and similar questions in formal settings: at symposia hosted by the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.; by the New South Wales Parliament in Sydney, Australia; and by the National University of Taiwan in Taipei. When Joseph Smith was just a boy of seventeen, he said an angel appeared to him and declared “that [his] name should be had for good and evil among all nations, kindreds, and tongues, or that it should be both good and evil spoken of among all people.”¹ This year in particular has seen that prediction borne out. Secular scholars and Christians, Hindus, Muslims, and presumed atheists—in many nations and in many tongues—speak good of Joseph’s name. In Sydney, Dr. Kazi Islam, a Muslim and chair of the Department of World Religions, Dhaka University, Bangladesh, explained that he introduced Mormonism as a compulsory part of the master’s degree in his department “because of [his] profound love and

Terryl L. Givens

Terryl L. Givens, Professor of Literature and Religion at the University of Richmond, is at the forefront of scholarship in Mormon Studies. He says, “I came to Mormon Studies through my work in nineteenth-century literature, when I realized how little fiction had been examined as a window into the Mormon conflicts of that century. It was a natural progression to turn my attention next to the most important religious text produced by an American during that century—the Book of Mormon itself—and its translator, Joseph Smith. As a student of Romanticism, I am continually impressed by the ways in which Joseph Smith embodied and fulfilled the highest and noblest aspirations of that movement, but without capitulating to the forces of secularism that were so manifest in the thought of many of his contemporaries. In my forum address, I try to take stock of how history and inspiration combined in him to produce what I really believe was one of the great intellectual syntheses of his age.



“At the same time, and on a related note, I wanted to continue my own search to understand how faith fits into the life of the mind, and why what is largely a spiritual gift can at the same time be endowed with such tremendous moral significance. Responses to my talk have confirmed for me that many Latter-day Saints are grappling with these same issues themselves.”

Dr. Givens’s publications include *Viper on the Hearth: Mormons, Myths, and the Construction of Heresy* and *By the Hand of Mormon: The American Scripture That Launched a New World Religion* (both published by Oxford University Press), and *The Latter-day Saint Experience in America* (published by Greenwood Press). He is currently working on a cultural history of Mormonism, to be published by Oxford in 2007.

respect for the ideals” of that tradition Joseph Smith founded.² Dr. Jason Lase, a director general in the Indonesian Department of Religious Affairs, affirmed his belief that Joseph Smith was “a modern religious genius” who created what he called “one of the most stable and well-organized religious organizations” he has ever known.³ A few months later, Arun Joshi, a Hindu journalist from India, gave a remarkable talk at the Taipei conference in which he related the experience of the First Vision to the conflicts in Kashmir and the Middle East, concluding, “The message of Joseph Smith is more relevant . . . today than ever before.”⁴

These are surely exciting developments, and it can be heady stuff for members of a previously marginalized religion of modest size to find their faith and founder the subject of symposia, celebration, and scholarly interest. Some have even predicted a new world religion will emerge out of these accelerating developments. As that researcher had asked me at a conference, “How do you account for this growth?”

I am, perhaps belatedly, coming to the recognition that the sustained growth of the Church, while impressive, is not itself the greatest legacy of Joseph—or the most significant issue we can investigate. Amway had a phenomenal growth rate. There is something else Joseph accomplished—something that is obliquely suggested by the very difficulty of knowing whether to define the people who now revere him as a church, a religion, a culture, an ethnicity, a global tribe, or something else. Joseph succeeded in creating a community with no real parallel—and few precedents—in the history of the world. The Prophet’s brother Hyrum tried to capture the unique quality of this society when, a few months before Joseph’s death, he said: “Men’s souls conform to the society in which they live, with very few exceptions, and when men come to live with the Mormons, their souls swell as if they were going to stride the planets.”⁵

It is the quality of this community, not its rate of increase, that is the more vital fact—and the more enduring mystery—of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. So I wish to explore some of the factors that I believe have contributed to the effect that Joseph’s message has wrought on the world and on his followers in particular. My remarks are in essence an extended commentary on the truth pronounced by Thomas Carlyle before Joseph’s own death. “The Great Man,” Carlyle wrote, “was always as lighting out of Heaven; the rest of men waited for him like fuel, and then they too would flame.”⁶ What I want to understand, then, is what did Joseph teach, and what did he embody, that did not simply attract a faithful core of followers but that galvanized and welded them into a powerfully cohesive group and that continues to endow a multimillion-member movement with those same bonds and cohesion and vitality today? As Carlyle’s quote

intimates, there is a dimension to “the Great Man” and his influence that is to be understood historically. And there is a dimension that transcends history in its evocation of that which is universal. Both elements are present in Joseph Smith’s case.

First, it is useful to see Joseph within a particular historical context. A scant dozen years before Joseph’s birth, Louis XVI was guillotined by radicals. That may seem an odd counterpoint to a talk about the Mormon Prophet, but Albert Camus called that execution “the crux of our contemporary history.”⁷ Why? Because it represented a banishment of God from the subsequent history of that people and because it precipitated a steep decline in the fortunes of religion in the West generally. Louis was, after all, supposed to be God’s representative by divine right. His premeditated execution represented a deliberate, willful repudiation of God and His role in civic society. The revolutions that would occupy America and Europe from 1776 and throughout the next century were occasioned by many factors. But central elements were an irrepressible optimism about human potential, a growing embrace of human dignity and freedom as the birthright of every man, and, in many cases, doubts that such values and aspirations could be compatible with the institutions of the organized church. Lafayette called his violent passion for liberty a “holy madness.”⁸ Jefferson swore on the altar of God eternal enmity against every form of tyranny over the mind of man. William Wordsworth spoke for millions when he wrote, “Bliss was it in that dawn [of revolution] to be alive, / But to be young was very heaven!”⁹ But as the *philosophes*, French revolutionaries, English radicals, and growing numbers of intellectuals and reflective individuals concluded, dignity and freedom alike were threatened by institutionalized systems of religion that almost universally emphasized human depravity, inherent guilt, and arbitrary omnipotence.

The result, when it wasn’t outright atheism or revolution, was often despair about the irredeemably tragic nature of the human condition. One cannot peruse the poetry of the Romantics without being struck by the soul-agony of an entire generation—drawn more than any other to the possibilities of the sublime, of transcendence, of the beautiful in nature and in humankind, but thwarted and oppressed at every turn by stultifying systems, rigid hierarchies, and inflexible orthodoxies. Thus the common lament of the poets of the age: “Man is of dust,” mused the great Wordsworth, but “ethereal hopes are his.” “Too, too contracted are these walls of flesh,” he mourned, “For any passion of the soul that leads / To ecstasy.”¹⁰ Lord Byron’s Lucifer taunted the man Cain because Cain was a creature of “high thought [but he was] / Linked to a servile mass of matter.”¹¹ The poet Robert Browning described the quintessentially

tragic human plight more simply as the intersection of “infinite passion, and the pain / Of finite hearts that yearn.”¹² So they all concluded, with Wordsworth, that “unless above himself he can / Erect himself, how poor a thing is Man!”¹³

Alexis de Tocqueville, in these same years, recorded how he “had seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom almost always move in contrary directions.”¹⁴ In Joseph Smith, religion and freedom found their first perfect, seamless synthesis. For it was into this environment that Joseph introduced a reinvented story of human origins, nature, and potential. And in the greatest intellectual fusion of his age, Joseph argued that the majesty of God does not exist at the expense of the dignity of man. He made religion the advocate, rather than the enemy, of all that is best in human yearning. But most important, Joseph promulgated a set of teachings that centered the restored gospel on a correct understanding of the divine nature, of human nature, and of their relationships to each other. That is the knowledge that imbued his followers with an uncommon degree of self-knowledge and shared purpose.

A Weeping God

He did this, first and foremost, by his radical reconceptualization of the nature of God. One of my favorite stories concerns a woman named Sarah Edwards, wife of the famous Puritan preacher Jonathan Edwards. He was best known perhaps for his sermon that every early American schoolchild had read: “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God.” He told his audience: “The wrath of God is like great waters that are dammed for the present. . . . The God that holds you over the pit of hell, much as one holds a spider, or some loathsome insect over the fire, abhors you.” And, for the unregenerate, he continued: “When God beholds the ineffable extremity of your case, and sees your torment to be so vastly disproportioned to your strength, and sees how your poor soul is crushed, and sinks down, as it were, into an infinite gloom; he will have no compassion upon you . . . ; there shall be no moderation or mercy.”¹⁵

I cannot help but wonder how such excesses struck the hearts and minds of tender people everywhere and of Edwards’ own devout and loving wife in particular. It so happened that on one occasion when Edwards was out of town, another local preacher came to visit Sarah and her children. He offered to have a prayer with the family, and she agreed. Afterward, she recorded in her journal that while the Reverend Peter Reynolds was offering his prayer, she found herself feeling “an earnest desire that, in calling on God, he should say, *Father*.” She asked herself, “Can I now at this time,

with the confidence of a child, and without the least misgiving of heart, call God my Father?"

In consequence of this reflection, she recorded, "I felt a strong desire to be alone with God," and withdrew to her chamber. In the moments that followed, she continued:

The presence of God was so near, and so real, that I seemed scarcely conscious of any thing else. God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, seemed as distinct persons, both manifesting their inconceivable loveliness, and mildness, and gentleness, and their great and immutable love to me. . . .

The peace and happiness, which I hereupon felt, was altogether inexpressible.¹⁶

Long before Joseph Smith offered his first prayer, thousands and millions of people must have yearned, as Sarah did, for the assurance that God is not the severe, distant, impersonal deity of Jonathan Edwards but the kind, loving, and very personal God that Joseph found in the Sacred Grove. That Joseph experienced this God, that the Book of Mormon testifies of and exemplifies His tender mercies, and that all and sundry are invited and given the means to experience God's presence in the world and in their own lives made belief in a living, personal God a potent and irresistible principle.

That God has a body of flesh and bones is not the revolutionary teaching. God's physical form is not the point. That God has a heart that beats in sympathy with ours is the truth that catalyzes millions—that He feels real sorrow, rejoices with real gladness, and weeps real tears. This, as Enoch learned, is an awful, terrible, yet infinitely comforting truth.

Growing organically out of this conception is a new human relationship to the divine that requires a new vocabulary. In 1844, Parley P. Pratt published a little story in the *New York Herald* entitled "Joe Smith and the Devil." In this story the devil happens upon Joseph, and they have a pleasant conversation. The devil is insisting to the Prophet that he, the devil, is happy to support "all creeds, systems, and forms of Christianity, of whatever name or nature; so long as they leave out that abominable doctrine, which caused me so much trouble in former times, and which, after slumbering for ages, you have again revived; I mean the doctrine of . . ." And guess what that doctrine was. What do you think Parley P. Pratt and (I think we can safely assume) Joseph Smith himself believed was the single most important doctrine he restored—one to make the devil himself quake in the knowledge that his kingdom was in jeopardy of total collapse? That principle, Pratt wrote, was this: "You have again revived

[and this is the devil speaking here] the doctrine of direct communion with God, by new revelation.”¹⁷

Latter-day Saints frequently refer to this principle as personal revelation, but I think that term fails to sufficiently delineate the distinct contours—historically and theologically speaking—of the model Joseph reinstituted. A prominent historian recently wrote in a history of the century before Joseph Smith that the extremes of deists and dissenters alike were happy to accept “religion without its substance, faith without revelation.”¹⁸ Another prominent historian of religion wrote that by the modern age, “Revelation in the fully personal sense characteristic of personal agents has been abandoned.”¹⁹

Two characteristics distinguish the revelation Joseph modeled:

First, from his initial inquiry in those New York woods to his last revelations, Joseph’s prayers anticipated a personal response, a discernible moment of dialogue or communicated content. This model, which I call dialogic revelation, situates Joseph and the religion he founded well outside Christian understandings of revelation. Even the Christian model that seems closest in spirit to this one, called by Avery Dulles “revelation as inner experience,”²⁰ differs sharply. Within this model, theologian George Tyrrell wrote that there can be no revealed statements or doctrines.²¹ Auguste Sabatier insisted that “the object of the revelation of God can only be God Himself,”²² and John Baillie insisted that, “according to the Bible, what is revealed to us is not a body of information concerning various things of which we might otherwise be ignorant.”²³ Against this backdrop Joseph insisted that prayer frequently and dramatically evokes an answer that is impossible to mistake as anything other than an individualized, dialogic response to a highly particularized question.

Second, the Book of Mormon expands the notion of revelation far beyond the Old Testament model, according to which, as the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* puts it, “[Prophecy] was pre-eminently the privilege of the prophets.”²⁴ This rupture with Judaeo-Christian precedent occurs most forcefully in 1 Nephi, chapters 10 through 11. Lehi is the patriarch and prophet of his people. In the Old Testament we find that it is to the prophets and patriarchs that revelation comes. So it is only to be expected that when a vision of the tree of life is given, Lehi would be the recipient. But Nephi was “desirous also that [he] might see, and hear, and know of these things” for himself (1 Nephi 10:17). When Nephi made his wish known to the Spirit of the Lord, he was asked if he believed the words of his father (see 1 Nephi 11:1–5). I don’t know this, but I can imagine that at this moment Nephi paused. Perhaps if he said no, the Spirit would rebuke him for disloyalty and faithlessness. But if he said yes, the Spirit

might well ask, “Then why not be content to take the word of your prophet and patriarch?”

When Nephi indicated that he did indeed believe the words of his father, the Spirit broke forth into a virtual psalm of rejoicing, shouting, “Hosanna!” Then Nephi was rewarded, not rebuked, for seeking his own personal revelatory experience (see 1 Nephi 11:5–6). Here we find a dramatic and momentous break with the Old Testament pattern. Revelation, we here learn, is the province of Everyman.

The subject of that dialogue between the human and the divine finds substantial definition as well. The revelations that come from God to prophets, the great Abraham Heschel wrote, “may be described as *exegesis of existence from a divine perspective*.”²⁵ Well, that may be. But not many individuals are concerned, when they kneel in prayer, with “exegesis of existence from a divine perspective.” In the Book of Mormon, worried parents, earnest missionaries, befuddled Church leaders, hungry hunters, and inquiring sons all learned the great truth that their concerns—their immediate, quotidian, personal concerns—were God’s concerns. And solutions to those proximate concerns are the appropriate subject of divine communication from the heavens. That knowledge binds a people to their God more powerfully than the “exegesis of existence.”

Four Truths About Human Nature

Joseph’s conception of humankind was as radical—and as well timed—as his views on deity and revelation. I am not sure which answered the greater hunger of the seeking soul. Here are the four truths about human nature that Joseph taught that would reinvent man. We are, he declared, *eternally* existent, inherently *innocent*, boundlessly *free*, and infinitely *perfectible*. These notions simply had to have resonated with special force in a time, as I mentioned earlier, when—even more forcefully than in the Renaissance—traditional strictures on man’s self-understanding were bursting.

1. Man Is Eternally Existent. Joseph quoted the Savior as saying: “I was in the beginning with the Father. . . . Ye were also in the beginning with the Father. . . . Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be” (D&C 93:21, 23, 29).²⁶ Philosophers since Plato had sensed this, poets like Wordsworth had believed this, but Joseph Smith was the first prophet to clearly teach this. But have you considered some of the logical implications of a premortal existence? First, that man lived forever through ages that recede back to an infinite past leads to a second powerful principle.

2. Man Is Inherently Innocent. If we lived as spirit children before the Fall of Adam, then we do not descend from corrupt or fallen parents. As Joseph taught, “Every spirit of man was innocent in the beginning; and God having redeemed man from the fall, men became again, in their infant state, innocent before God” (D&C 93:38).

A second implication of premortality is equally profound. A British philosopher only pointed out the obvious when he argued that if God created our souls, He “could have prevented all sin by creating us with better natures and in more favourable surroundings. . . . Hence we should not be responsible for our sins to God.”²⁷ Thomas Aquinas was one of the first theologians to recognize this problem when he admitted the logical difficulty of finding freedom in a universe where God is the first cause of everything—because, as Aristotle had reasoned, only that which is not created can be free.²⁸ But if the soul is coeternal with God, as Joseph proposed, then the Gordian knot is severed.

3. Man Is Inherently Free. If man is coeternal with God, agency—or moral freedom—can logically inhere in every human being. And so we find Joseph affirming that “all truth is independent in that sphere in which God has placed it, to act for itself, as all intelligence also; otherwise there is no existence” (D&C 93:30).

4. Man Is Infinitely Perfectible. And, finally, Joseph taught that this perfect moral freedom that God grants to us opens up possibilities that exceed anything the Christians of his day could imagine. He said:

You have got to learn how to make yourselves Gods . . . by going from a small capacity to a great capacity, from a small degree to another, from grace to grace, until the resurrection *of the dead*, from exaltation to exaltation—till you are able to sit in everlasting burnings and everlasting power and glory.²⁹

In so literally embracing the divine potential in man, Joseph ennobled human nature to such a degree that even the most exuberant Renaissance humanists would have blanched. Parley P. Pratt suggested the profound implications of all this for our relationships to deity and to each other: “Gods, angels, and men are all of one species, one race, one great family, widely diffused among the planetary systems.”³⁰

The audacity of such a view is the more striking when it is juxtaposed with the teaching of one of the most influential founders of the Christian tradition. Writing 1,500 years ago, Augustine asked, “What could be worse pride than the incredible folly in which I asserted that I was by nature what [God is]?”³¹ How significant that Joseph’s most potent teaching—the one with the greatest power to found true community by rooting it in a knowledge of relations among men and women and gods as they really are and

really can be—should be condemned in the early Christian centuries as the greatest and most dangerous of blasphemies.

Eternal existence, inherent innocence, perfect freedom, and infinite potential—in the world before Joseph Smith, man was seen as created out of nothing, crippled from his birth with a depraved nature, often enjoying little or no freedom of the will, and limited in his potential by a jealous god. No wonder that by the nineteenth century some societies were rebelling against kings and church alike, believing that both were an enemy to man and his eternal soul. No wonder that when Joseph taught again these doctrines of human nature, his ideas were like fire on dry kindling.

The Primacy and Durability of Personal Relationships

Joseph emphasized the primacy and durability of personal relationships. On the eve of his martyrdom, the Prophet turned to Dr. Willard Richards and said:

“If we go into the cell, will you go in with us?” The doctor answered, “Brother Joseph you did not ask me to cross the river with you—you did not ask me to come to Carthage—you did not ask me to come to jail with you—and do you think I would forsake you now? But I will tell you what I will do; if you are condemned to be hung for treason, I will be hung in your stead, and you shall go free.” Joseph said, “You cannot.” The doctor replied, “I will.”³²

How does one explain the depths of this love and loyalty? Joseph’s friends loved him because they knew the extent of his love for them. Nothing in Joseph’s life was more important than friendship. When he revealed that the “same sociality which exists among us here will exist among us there [in the eternal world],”³³ Joseph was affirming the fact that heaven is constructed out of a web of human relationships that extend in every direction. By the time his work was done, he had laid the groundwork for men to be sealed to their wives across the eternities; for parents to be sealed to their children and their children’s children and to their parents and their parents’ parents across infinite generations; and for friends to be bound to friends in a great assembly and Church of the Firstborn. Parley Pratt singled out this dimension to Joseph’s teachings as a supreme contribution:

It was Joseph Smith who taught me how to prize the endearing relationships of father and mother, husband and wife; of brother and sister, son and daughter.

It was from him that I learned that the wife of my bosom might be secured to me for time and all eternity; and that the refined sympathies

and affections which endeared us to each other emanated from the fountain of divine eternal love. . . .

I had loved before, but I knew not why. But now I loved—with a pureness—an intensity of elevated, exalted feeling, which would lift my soul from the transitory things of this grovelling sphere and expand it as the ocean.³⁴

The privileged status of personal relationships was not just incidental to the Restoration; it was a primary focus. As Joseph wrote, “It was my endeavor to so organize the Church, that the brethren might eventually be independent of every incumbrance beneath the celestial kingdom, by bonds and covenants of mutual friendship, and mutual love.”³⁵ When he later stated, with striking brevity, “Friendship is one of the grand fundamental principles of ‘Mormonism,’”³⁶ he was saying something about the deepest underpinnings of Mormon theology. Joseph rejoiced in his relationships to God, family, and friends, and he articulated a system that both revealed their eternal dimension and—this is key—provided the principles, ordinances, and knowledge to render them eternal.

He wrote in his journal: “How good and glorious it has seemed unto me, to find pure and holy friends, who are faithful, just, and true. . . . In the name of the Lord, I feel in my heart to bless them. . . . These love the God that I serve; they love the truths that I promulgate. . . . I . . . prayed for them with anxious and fervent desire. . . . They shall not want a friend while I live.”³⁷ No wonder he could say truthfully, “Let me be resurrected with the Saints, whether I ascend to heaven or descend to hell.”³⁸

To others he insisted: “When you & I meet face to face, I anticipate, without the least doubt, that all matters between us will be fairly understood, and perfect love prevail; and [the] sacred covenant by which we are bound together, have the uppermost seat in our hearts.”³⁹ Again, how significant it is that he actually made the affirmation of such bonds into a sacred ritual. Those who attended his School of the Prophets were greeted in this manner:

Art thou a brother or brethren? I salute you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, in token or remembrance of the everlasting covenant, in which covenant I receive you to fellowship, in a determination that is fixed, immovable, and unchangeable, to be your friend and brother through the grace of God in the bonds of love. [D&C 88:133]

Seeing this project of a timeless and borderless web of human relationships as his objective, one can understand what sociologists and students of religion cannot: how to explain the great secret of how Mormonism became not just another church, not just a thriving institution, but a people for whom the words *brother* and *sister* carry more than metaphoric

significance. The great appeal of first-generation Christianity, Elaine Pagels has recently written, was the feeling of entering into an extended family community.⁴⁰ It was no small feat and not without the highest significance that Joseph successfully replicated the most essential, the most authentically Christian aspect of the primitive Church. That is the true greatness of his legacy: he forged a genuine community.

A Culture of Certainty

There is, I think, another aspect of his legacy that shapes the special character of the people who call Joseph “Prophet” and that connects them in a particularly powerful way. That is the possibility of religious certainty that Joseph held out. A man inducted into his religious vocation with a literal visit by an embodied God and Christ is not likely to view his religious convictions in the same terms as a typical Christian believer. Translating scripture out of tangible metal plates weighing forty or fifty pounds is not of the same order of prophetic utterance as expressing mere spiritual intimations. Feeling the weight of angelic hands belonging to resurrected Apostles on his head—conferring upon him the priesthood of God—produced a crystalline certainty about his authority (the lack of which would drive Roger Williams to abandon his own church). Joseph Smith, in other words, did not simply believe he was a prophet inspired to act in God’s name; in his mind he was as certain as any man could be on any subject sacred or secular. “I knew it, and I knew that God knew it,”⁴¹ he said of his initial encounter with deity. Joseph’s formative experiences—as a fourteen-year-old seeker, as a prophet, and as a religion maker—were saturated in the physical, the tangible, the material, and the visible.

Certainty is a term that frequently appears in the ministry of Joseph Smith—often in a doctrinally prominent position. In his *Lectures on Faith*, which he delivered to the elders in Kirtland, he claimed that from earliest times, faith has been a prelude to sure knowledge:

The inquiry and diligent search of the ancient saints to seek after and obtain a knowledge of the glory of God [was rooted in] the credence they gave to the testimony of their fathers. . . . The inquiry frequently terminated, indeed always terminated when rightly pursued, in the most glorious discoveries and eternal certainty.⁴²

Of his own case he wrote to his wife, “For as much as I know for a certainty of Eternal things if the heveans linger it is nothing to me.”⁴³ It is easy to see why his personal encounter with a conversing deity would ground his own sense of epistemological certainty. But he clearly saw his own experience as a prototype others could—and should—aspire to.

An 1833 revelation had the Lord declaring, “Every soul who forsaketh his sins and cometh unto me, and calleth on my name, and obeyeth my voice, and keepeth my commandments, shall see my face and know that I am” (D&C 93:1). This possibility Joseph related to the doctrine of the Second Comforter, spoken of by Christ when He addressed His disciples before His crucifixion. On that occasion He promised that the Father would send them “another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever” (John 14:16). Joseph wrote: “When any man obtains this last Comforter, . . . the visions of the heavens will be opened unto him, and the Lord will teach him face to face, and he may have a perfect knowledge of the mysteries of the Kingdom of God.”⁴⁴

Joseph apparently believed that the personal epiphany he experienced in his visitation by the Father and the Son—heralding full immersion in the divine light, with all its epistemological fullness and certainty—betokened an order of knowledge that was the right and destiny of all faithful Saints. That very real possibility informs Mormon life, worship, personal aspirations, and shared purpose. To attend any LDS testimony meeting, for example, is to enter into a rhetorical universe in which a language of calm assurance and confident conviction and even professions of certain knowledge overwhelm the more traditional Christian expressions of common belief. It may well be that this sense of shared knowledge—its possession or pursuit—is an even more potent community builder than shared faith. At the same time, of course, such rhetoric can have its drawbacks. It can convey a sense of smugness or superiority; it can create the tragic impression that with certainty there is no room or need for searching; and it can create discomfort and alienation on the part of those who do not or cannot share in expressions of serene, unconflicted conviction.

So it is at this point that I want to conclude with a few observations about what happens in the absence of such certainty. Whether faith is a way station on the way to certainty, as it seems to be in Alma’s sermon, or the place one’s spiritual journey takes one to, it is important that one understand the incalculable significance of faith—of this deliberate gesture of belief—as a defining moral gesture.

It is true that some people seem born with faith. And many people die with a full complement. My own grandmother spent her last months pining for death because she was the last of her generation; she “missed her people” to an excruciating degree; and she grew more and more disconnected from a world she saw as simply irrelevant, without the power to interest or lay hold upon her. It was striking to watch the world and persons beyond the grave assume, in her mind and in her conversation, a fully fleshed-out texture and presence that utterly displaced the inhabitants of

the here and now. Faith did not seem a choice for her. It descended upon her as naturally, irresistibly, and encompassingly as the heavy snowfalls on her upstate New York farm.

But such a gift I have not found to be common. It would seem that among those who vigorously pursue the life of the mind in particular, who are committed to the scholarly pursuit of knowledge and rational inquiry, faith is as often a casualty as it is a product. The call to faith is a summons to engage the heart, to attune it to resonate in sympathy with principles and values and ideals that we devoutly hope are true, and to have reasonable but not certain grounds for believing them to be true. I am convinced that there must be grounds for doubt as well as belief in order to render the choice more truly a choice—and, therefore, the more deliberate and laden with personal vulnerability and investment. The option to believe must appear on our personal horizon like the fruit of paradise, perched precariously between sets of demands held in dynamic tension. One is, it would seem, always provided with sufficient materials out of which to fashion a life of credible conviction or dismissive denial. We are acted upon, in other words, by appeals to our personal values, our yearnings, our fears, our appetites, and our egos. What we choose to embrace, to be responsive to, is the purest reflection of who we are and what we love. That is why faith, the choice to believe, is, in the final analysis, an action that is positively laden with moral significance.

I believe that we are—as reflective, thinking, pondering seekers—much like the proverbial ass of Buridan. If you remember, the beast starved to death because he was faced with two equally desirable and equally accessible piles of hay. Having no determinative reason to choose one over the other, he perished in indecision. In the case of us mortals, men and women are confronted with a world in which there are appealing arguments for God as a childish projection, for modern prophets as scheming or deluded imposters, and for modern scriptures as so much fabulous fiction. But there is also compelling evidence that a glorious divinity presides over the cosmos, that God calls and anoints prophets, and that His word and will are made manifest through a sacred canon that is never definitively closed. There is, as with the ass of Buridan, nothing to compel an individual's preference for one over the other. But in the case of us mortals, there is something to tip the scale. There is something to predispose us to a life of faith or a life of unbelief. There is a heart that in these conditions of equilibrium and balance—and only in these conditions of equilibrium and balance, equally “enticed by the one or the other” (2 Nephi 2:16)—is truly free to choose belief or cynicism, faith or faithlessness.

Why, then, is there more merit—given this perfect balance—in believing in the Christ (and His gospel and prophets) than believing in a false deity or in nothing at all? Perhaps because there is nothing in the universe—or in any possible universe—more perfectly good, absolutely beautiful, and worthy of adoration and emulation than this Christ. A gesture of belief in *that* direction, a will manifesting itself as a desire to acknowledge *His* virtues as the paramount qualities of a divided universe, is a response to the best in us, the best and noblest of which the human soul is capable. For we do indeed create gods after our own image—or potential image. And that is an activity endowed with incalculable moral significance.

As Carlyle said, “The Great Man was always as lightning out of Heaven; the rest of men waited for him like fuel, and then they too would flame.” Joseph Smith ignited something in thousands of men and women that connects them to God and to each other in powerful ways. In part, this was because he was, like Esther, born to his hour in human history—an hour when the passion for human liberty never burned brighter. His message resonated because it was a stirring, compelling, and exciting synthesis that presented a spiritually hungry humankind with a god, like the god of Plato, who “was good, and the good can never have any jealousy of anything. And being free from jealousy, he desired that all things should be as like himself as they could be.”⁴⁵ The god of Joseph Smith was not a threat to human potential but a being who gloried in that potential and whose work was to bring it to fruition. That was why Joseph’s message resonated and caught hold like a burning fire.

But his message also flamed forth because millions of men and women have freely chosen to believe. They assayed the opinions of doubters, and they gave a hearing to the critics. Like Brigham Young, they knew Joseph was human and subject to err, but they sampled his words and agreed they tasted like honey. They weighed the beauty of a god and of human origins and a human future unlike anything before imagined. They found reason to doubt, and they found reason to believe. They chose to believe.

Terryl L. Givens (tgivens@richmond.edu) is Professor of Literature and Religion and is the James A. Bostwick Chair of English at the University of Richmond.

1. Joseph Smith—History 1:33; also Joseph Smith Jr., *The History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2d ed. rev., 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971), 1:11–12 (hereafter cited as *History of the Church*).

2. Kazi Islam, “The Economic World of Joseph Smith—A Response,” remarks delivered May 21, 2005, at *The Worlds of Joseph Smith*, bicentennial symposium held May 20–21, 2005, New South Wales Parliament, Sydney, Australia.

3. Jason Lase, "Fruits and Roots of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," delivered May 21, 2005, at *The Worlds of Joseph Smith*, bicentennial symposium held May 20–21, 2005, New South Wales Parliament, Sydney, Australia.

4. Arun Joshi, "Mormon Ways of Family Life Can Resolve Conflicts in World," paper delivered at *Ideas for the 21st Century: The Worlds of Joseph Smith*, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, August 27, 2005.

5. Address of Hyrum Smith, April 7, 1844, *History of the Church*, 6:300.

6. Thomas Carlyle, "The Hero as Prophet," *Heroes and Hero Worship* (1840).

7. Albert Camus, "The Execution of the King," in part 3 of *The Rebel: An Essay on Man in Revolt*, trans. Anthony Bower (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 120; see also Adam Zamoyski, *Holy Madness: Romantics, Patriots, and Revolutionaries, 1776–1871* (New York: Viking, 2000), 1.

8. Marquis de Lafayette, *Lettres de Prison*, ed. Jules Thomas (Paris: Delagrave, 1907), 203–5, quoted in Zamoyski, *Holy Madness*, 88.

9. William Wordsworth, *The Prelude* (1799–1805), book 11, lines 108–9.

10. William Wordsworth, *The Excursion* (1814), book 4, lines 140, 179, 182–83.

11. Lord Byron, *Cain* (1821), act 2, scene 1, lines 50–51.

12. Robert Browning, *Two in the Campagna* (1855), stanza 12.

13. William Wordsworth, *The Excursion* (1814), book 4, lines 330–31.

14. Alexis de Tocqueville, "On the Principal Causes That Make Religion Powerful in America," *Democracy in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 282 (vol. 1, part 2, chapter 9), quoted in Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Roads to Modernity: The British, French, and American Enlightenments* (New York: Knopf, 2004), 205.

15. Jonathan Edwards, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," *The Works of President Edwards: With a Memoir of His Life*, ed. Sereno Edwards Dwight, 10 vols. (New York: Carvill, 1830), 7:169, 170, 172.

16. Sarah Edwards, in *Works of President Edwards*, 1:172–73; italics in original; see also George M. Marsden, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2003), 243–44.

17. Parley P. Pratt, "Joe Smith and the Devil: A Dialogue," *New York Herald*, August 25, 1844, 1.

18. Himmelfarb, *Roads*, 48.

19. William J. Abraham, *Divine Revelation and the Limits of Historical Criticism* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 24.

20. Avery Dulles, *Models of Revelation* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 68.

21. See George Tyrrell, *Through Scylla and Charybdis* (London: Longmans, Green, 1907), 326–27.

22. Auguste Sabatier, *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion Based on Psychology and History* (New York: Harper, 1957), 33.

23. John Baillie, *The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), 28.

24. In F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed., rev. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), s.v. "prophecy," 1345.

25. Abraham J. Heschel, *The Prophets*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1969–71), 2:xvi; emphasis in original.

26. The nature of eternal intelligence has not been specified. Joseph Smith addressed “the immortality of the spirit of man. . . . The intelligence of spirits had no beginning, neither will it have an end.” Joseph Fielding Smith, comp., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976), 353.

“Some LDS leaders have interpreted this [the coeternal nature of intelligence] to mean that intelligent beings—called intelligences—existed before and after they were given spirit bodies in the premortal existence. Others have interpreted it to mean that intelligent beings were organized as spirits out of eternal intelligent matter, that they did not exist as individuals before they were organized as spirit beings in the premortal existence (Abr. 3:22; *JD* 7:57; 2:124). The Church has taken no official position on this issue.” Dennis J. Packard, “Intelligence,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, ed. Daniel H. Ludlow, 4 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1992), 2:692.

27. John McTaggart and Ellis McTaggart, *Some Dogmas of Religion* (1906; reprint, New York: Kraus Reprints, 1969), 165.

28. See Thomas Aquinas, Objection 3 and Reply to Objection 3 in Part 1, Question 83, First Article: “Whether Man Has Free-Will?” *Summa Theologica*, 3 vols. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947–48), 1:418. Aquinas is quoting Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, book 1, chapter 2.

29. Stan Larson, “The King Follett Discourse: A Newly Amalgamated Text,” *BYU Studies* 18, no. 2 (1978): 201; emphasis a demarcation in original; see also *History of the Church*, 6:306.

30. Parley P. Pratt, *Key to the Science of Theology: A Voice of Warning* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1978), 21.

31. Augustine, *Confessions* (397–401), trans. F. J. Sheed, book 4, section 15.

32. *History of the Church*, 6:616.

33. D&C 130:2; see also *History of the Church*, 5:323.

34. Parley P. Pratt Jr., ed., *The Autobiography of Parley P. Pratt*, 4th ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 259–60.

35. *History of the Church*, 1:269.

36. *History of the Church*, 5:517; text as in original.

37. *History of the Church*, 5:107, 108, 109.

38. *History of the Church*, 5:517.

39. Letter to Edward Partridge and others, December 10, 1833, in Dean C. Jessee, ed. and comp., *Personal Writings of Joseph Smith*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo: BYU Press, 2002), 337–38; brackets in Jessee.

40. See Elaine Pagels, *Beyond Belief: The Secret Gospel of Thomas* (New York: Random House, 2003), 6–10.

41. Joseph Smith—History 1:25; *History of the Church*, 1:8.

42. N. B. Lundwall, comp., *Lectures on Faith* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, n.d.), 23 (2:56). Joseph’s actual authorship of the Lectures on Faith has become increasingly doubtful; it seems that they were, at the least, authorized by him and a reflection of his theological views.

43. Letter to Emma, March 21, 1839, in Jessee, *Personal Writings*, 449; text as in original.

44. *History of the Church*, 3:381.

45. Plato, *Dialogues*, “Timaeus,” trans. Benjamin Jowett, section 1, 29.



Courtesy Church Archives, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

FIG. 1. Jonathan Hawaii Napela (1813–1879), taken in 1869 during his trip to Salt Lake City. Photograph by Charles R. Savage.

An Islander's View of a Desert Kingdom

Jonathan Napela Recounts His 1869 Visit to Salt Lake City

Fred E. Woods

Jonathan (Ionatana) Hawaii Napela (fig. 1) bridged cultures. As one of the first Hawaiian converts to Mormonism, he helped George Q. Cannon translate the Book of Mormon into the Hawaiian language in 1852–53,¹ he instigated the first language training center for foreign missionaries in 1853, and he helped establish the first gathering place for the Hawaiian Saints in 1854. In 1869 Napela visited Salt Lake City. In an April 11, 1871, letter to Brigham Young, Napela recounted his visit as he reported it to the Hawaiian king, Kamehameha V. Written in Hawaiian, the letter is evidence of Napela's ability to bridge his native and adopted cultures and pave the way for the restored gospel to take root in the Hawaiian Islands. In 1873, his wife, Kitty, contracted leprosy (Hansen's Disease) and she and Jonathan went to the leper settlement on the island of Molokai. For the remaining years of his life, Jonathan presided over Latter-day Saints living in the leper colony.² Jonathan died of leprosy August 6, 1879, and Kitty died less than two weeks later.³

1. George Q. Cannon, Journals, January 5, 1852, Church Archives, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City (hereafter cited as Church Archives).

2. Andrew Jenson, "Manuscript History of the Hawaiian Mission of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," 6 vols., typescript, January 27, 1878, Church Archives, notes that in 1878, there were seventy-eight members of the Church in two branches in Kalawao and Kalaupapa.

3. *Kalawao Death Register 1879–1880*, Hawaii State Archives, Honolulu. See also Robert J. Morris, review of *News from Molokai*, by Alfons L. Korn, *BYU Studies* 17, no. 3 (1977): 379–81.

In researching many traveler accounts, Dr. Fred Woods observes converts building intercultural bridges. Jonathan Napela was such a person, he says. "Napela was the first known Hawaiian convert to visit Salt Lake City and to be endowed. He assisted George Q. Cannon with the translation of the Book of Mormon into the Hawaiian language, probably making Napela the most famous Hawaiian convert to Mormonism. Napela not only crossed cultures, but in this priceless letter he provides a rare glimpse of an Islander's view of a desert kingdom. In the letter, Napela symbolically stretches his hands out in each direction, bridging the vast cultural ocean that lay between his local political leader, the Hawaiian monarch, and his distant spiritual leader, President Young."



Jonathan Napela is considered by many to be the most famous Hawaiian convert to Mormonism. Descending from royal lineage (known to Hawaiians as the *ali'i*), he was born September 11, 1813, in Honokowai, on the island of Maui.⁴ Here on Maui (Lahaina), at the age of eighteen (1831), Jonathan began his formal education at a Protestant school called Lahainaluna, where he was one of forty-three students, including the later well-known Hawaiian scholar David Malo.⁵ From this academic foundation, Jonathan developed a

4. Jonathan Hawaii Napela's Hawaiian name was Namahanaikaleleonalani, as noted in Genealogy of Hattie Panana Kaiwaokalani Napela, typescript, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, citing *Honolulu Advertiser*, July 19, 1901. He was the son of Hawaiiwa'aole (father) and Wikiokalani (mother). *International Genealogical Index*, CD-ROM, v. 5.0, file no. 1235151.

5. Scott G. Kenney, "Mormons and the Smallpox Epidemic of 1853," *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 31 (1997): 18. Primary documents covering the Lahainaluna classes may be obtained at the Children's Museum Library in Honolulu. Kenney is correct on this point of education, but he is incorrect on the date of Jonathan's birth and thus on the date he began school at Lahainaluna.

keen mind and went on to practice law. On August 3, 1843, he married Kitty Kelii-Kuaaina Richardson, who was also from *ali'i* blood.⁶ They had one known child, named Hattie Panana Kaiwaokalani Napela.⁷ Jonathan also served as a district judge in Wailuku during the years 1848–51.⁸

Jonathan was introduced to the Church by missionary George Q. Cannon, and on January 5, 1852, he was baptized.⁹ Cannon wrote that there were negative consequences for Jonathan's conversion: "I had an interview with Mr. Napela this morning. . . . He told me that his office of Judge was *pau* or stopped. I asked him if he thought that his entertaining me had any effect in their breaking him; he said he thought it was mainly attributed to that."¹⁰

Napela and Cannon developed a wonderful symbiotic relationship as Cannon taught Napela the restored gospel and they worked together on the Book of Mormon translation. Cannon wrote that Napela "could give me the exact meaning of words. The meaning attached to many words depended upon the context. . . . Probably but few in the nation were as well qualified as Brother Napela, to help me in this respect."¹¹ In addition, Napela showed Cannon a greater dimension of faith. Cannon recalled one particular experience in his journal. After Cannon and others had prayed for good weather for a spring conference, they then decided to have their meeting the following day indoors, thinking the weather would be unpleasant. However, when they were about to enter a shop for the meeting, Cannon writes, "Napela and a few more of the native brethren came up as we were going and he asked if we were going in the house to meet after asking the Lord to bless us with fine weather; he said it did not manifest faith; he appeared much surprised—and we felt to be rebuked for our lack of faith and we started for a grove."¹²

To Jonathan should go the credit for first suggesting a language training center for missionaries. As evidenced in Cannon's journal in the

A letter written by Jonathan Napela to E. O. Hall, October 23, 1873, Board of Health Records 1873, Letters Incoming, Hawaii State Archives, supports his birth being in the year 1813.

6. Kitty was half Hawaiian and half Caucasian.

7. *International Genealogical Index*, file no. 1235151.

8. Document from the Judiciary History Center, Honolulu. Appreciation is expressed to Chris Mahelona (a Napela descendant) for bringing this document to my attention and scanning it for me.

9. Cannon, Journals, January 5, 1852.

10. Cannon, Journals, July 4, 1851. Thanks is expressed to Chad M. Orton for bringing this point to the attention of the author, as well as other items pertaining to the relationship of Napela and Cannon.

11. George Q. Cannon, *My First Mission* (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1879), 59.

12. Cannon, Journals, April 1, 1852.

spring of 1853, Napela recommended that upon arriving in the Hawaiian Islands, Utah elders should first learn the native language at Napela's home. Redick Allred explained that Napela "wanted to keep us [the Utah elders] in school 2 months & then we might go, for he thought we would begin to talk [in Hawaiian] in that time to get our places of appointment."¹³ Not only were Napela's language training plans put into immediate practice in his home,¹⁴ but LDS Missionary Training Centers currently use this same time sequence for missionaries assigned to most foreign-speaking missions. In addition, the Jonathan Napela Center for Hawaiian Language and Cultural Studies is an integral part of the BYU-Hawaii campus.

At the Sandwich Islands [Hawaii] Mission Conference on October 19, 1853, several missionaries, including Cannon and Napela (the only Hawaiian), were appointed to find a gathering place for the Hawaiian Saints.¹⁵ The next day, this committee traveled to the island of Lanai to explore possible locations. On the return voyage from Lanai to Lahaina, Cannon notes that "Bro. Napela prayed aloud to the Lord, by my request to bless us with a breeze and it was only a few minutes before we had to unship our oars and we were gliding along delightfully before a pleasant breeze."¹⁶ In the following year the Palawai Basin on Lanai was officially established as the first Hawaiian gathering place.¹⁷ For nearly a decade, the Palawai Basin would be Napela's primary place of residence.

In 1857 the Utah missionaries were called to return to the mainland due to the Utah War. Soon after, Walter Murray Gibson came to the Hawaiian Islands, and during the years that Gibson presided over the Church in Lanai, Napela served as a member of his first presidency (1862–64).¹⁸ In 1864, Gibson was excommunicated for apostasy, while Napela joined with other Hawaiian Saints in establishing a Mormon plantation at the newly

13. Cannon, Journals, April 8, 1853; Redick Allred, Journal, April 27, 1853, Church Archives. Thanks to Chad M. Orton for sharing this information with the author.

14. Ephraim Green, Diary, typescript, April 9, 16, 20, 1853, BYU Hawaii Special Collections.

15. Jensen, "Manuscript History of the Hawaiian Mission," October 19, 1853.

16. Cannon, Journals, October 21, 1853.

17. For more information on this topic, see Fred E. Woods, "The Palawai Pioneers on the Island of Lanai: The First Hawaiian Latter-day Saint Gathering Place (1854–1864)," *Mormon Historical Studies* 5 (Fall 2004): 3–35.

18. Kenney, "Mormons and the Smallpox Epidemic of 1853," 18. For more information on Walter Murray Gibson, see Gwynn Barrett, "Walter Murray Gibson: The Shepherd Saint of Lanai Revisited," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 40 (Spring 1972): 142–62; and R. Lanier Britsch, "Another Visit with Walter Murray Gibson," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 46 (Winter 1978): 65–78.

designated gathering place in Laie on the island of Oahu.¹⁹ Here Jonathan supervised the temporal work of his LDS Hawaiian brothers.²⁰

The following letter is the last of four known letters written by Napela to President Brigham Young, all written in Hawaiian.²¹ The first one, written in the spring of 1852 shortly after his entrance into the Church, noted, among other things, "This is the church of God, and that it is the gospel which is preached by the white men from the Rocky Mountains." Jonathan further noted, "My desire is great to see you, ye Fathers of the gospel of Jesus Christ."²²

President Young had written to the Sandwich Islands missionaries in early 1855, "If some of the native brethren would accompany you that come here the ensuing season, I should be pleased to see them, and if they find by trying our winter that they can endure this climate, I shall be glad to have them gather to this place as fast as the way shall open for them to do so."²³ A few months later, the Sandwich Islands Mission voted to send Napela and three other Hawaiians to Utah.²⁴ However, the Hawaiian monarchy

19. "Sandwich Islands Mission," *Deseret News*, November 30, 1864, 67, reported the minutes of a mission conference held in Honolulu in October 1864. During this conference, Napela stated, "We have been listening to plain but great truths, we have sinned ignorantly. We were deceived and led away by Gibson's cunning words, and thereby have broken the sacred covenants we had made, but we are now undeceived, therefore let us renew our covenants and be faithful. I know this work is of God, that Joseph Smith and Brigham Young are prophets of God."

20. Woods, "The Palawai Pioneers on the Island of Lanai," 24–35.

21. The first letter was written on April 8, 1852, from Wailuku, Maui. Written on the back of Napela's letter was a letter written by George Q. Cannon to Brigham Young on the same day. Napela's letter appeared in "Foreign Correspondence," *Deseret News*, November 27, 1852, 4, in the Hawaiian language, followed by the English translation that George Q. Cannon provided. Cannon noted in his letter that Napela was "the most influential man that has yet joined the Church" and added that Napela was "anxious to see the Valley and the folks there." The other two letters were written on October 11, 1865, and May 2, 1868, and are found in Brigham Young Letters, Incoming Correspondence, Church Archives.

22. "Foreign Correspondence," 4.

23. Brigham Young to Philip B. Lewis, B. F. Johnson, and The Brethren of the Sandwich Islands Mission, January 30, 1855, Brigham Young Letters, Outgoing Correspondence, Church Archives.

24. Eli Bell, Journal, July 25, 1855. Bell's entry was apparently extrapolated for the mission history and is evidence for the entry in Jenson, "Manuscript History of the Hawaiian Mission," July 25, 1855.

had previously established a law prohibiting immigration,²⁵ which delayed Napela's meeting President Young for another fourteen years.

On June 22, 1869, Napela and George Nebeker²⁶ left Honolulu for San Francisco on the *D C Murray*²⁷ and continued by train to Salt Lake City.²⁸ Their arrival was reported in the *Deseret News*:

Elder George Nebeker . . . was accompanied by Elder J. H. Napela, a native of the Sandwich Islands, who became a member of the Church about eighteen years ago, and is the first of that race who has visited this country. He has been welcomed warmly by all who have met him, and his meeting with some of the Elders who have labored there has been affecting. They have never forgotten the many acts of kindness which they received from him while on the Islands. They left the Islands on the 22nd of June, and had a slow passage, three weeks having been spent on the water.²⁹

Nebeker brought with him "six tons and a half of sugar and eighty barrels of molasses, the product of the plantation of Laie."³⁰

In Utah Napela fulfilled his long-anticipated dream of meeting Brigham Young. Napela was seated with the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve for viewing the July 24 holiday celebration, and the next day, Sunday, he and Nebeker addressed a congregation. Jonathan spoke "in his native tongue, his remarks being interpreted by Elder

25. The law stipulated that "no native subject of the King shall be allowed to emigrate to California or other foreign country." Raymond Clyde Beck, "Palawai Basin: Hawaii's Mormon Zion" (MA thesis, University of Hawaii, 1972), 27; "Hawaiian House of Nobles and Representatives," *Penal Code Session Laws* 1850, section 1, 154.

26. George Nebeker was born in Delaware in 1827 and came to the Salt Lake Valley in 1847. In the fall of 1864, he and Elder Francis A. Hammond were assigned to purchase land for a new gathering place, which was selected in Laie, on the island of Oahu. Nebeker served as the president of the Sandwich Islands Mission from 1865 to 1873. Andrew Jenson, *Latter-day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia: A Compilation of Biographical Sketches of Prominent Men and Women in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: Andrew Jenson History, 1901-36), 1:682-83; 4:340.

27. The *D C [Colden] Murray* was a bark that made regular trips between Honolulu and San Francisco during this period. A number of LDS missionaries sailed on the *D C Murray*. Both Napela and Nebeker are attested on the passenger list for this vessel disembarking from Honolulu on June 22, 1869. Passenger List, *D C Murray*, June 22, 1869, Hawaii State Archives.

28. The transcontinental railroad had just been completed on May 10, 1869, intersecting at Promontory Point, in Utah Territory.

29. "From the Sandwich Islands," *Deseret Evening News*, July 22, 1869, 2.

30. "From the Sandwich Islands," 2.

Geo. Q. Cannon.”³¹ Napela received his own endowment on August 2, 1869³² (the first known Hawaiian to do so), and was baptized as a proxy for the deceased King Kamehameha I. Napela had a photograph taken by Charles Savage (see fig. 1).

When Nebeker and Napela returned to Hawaii in November 1869,³³ Nebeker reported that they

found the brethren and sisters glad to see us and to hear what good news we had to tell them about the Saints at home. . . . Bro. Napela has visited the king several times and has been kindly received. The king makes a great many inquiries about the people of Utah and his trip there. The present that President Young sent was kindly received and one promised in return.³⁴ The king advises Bro. Napela to offer himself as a candidate for the next Legislature.³⁵

Nebeker's letter evidences that Kamehameha V was very interested in Utah and that the king encouraged Napela to run for political office.³⁶

Napela's memorable 1869 visit to Utah is brought to light in this unique four-page letter dated April 11, 1871 (fig. 2). In this account, written with ink in his own hand, Napela provides Young with a recounting of the visit as he explained it to the Hawaiian king, Kamehameha V, about eighteen months after he returned from Utah. The letter was translated into English by Jason Achiu.

31. [George Q. Cannon], “The Celebration,” *Deseret Evening News*, July 26, 1869, 2; “Sabbath Meetings,” *Deseret Evening News*, July 26, 1869, 3.

32. *International Genealogical Index*, file no. 1235151.

33. In George Nebeker to the Editor [George Q. Cannon], written November 21, 1869, *Deseret News*, December 15, 1869, 529, Nebeker states that they “arrived in Honolulu on the 4th of November,” but the passenger list evidences that they arrived on November 5, 1869. On this passenger list, Napela is listed as forty-five years of age, from Honolulu, and as having the vocation of a preacher. Nebeker is noted as age forty, from Honolulu and with the occupation of a farmer. Passenger List, *D C Murray*, November 5, 1869, Hawaii State Archives. Appreciation is expressed to archivist Jason Achiu for bringing these manifests to the attention of the author.

34. Nebeker's letter does not say what either present was, but they may have been photographs of the givers.

35. Nebeker to the Editor [George Q. Cannon], *Deseret News*, December 15, 1869, 529.

36. A few months later, Nebeker wrote another letter, stating, “In my last letter I promised you some political news. Brother Napela lost the election by forty votes. The people here have become so advanced in civilized life that they are acquainted with all the ‘ins’ and ‘outs’ and intrigues of a political struggle, and to succeed here it takes money, just as it does elsewhere, and we thought it would not pay to invest, so our friend Nepela [Napela] came out a little behind.” George Nebeker, Letter from Laie, Oahu, written March 14, 1870, *Deseret News*, April 13, 1870, 113.

Napela to Brigham Young

I Ka Makua.

Ia B Young,

He Alakai mo Keia ao.

Owau no I Hapela me ke Aloha nui, a me ka
olihi pane ole

Ua lohi loa wau, he hooKahi ma ka hiki'a me
ka hapa; aole au i olelo iki' aku ia oe, no ka mea
a i ke ia e au mea nui; akahi no a olelo aku i
mua ou e ka Makua

Ma ka hua e ahiahi' a kakahi ^{hou} ma nawa
o ka la 20 o Novemba 1869 ma hiki au ma ka ha
le o Kamehameha V, a hiki i ka wamano. oia po:
mai luna mai au o ka Makua O C Murray, oia ko
man manawa i hiki mai i Hawaii nei me G
Stebler.

Ua hui au i ka maole no Kamehameha, ma
i Hawaii nei aku; aole nae i na mea e pili
ana i na KahuKahu; aka i na mea e ke alaka
o a hiki i ko Salt Lake; a me na mea e pili
ana ia oe; mai kau man hana; hiki ana ma
hele wahi Kua wahi o Uta, me kau Kahu Kama
i na la mai 24 Iulai;
a me kau hooponopono ana, ma wahi o ka
pae Kulu a me na mea puahe Kaa, a holo
kohe i na miute pakale.

FIG. 2. First page of a letter from Jonathan H. Napela to Brigham Young, April 11, 1871, written in Hawaiian. This letter tells how Napela met with King Kamehameha V and told the king about his 1869 trip to Utah. The letter is found in Brigham Young's correspondence and is now housed in the Church Archives, Salt Lake City.

Letter from Jonathan Napela to Brigham Young, April 11, 1871

To our father, B. Young, a leader for this earth:

I am J. H. Napela, with deepest regards and everlasting joy.

It has been awhile, a year and a half, since I've spoken to you about what I saw there, so I am now reporting again to you, our father.

At 6 p.m. or thereabouts on November 20, 1869 I reached the home of my King, Kamehameha V, where I stayed until sunrise. I had come from the ship *DC Murray* and that is the date when G. Nebeker and I arrived back in Hawaii.³⁷

I've given an account of my travel from Hawaii, not what happened from shore to shore, but on what happened along the rail route to Salt Lake, and about you: from what you do, your traveling to everywhere in Utah, your clothes on the July 24 holiday,³⁸ and your mediation between some merchants and creditors which was quickly settled in a few minutes.

I informed my King about your counselors, G. A. S. [George A. Smith] & D. H. W. [Daniel H. Wells], and the quorum of twelve, and so forth including all the levels of leaders, and about the one special garment and explained the significance of that garment.³⁹ It is something so a person will not have base desires, but does not punish the conscience of a people.

I also spoke of your wisdom as far exceeding any government on earth, and of your great wealth, and of all the people in Utah.⁴⁰

37. Napela seems to be off a bit in his dating and sequence of events. This is understandable since he was writing about a year and a half after he returned to Hawaii. See note 33.

38. It is not known exactly what Brigham Young was wearing on this festive occasion. President Young and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles participated in a procession that day. [Cannon], "The Celebration," 2.

39. The garment mentioned here has reference to the special clothing received by Church members who participate in the LDS endowment ceremony.

40. Prior to Napela's encounter with the king, Kamehameha V was aware of Young. Having received a letter from Young dated March 24, 1865 (see Brigham Young Letters, Outgoing Correspondence), Kamehameha V was keenly aware of Young's influence. In this letter Young had requested that the Hawaiian monarch allow a group of Latter-day Saints to settle in Laie, where they could teach the doctrine of "practical salvation" to the Hawaiians gathered with them. This same year, the king replied that the Mormons would be allowed to settle and conduct temporal affairs, but warned that they would not be received on the same standing as other Christian faiths. Foreign Office and Executive Papers, 1865, Hawaii State Archives. Jeffrey S. Stover (in "Not All Is Simple: The Political Reasons for King Kamehameha V Not Wanting the Mormon Colony to Preach," Mormon

I reported there is no hotel for the citizens of Utah, but did see one for visitors. That all the people of Utah will dine in their own homes, they do not eat in hotels.⁴¹ The people have sufficient food. I told of the people being kind, just like Hawaii's people.

I commented on how unusual it was to get supplies so quickly, as there is no great ocean near Utah, or river from the east, or great highway, yet there are supplies.

I said there is no small locale where B. Young's words do not fall. B. Young makes two circuits to every part of Utah annually.⁴²

I reported that Utah is a peaceful place. Among the people there is no stealing, adultery, fighting, talking at night or drunkenness. However the soldiers do get drunk and must labor on the road in uniform with their pistols at their side.⁴³ A very odd thing is that their superior is made to labor on the road also. When I asked G. Q. C. [George Q. Cannon] he replied it is so the sinners will not grumble.

Pacific Historical Society Proceedings, March 16, 1996, 53–54) maintains that the chief concern of the king was that he viewed Young as having both religious and political control of the LDS people. Thus, he apparently feared the implications of Young's political power.

41. According to *The Salt Lake City Directory and Business Guide for 1869*, comp. E. L. Sloan (Salt Lake City: E. L. Sloan and Company, 1869), 78, the principal hotels at this time were the Salt Lake House, the Townsend House, the Revere House, the Mansion House, and the Delmonico. Napela seems to be implying that at this time the Utah Saints ate in their homes and not in public places.

42. The purpose of Young's visits was to encourage and counsel the Saints scattered in many settlements in Utah Territory. On this topic, see Gordon Irving, "Encouraging the Saints: Brigham Young's Annual Tours of the Mormon Settlements," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 45 (Summer 1977): 233–51.

43. The soldiers who interacted with the Saints in Salt Lake City were stationed at Fort Douglas, which was established near the city in 1862. According to Charles G. Hibbard, California volunteers were assigned to this location soon after the Civil War broke out as they were needed "both to protect the overland mail route and to keep an eye on the Mormons." In 1869, the transcontinental railroad allowed for the rapid deployment of troops. By 1947, military property at this facility began to be sold to the University of Utah. In 1975, after over a century of service, Fort Douglas was designated as a National Historic Landmark. Charles G. Hibbard, "Fort Douglas," in *Utah History Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan Kent Powell (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), 199–200. For a more detailed treatment of this topic, see Leonard J. Arrington and Thomas G. Alexander, "The U.S. Army Overlooks Salt Lake Valley: Fort Douglas, 1862–1965," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 33 (Fall 1965): 326–50.

I reported there is no church minister fee, no doctor's fee, no lawyer's fee, no messenger [courier] fee, no preaching the gospel fee.⁴⁴

It is not uncommon for a person traveling on the roadway, upon seeing a gate open will close it and continue on. The children there will do the same.

I informed my King that B. Young's responsibility to Kamehameha I was concluded, as I was baptized on his [Kamehameha I's] behalf; but that he [the King] is responsible for the remainder of his ancestors buried in the earth and that their salvation rests upon him and that he must think about them. Young was saved. There was much astonishment before me and appreciation and the validation of everything.

I reported that the people are educated.⁴⁵

Our father: I am presently on a mission to all the Hawaiian Islands to preach the gospel. President G. N. [George Nebeker] and the counselors have selected longtime church members in Hawaii to constitute ten mission leaders and I am one of the ten.⁴⁶

I reported on the source of your great wealth like this, that any wealth or chattel B. Young receives is not from the Mormon people, but created from his leadership.⁴⁷ He was appointed governor of Utah and with his annual salary he purchased businesses such as a sawmill, flourmill and so forth.

From these businesses he receives annual payments. I saw a theater established by him which pays him \$12,500. annually. That theater has revenues of not less than \$6000. every week.⁴⁸

44. Napela seems to be giving a utopian view of Utah society. Perhaps his view was the result of free services he received in Salt Lake City.

45. For the impact Brigham Young had on Utah education during this period, see Frederick S. Buchanan, "Education among the Mormons: Brigham Young and the Schools of Utah," *History of Education Quarterly* 22 (Winter 1982): 435–59.

46. Elder H. H. Cluff reported, "Bro. Napela attended conference and seemed more interested than at any previous time since his return from Salt Lake. He in connection with thirteen others were appointed as missionaries to visit all the islands of this group, Bro. Napela having charge and instructions to look after affairs generally on the several islands." "Correspondence," H. H. Cluff to Editor [George Q. Cannon], written October 15, 1871, *Deseret News*, November 15, 1871, 484.

47. "After the settlement of his debts and the credit for income earned as church president, Young's estate amounted to slightly less than \$700,000 in cash, stocks, real estate, and other property available to the heirs." Thomas G. Alexander, *Utah, the Right Place: The Official Centennial History* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith Publisher, 1996), 191.

48. Ronald W. Walker notes that the Salt Lake Theater was used from 1861 to 1928. He further explains that Brigham Young was the person who advanced

I've told this account not just to the King, but to the Protestant congregations and all other conventions.

If you please, my wife is angry with me for giving your photograph to the King and she has none.⁴⁹ Could I please obtain another photograph of you for my wife, Kitty, when G. Nebeker goes there in June.⁵⁰ 11 April 1871
God save you. Amen.

the project from beginning to end. Ronald W. Walker, "Salt Lake Theater," in *Utah History Encyclopedia*, 484–85. Leonard J. Arrington explains that the theater held three thousand persons and was "the first theater of importance west of the Mississippi." Leonard J. Arrington, *Great Basin Kingdom: An Economic History of the Latter-day Saints 1830–1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1958), 211–13.

49. In an earlier letter to Brigham Young, Napela requested a photograph of Brigham as well as other Church leaders, including Joseph and Hyrum Smith, as well as Young's counselors in the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve. Jonathan Napela to Brigham Young, Brigham Young Letters, October 11, 1865, Incoming Correspondence, Church Archives.

50. Apparently George Nebeker did not make a trip to Utah in June 1871. However, the *D C Murray* Passenger List, dated December 14, 1872, does list George Nebeker leaving Honolulu bound to San Francisco on this date.

Fred E. Woods (fred_woods@byu.edu) is Professor of Church History and Doctrine at Brigham Young University and occupies a Richard L. Evans Chair for Religious Understanding. He compiled and edited the Mormon Immigration Index and has written numerous articles on migration in the *Ensign* and scholarly journals including *BYU Studies*, *History Scotland*, *Missouri Historical Review*, *Kansas Journal*, *The Log of Mystic Seaport*, and *Inland Seas: Quarterly Journal for the Great Lakes Historical Society*. He is the executive director of the Mormon Historic Sites Foundation.

The author wishes to thank Hawaiian translator Jason Achiu for providing the translation of this letter. He also expresses gratitude to Chad M. Orton, Mark J. Sanderson, and Chris Mahelona (a descendant of Jonathan Napela) for their research assistance in preparing this article.

Are Christians Mormon?

Reassessing Joseph Smith's Theology in His Bicentennial

David L. Paulsen

Harold Bloom, the self-proclaimed “unbelieving Jew”¹ and distinguished scholar, recently characterized Joseph Smith as “a religious genius,” stating that the religion Smith founded “is truly a biblical religion.”² More recently, Carl Mosser has written concerning the doctrine of that religion: “Mormonism’s heresies are legion; they are also very interesting and often unique in the history of heresy.”³ Biblical or heretical? Of these two reactions, the charge of heresy has been far more common, especially among conservative Christian critics, who consistently draw a circle that leaves Joseph’s Mormonism out.

No wonder, then, the interest in 1974 when Truman Madsen published an article in *BYU Studies* with the half-jesting title “Are Christians Mormon?”⁴ The title was an obvious play on the often repeated and too familiar question “Are Mormons Christian?”⁵ It was only a *half*-jest because, as Madsen puts it, “In our time there are renowned and influential spokesmen

1. Harold Bloom, *The American Religion* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992), 30.

2. Bloom, *American Religion*, 80–82, 96.

3. Carl Mosser, “And the Saints Go Marching On,” in *The New Mormon Challenge: Responding to the Latest Defenses of a Fast-Growing Movement*, ed. Francis J. Beckwith, Carl Mosser, and Paul Owen (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2002), 85.

4. Truman G. Madsen, “Are Christians Mormon?” *BYU Studies* 15, no. 1 (1974): 73–94.

5. For a careful survey and critique of contemporary attempts to demonstrate that Latter-day Saints are not Christian, see Stephen E. Robinson, *Are Mormons Christians?* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1991).

BYU Studies: What made you passionate enough about this subject to pursue all the research and writing required to produce this article?

Paulsen: My paper “Joseph Smith Challenges the Theological World” delivered at the Library of Congress focused principally on Joseph’s divergence from and, hence, on his challenges to traditional Christian theology. However, my research for this paper uncovered considerable contemporary convergence in some Christian quarters toward Joseph’s once radical theological ideas. Last June, while preparing the Library of Congress paper for publication, the idea for a second paper stressing this convergence struck me with the force of what seemed to be inspiration. Here was another way to honor Joseph on the occasion of his bicentennial—to point out that highly influential Christian thinkers were now appropriating insights once uniquely owned, or nearly so, by the uneducated “ploughboy of Palmyra.” My love for Joseph Smith, my personal testimony of his prophetic calling, and my desire to honor him in his bicentennial drove this project. With the devoted and competent work of an able corps of student assistants who shared these passions with me, this idea became a hundred-plus-page manuscript in forty-five days.

BYU Studies: What impact do you hope your article will make?

Paulsen: I hope it will motivate others, especially Christian theologians, to take Joseph’s ideas more seriously and generate more interfaith discussion of Joseph’s theological insights.

BYU Studies: Where do you see Christian theology going next?

Paulsen: I don’t know. But I won’t be surprised if convergence in Joseph’s direction continues. For instance, Joseph taught a social model of the Godhead; at a conference I attended recently, an informed Christian scholar estimated that over half of Christian thinkers currently publishing on the topic of the trinity now hold social models of the same.

—David Paulsen has also published in journals such as *Faith and Philosophy*, *Analysis*, and the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*.



and writers in all the major wings of Christendom—and they are not on the periphery but at the center—who are defending and teaching what, a century ago, Joseph Smith almost alone taught.”⁶

Now that Latter-day Saints and others⁷ have commemorated the two-hundredth birthday of Joseph Smith (1805–1844), founding prophet of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, it is time to reassess how far Christian thinkers have come in appropriating theological insights once owned uniquely, or nearly so, by Smith and his followers.

In undertaking this task thirty-one years ago, Madsen prefaced his findings with four cautions, which I repeat and endorse here:

First, tracing trends and movements and shifts is always a selective affair. Just as powerful as the movements I am going to chronicle are counter movements equally influential that could lead one to the conclusion that Christianity today has never been farther away from its original moorings. . . .

Second, terminology is deceptive. Men may speak similarly but *mean* and *feel* differently. And, as you know, the theological vocabulary is notoriously vague.

Third, the focus on belief is misleading because religion is much more than belief—it involves values, commitments, kinds of loyalty, and cultures.

Finally, there is . . . a tremendous chasm between what professional writers may say theologically, philosophically, and what actually penetrates to the grass roots. Between the theoretician and the layman there is an ocean.⁸

One more very important reminder: when it comes to Christian fundamentals—the divinity and lordship of Jesus Christ, his redemptive atonement, his resurrection, and our victory through him over sin and death—there is little to distinguish Joseph's understandings from those of “orthodox” Christians. This point has often been made, most recently

6. Madsen, “Are Christians Mormon?” 73.

7. For instance, most notably, the Library of Congress hosted a commemorative conference, “The Worlds of Joseph Smith,” May 6–7, 2005, published in *BYU Studies* 44, no. 4 (2005). A similar conference (“The Worlds of Joseph Smith”) was held May 20–21, 2005, in the New South Wales Parliament House and State Library, Sydney, Australia, where conference cosponsors were the University of Richmond, Griffith University, Monash University, and the LDS Church. The Claremont School of Religion hosted a third academic bicentennial observance, “Joseph Smith and the Prophetic Tradition” on October 20–22, 2005. Other conference locations included Centenary College in Shreveport, Louisiana, October 25–27, 2005, and conferences in Atlanta and Taipei.

8. Madsen, “Are Christians Mormon?” 73–74.

by Robert Millet in *A Different Jesus? The Christ of the Latter-day Saints*.⁹ And a final important reminder: Latter-day Saint views on many points of doctrine still differ, sometimes radically, from more traditional Christian views. This is true for even those doctrines toward which, as shown in this paper, there has been significant Christian convergence.

With these reminders noted, I examine here seven distinctive theological ideas attributed to Joseph Smith and generally accepted by Latter-day Saints, all of which have engendered the heresy charge: (1) the resumption of New Testament charismata and the reopening of the canon; (2) God as a personal and passible being; (3) a social model of the trinity; (4) deification; (5) the divine feminine; (6) God as eternally self-surpassing; and (7) postmortem evangelization. My threefold aim is to set out Joseph's views on each of these topics, summarize divergent Christian views and criticisms of Joseph's views, and spell out developments or trends in contemporary Christian theology that significantly converge in Joseph's direction. My purpose is not to provide an exhaustive discussion of each of these seven developments, but simply to set them forth in sufficient detail to sustain my thesis that, on the occasion of the two-hundredth birthday of the uneducated "ploughboy of Palmyra,"¹⁰ his viewpoints on these once-theological-distinctives are winning increasing acceptance by influential non-LDS Christian thinkers. In light of this, I half-humorously repeat the question, "Are Christians Mormon?"

I. RESUMPTION OF NEW TESTAMENT CHARISMATA AND REOPENING OF THE CANON

A. Joseph's Views

Of all Joseph's challenges to traditional Christian theology, none is more fundamental than his claim to direct revelation from God. This claim serves to ground all of Joseph's additional claims. No natural or cultural explanations can adequately account for the range, depth, and unique synthesis of Joseph's teachings. Even the most determined cultural

9. Robert L. Millet, *A Different Jesus? The Christ of the Latter-day Saints* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005). See also Roger R. Keller and Robert L. Millet, eds., *Salvation in Christ: Comparative Christian Views* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 2005); Craig L. Blomberg and Stephen Robinson, *How Wide the Divide? A Mormon and an Evangelical in Conversation* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997); and Robinson, *Are Mormons Christians?*

10. An early description of Joseph by critics intent on disparaging the credibility of his ideas.

reductionist must still, in the end, deal with Joseph's claims to authority by divine revelation.¹¹ Revelation is the rock of Latter-day Saint belief.¹² The authoritativeness of the Bible for Christians generally hinges on a similar claim to its being God's revealed word. As Richard Bushman explains:

Joseph aimed a question at the heart of the culture: Did Christians truly believe in revelation? If believers in the Bible dismissed revelation in the present, could they defend revelation in the past? . . . [And] if revelation in the present was so far out of the question that Joseph's claims could be discounted without serious consideration, *why believe revelation in the past?*¹³

Joseph's claim of new revelation is a challenge based on the Bible itself, a fact of which the Prophet was fully aware. When asked concerning the differences between Mormons and Christians, he responded, "We *believe* the Bible, and they do not."¹⁴ His was a church alive with angelic messengers, the restoration of the priesthood, new revelation, and new scripture, all of which Joseph viewed as the essence of a true biblical religion. If the biblical canon is closed, Joseph argued, then "there is a great defect in the book, or else it would have said so."¹⁵ Elsewhere he argued, "To say that God never said anything more to man than is there recorded [in the Bible], *would be saying at once that we have at last received a revelation*: for it must require one to advance thus far, because it is nowhere said in that volume by the mouth of God."¹⁶

To those who deny the possibility of extrabiblical revelation, Joseph's challenge is not based on argument but on testimony of his revelatory experiences. In setting out Joseph's experiences, my focus is not on whether Joseph's claims are true, but simply to make clear how those claims were understood by Joseph and his followers.

11. See my article "The Search for Cultural Origins of Mormon Doctrines," in *Excavating Mormon Pasts: A New Historiography of the Last Half Century*, ed. Newell G. Bringham and Lavina Fielding Anderson (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2004), 27–52.

12. Chauncey C. Riddle, "Revelation," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, ed. Daniel H. Ludlow, 4 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1992), 3:225–29.

13. Richard Lyman Bushman, *Believing History: Latter-day Saint Essays*, ed. Reid L. Neilson and Jed Woodworth (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 272–73; emphasis added.

14. Dean C. Jessee, ed., *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, 2 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992), 2:155; emphasis added.

15. Larry E. Dahl and Donald Q. Cannon, eds., *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1997), 73.

16. Dahl and Cannon, *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings*, 73; emphasis added.

Joseph's heavenly instruction began on a spring morning in 1820 when he retired to a grove of trees and, kneeling in prayer, he sought divine guidance in choosing a church. Joseph testified that he saw and heard and was instructed by the living God and Jesus Christ.¹⁷ The First Vision was a transcendent, tradition-shattering experience, yielding many profound insights. Later, Joseph was to write: "Could you gaze into heaven five minutes, you would know more than you would by reading all that ever was written on the subject."¹⁸ Joseph was privileged to have many such gazes. As a result, Latter-day Saints have greatly enlarged the Christian canon, adding 872 pages of inspired writ, wherein dramatic "thus saith the Lord" directives appear ninety-nine times.

Writers in the Book of Mormon such as Nephi (circa 550 BC) and Moroni (circa AD 400) explicitly reject the claim that God's revelations would ever permanently cease.¹⁹ Joseph viewed the coming forth of the Book of Mormon as a divine harbinger that promised further revelations and greater spiritual gifts. In 1835, Joseph spoke of the Book of Mormon and its attendant fruits in language drawn from Christ's parables:

Let us take the book of Mormon, which a man took and hid in his field, securing it by his faith, to spring up in the last days, or in due time; let us behold it coming forth out of the ground, which is indeed accounted the least of all seeds, but behold it branching forth, yea, even towering, with lofty branches, and God-like majesty, until it, like the mustard seed, becomes the greatest of all herbs; And it is truth, and it has sprouted and come forth out of the earth, and righteousness begins to look down from heaven; and God is sending down His powers, gifts and angels, to lodge in the branches thereof.²⁰

17. All extant accounts of the vision (1832, 1835, 1838, 1842, 1840, 1869, 1871, 1874, 1842, 1843, and 1844) corroborate Joseph's claim of both seeing and hearing Jesus Christ. While mutually corroborative on this point, the accounts vary in other ways. See Milton V. Backman Jr., "Joseph Smith's Recitals of the First Vision," *Ensign* 15 (January 1985): 8. For a more recent and comprehensive study of all available accounts of Joseph's vision, see also Dean C. Jessee, "The Earliest Documented Accounts of Joseph Smith's First Vision," and James B. Allen and John W. Welch, "The Appearance of the Father and the Son to Joseph Smith in 1820," in *Opening the Heavens: Accounts of Divine Manifestations, 1820–1844*, ed. John W. Welch (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press; Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005), 1–34 and 35–76.

18. Dahl and Cannon, *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings*, 319.

19. 2 Ne. 29:9; Morm. 9:7–9.

20. Joseph Smith Jr., *History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2d ed., rev., 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971), 2:268.

Indeed, the Book of Mormon paved the way for future events of the Restoration to occur during Joseph's own lifetime, including the organization of the Church itself, the restoration of the priesthood by angelic administration, the coming forth of the Book of Moses and the Book of Abraham, the building and dedication of temples, and the coming of additional angelic visitors.

The gifts of the Spirit were emphasized by Joseph very early on as an important part of the Restoration of the gospel. Though "all things which pertain to our religion are only appendages" to the mission and resurrection of Jesus Christ, Joseph saw spiritual gifts indelibly "in connection with these" principles.²¹ Furthermore, the restoration and enjoyment of these spiritual gifts were seen to be equal in measure to the outpourings of the Spirit in the days of the Apostles:

We believe in the gift of the Holy Ghost being enjoyed now, as much as it was in the Apostles' days; . . . we also believe in prophecy, in tongues, in visions, and in revelations, in gifts, and in healings; and that these things cannot be enjoyed without the gift of the Holy Ghost. . . . We believe in it in all its fullness, and power, and greatness, and glory; but whilst we do this, we believe in it rationally, consistently, and scripturally, and not according to the wild vagaries, foolish notions and traditions of men.²²

In 1831, Joseph received by revelation instruction to the early members of the Church concerning the gifts of the spirit. These gifts were a direct resumption of New Testament charismata: the faith to heal and be healed, the gift to speak in tongues, the working of miracles, the gift of prophecy, visions, and the discerning of spirits (D&C 46:17–26). Later, Joseph included the resumption of New Testament charismata as the one of the Church's thirteen basic Articles of Faith (A of F 7). Latter-day Saints believe that these gifts have been restored in their fullness, and as they were a blessing to the lives of the primitive Saints, so are they now.

B. Christian Divergence and Criticisms

Joseph Smith's claim to have translated a new book of scripture on par with the Bible caused an uproar in the Christian world from day one. To most of his opponents, Joseph's "Golden Bible" was an instant sign of inexcusable sacrilege. Francis W. Kirkham related that one of the first recorded reactions to the Book of Mormon was a headline in the *Rochester Daily*

21. *History of the Church*, 3:30.

22. *History of the Church*, 5:27.

Advertiser: “Blasphemy—Book of Mormon, Alias the Golden Bible.”²³ The very notion of new scripture went directly against the long-standing conviction that the “deposit of faith” had been entrusted into the hands of the church in its completeness. When Warren Isham, a Presbyterian editor, received a copy of the Book of Mormon, he described it as “a volume of silly imposture” and denied that it could be “a New Revelation” since, in his words, “A new revelation was not needed. Everything essential to our salvation was already revealed.” Furthermore, “A new Revelation was not expected. . . . The Christian world had settled down into the belief that no further revelation would ever be made to mankind.” To these remarks Walter Norton concluded, “The strong rejection of Mormonism was directly linked to the unalterable orthodox doctrine that revelation had ceased in the apostolic era and that any professing new revelation must come with power to prove their divine mission.”²⁴ In the meantime, then, the canon was deemed closed, and no new scripture was expected from the heavens.

In addition to affirming a closed canon, the Christian world had also by and large held to the belief that the New Testament charismata had ceased, that such gifts and miracles were unique to the days of the Apostles, and with their death so passed away the gifts of the Spirit. Adding further fuel to the fire, then, was Joseph’s pronouncement that the gifts of the Spirit had again been restored on the earth, in a way no less miraculous than on the day of Pentecost among the early apostles. This, too, was unwelcome news and grounds to deal dismissively with the Mormon problem. Around 1839 the Mormon William Seichrist was

excluded from the fellowship of this [the first regular Baptist] church [of the city of Alleghany, Alleghany county Pennsylvania] for embracing and maintaining a heresy,—to wit, doctrines peculiar to a late sect called Mormons or Latter-day Saints, that miracles can be wrought through the instrumentality of faith; that special revelations from God are now given to men; and that godly men are now endowed with the gift of prophecy.²⁵

23. Francis W. Kirkham, *A New Witness for Christ in America: The Book of Mormon* (Independence, Mo.: Press of Zion’s Printing and Publishing, 1951), 40.

24. Quoted in Walter A. Norton, “Comparative Images: Mormonism and Contemporary Religions as Seen by Village Newspapermen in Western New York and Northeastern Ohio, 1820–1833” (PhD diss., Brigham Young University, 1991), 315–16.

25. *History of the Church*, 5:166, brackets in original. In addition, see the references to other excommunications of Mormons during the period 1835 to 1844 in Ruth Alden Doan, *The Miller Heresy, Millennialism, and American Culture* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987), 126–30.

News against the Mormons spread quickly. The 1835 guidebook for Ohio immigrants warns the English against the “wildest fanaticism” called Mormonism, which espouses belief in miracles, new revelation, gifts of healing and of prophecy.²⁶ The Christian world at that time wanted little to do with Smith's fanciful notions of new scripture and heavenly revelations. And until recently, most Christian thinkers have held fast to this position.

C. Contemporary Christian Convergence

Recognition of Pentecostal and other charismatic movements in main-line denominations over the past century has given rise to new waves of thought in relation to the once dogmatic cessation of the charismata. It is currently a hot topic. Not only do many branches of thought consider, they insist on the need for spiritual gifts. This change has occurred remarkably fast. According to Jon Ruthven,

Perhaps no theological issue among evangelicals provokes more controversy than the role of ‘miraculous’ spiritual gifts in the contemporary church. A recent *Christianity Today* poll reported that according to their readers two of the ten most important theological issues today concern the cessation and operation of certain gifts of the Holy Spirit. Traditions from within the Reformation and the Scofield *Reference Bible* had produced a broad consensus among evangelicals and fundamentalists (outside of charismatic and Pentecostal believers) that so-called ‘extraordinary’ or miraculous gifts, such as prophecy, direct divine revelation, healings, miracles and the like, had ceased with the apostles or their writings (this view may be labeled cessationism).

Within the last two decades, however, that consensus has been rapidly eroding. A growing capability in biblical interpretation has weaned these groups from uncritical dependence upon the classic Reformation and Scofieldian traditions. Further, the amazing world-wide growth of the Pentecostal-charismatic movement and the increasing sophistication of its apologists have also prompted a widespread re-evaluation of cessationism.²⁷

Within traditional Christianity, Pentecostalism has paved the way in this area. It is no surprise then that Pentecostals, like Mormons, have suffered persecution from other Christians along the way, though they continue to grow in numbers. The following observation of Ruthven could well describe Mormonism: “This growth did not occur without opposition.

26. D. Griffiths Jr., *Two Years in the New Settlements of Ohio* (London, 1835; reprint, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1966), 132–40.

27. Jon Ruthven, *On the Cessation of the Charismata: The Protestant Polemic on Postbiblical Miracles* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 7.

Historically, Pentecostalism has provoked controversy at almost every stage of its development. This has been true not merely because of its tradition-breaking forms of worship and practice,” but also “because the emergence of Pentecostalism was a tangible challenge to a theological position maintained in the church for centuries: that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit had ceased.”²⁸ Today, many Christian thinkers, such as Krister Stendahl, regret how Christianity has treated Pentecostals and feel that the consequences have been grave. “We in the mainline Protestant traditions,” Stendahl explains, “froze out our Pentecostal brethren in the nineteenth century. . . . As a result, the growth of the spirit, the soul, the church—the growth of everything—is stymied.”²⁹

For Stendahl, the renewal of the New Testament charismata is indispensable in triggering a much needed, invigorating vitality into Christianity. Says Stendahl, “I believe that the charismatic movement represents ‘high-voltage’ religious experience—and heaven knows we need it in the churches. . . . And the tragedy of tragedies would be if the mainline churches threw out the charismatic stirrings now going on.”³⁰

Yet many theologians are still hesitant in acknowledging and encouraging spiritual gifts because of their highly subjective nature and the danger of allowing such charismata to overshadow or distort God’s inclusive parcel of revelation in the Bible. W. D. Davies points out the danger, of which Protestants and Catholics alike are quite aware: “Progressive and continuous revelation is certainly an attractive notion, but equally certainly it is not without the grave danger of so altering or enlarging upon the original revelation as to distort, annul, and even falsify it.”³¹ Wayne Grudem presents similar cautions in relating the role of spiritual gifts in the church. He encourages “charismatics [to] go on using the gift of prophecy,” but cautions that its use should never be confused with or considered equal to the biblical witness. To add balance, he invites those holding to cessationism to “think again about those arguments for the cessation of certain gifts” to allow for a healthy use of the gift of prophecy in the church.³²

28. Ruthven, *Cessation of the Charismata*, 14.

29. Krister Stendahl, “The Charismatic Movement and the New Testament,” in *What the Spirit Is Saying to the Churches*, ed. Theodore Runyan (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1975), 26. To be precise, Pentecostalism did not formally begin until 1906, though its roots go back to the Holiness Movement of the nineteenth century.

30. Stendahl, “Charismatic Movement,” 25.

31. W. D. Davies, “Reflections on the Mormon ‘Canon,’” *Harvard Theological Review* 79, nos. 1–3 (1986): 64.

32. Wayne Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament and Today*, rev. ed. (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 2000), 18.

The emergence and embrace of spiritual gifts on the grassroots level of Christianity reflects a thirsting for a closer, two-way relationship with God and the confirmation that he, through his Holy Spirit, will respond to humankind through the generous outpouring of his gifts. As much as some Christians fear the dangers inherent in spiritual gifts, others fear more how the church would manage to survive without them. According to Stendahl, "High-voltage ecstatic enthusiasm is an important part of total Christian community in any time in any place. Of course, such enthusiasm has risks—everything has." If nothing else, Stendahl sees a highly pragmatic need for the charismata in today's churches: "Our flash-light battery voltage isn't strong enough to fight drugs [and other challenges] the way the high-voltage, charismatic experience does."³³

As we have seen, inherent in the fears of the resumption of New Testament charismata is the adverse way in which such a resumption might affect the scriptural canon. The notions of canon and continuing revelation are no doubt inextricably linked. And recently canon studies has become a very dynamic field. James Sanders writes of the barrier, which is increasingly being breached, to the idea of an open canon:

The quest for closure spawned a corresponding quest for lists, or what could be construed as lists, in ancient Jewish literature outside the Tanak: Sirach, Second Maccabees, Jubilees, Philo, Josephus, and Luke. Similarly, work on the New Testament canonization process looked to "lists" in Tertullian, Eusebius, the Muratorian Fragment, Athanasius's Easter Letter, etc.³⁴ Such lists were taken to indicate closure for all of Judaism, or all of Christianity, instead of reflecting the distinctive purposes of a particular school or faction at a specific time. Ancient lists, or perceived lists, that contradicted or failed to support eventual official canons could be ignored as uninformed or irrelevant to the quest. Even after the discovery of the Nag Hammadi documents, the Judaeen Desert Scrolls, and many New Testament Greek papyri, the consensus tended to hold on despite questions raised by the new discoveries.³⁵

33. Stendahl, "Charismatic Movement," 25.

34. See the critical discussion of them in Lee M. McDonald, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, rev. and enl. (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995), esp. 268–76.

35. James A. Sanders, "The Issue of Closure in the Canonical Process," in *The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 252–53. See Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), for an excellent discussion of the new evidence; see also the review of Flint in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6, no. 1 (1999): 84–89, as well as the review of Shemaryahu Talmon in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 3 (1999): 545–47.

Yet, “in the last forty years,” say Lee M. McDonald and James Sanders, “interest has been growing not only in the origins of the biblical canon but also in its development, continuing viability, and future as a fixed collection of sacred writings.”³⁶

Certainly much of the impetus of this movement has been caused by the ancient document explosion of the last half of the twentieth century. These new discoveries include about eight hundred manuscripts³⁷ recovered from the vicinity of Qumran alone. While greatly increasing our knowledge of the ancient world, the Qumran texts, as Sanders notes, have proven to make the question of canonicity more complex. Indeed one scholar proposes, “The biblical scrolls are of central importance for the way we think about the Bible, and that they require us to update our way of thinking about it both historically and theologically.”³⁸ Furthermore, “The second half of the twentieth century witnessed a strong renewal of interest in and research on the so-called New Testament Apocrypha.”³⁹

The significance of the Qumran texts in regards to canon is twofold. The first is ably stated by James VanderKam:

The thesis I would like to defend regarding the second temple period is that while there were authoritative writings, and these were at times gathered into recognizable groupings (e.g., Law, Prophets, Others), the category of revealed literature was not considered a closed and fixed one, at least not for the type of Judaism for which we now have the most evidence—the people of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Essenes according to most scholars). This is in line with their documented belief that revelation was not confined to the distant past but continued in their time and fellowship. About the Teacher of Righteousness it is said that to him “God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets” (1QpHab VII, 4–5). Regardless whether that gift extended to others, the text is clear that revelation continued at least in the Teacher’s time. Whether others who did not belong to the Qumran community’s persuasion would have agreed that divine disclosures occurred in the

36. Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders, “Introduction,” in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 1.

37. Florentino Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996), xxiv.

38. Eugene Ulrich, “The Scrolls and the Study of the Hebrew Bible,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*, ed. Robert A. Kugler and Eileen M. Schuller (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999), 31.

39. Harry Y. Gamble, “The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Quaestionis,” in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 273.

present we do not know—with the exception, of course, of the group of Jews who followed Jesus of Nazareth.⁴⁰

Thus, “at the beginning of the Common Era we cannot speak of a ‘canon’ in the sense of a well-defined number of holy writings—at least not for Judaism as a whole.”⁴¹ Secondly, according to Adam S. van der Woude,

Instead of assuming a gradual development from pluriformity to uniformity in the textual tradition of the Old Testament, as has been postulated by Albrectson, E. Ulrich and others, we should consider another possibility: that a far-reaching uniformity of textual tradition existed in the religious circles around the Temple of Jerusalem well before 70 CE *alongside* a pluriform tradition elsewhere in Palestine, with both traditions being exemplified by the Qumran biblical texts.⁴² This explains in simple fashion why the textual tradition supported by the Pharisees, who survived the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple, could almost abruptly gain the field after 70 CE. The Pharisaic conviction that the Holy Spirit had withdrawn from Israel since the days of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi excluded appeal to any later divine inspiration, thereby entailing a shift from authority outside Scripture to Scripture alone. This development gradually led to the canonization of Holy (Hebrew) Scripture as God’s literally inspired word, and did not admit of various diverging textual recensions. But the situation at Qumran was different: since the community knew its own divinely-inspired authorities, pre-eminently the Teacher of Righteousness, the need to replace textual pluriformity by uniformity was not urgent.⁴³

In regards to the “strong renewal of interest in and research on the so-called New Testament Apocrypha,”⁴⁴ at least one scholar has proposed completing work on *The Complete New Testament* containing the entire library of early Christian texts.⁴⁵

40. James C. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 92.

41. Adam S. van der Woude, “Fifty Years of Qumran Research,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:40.

42. See more on this topic in Adam S. van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament,” in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism*, ed. J. N. Bremmer and F. Garcia Martinez (Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1992), 151–69.

43. Van der Woude, “Fifty Years of Qumran Research,” 1:42–43.

44. Gamble, “The New Testament Canon: Recent Research and the Status Quaestionis,” in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 273.

45. Robert W. Funk, “The Once and Future New Testament,” in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 557.

Many scholars today are reexamining whether closing the canon was, in fact, the proper thing to do. As noted above, Joseph Smith thought it strange that the canon had been regarded closed since the Bible itself never mentions this closure. Reasoning along similar lines, James Barr remarks that the notion of a finite, strictly defined biblical canon is itself an extra-biblical conclusion: “For *evidence* about what was within the canon, one had to go outside the canon itself” since there was “no *scriptural* evidence to decide what were the exact limits of the canon.”⁴⁶ Similarly, John Barton refers us to “the curse of the canon”—the oft-repeated saying British scholar Christopher Evans used in describing the downsides of having a closed canon. According to Evans, says Barton, “It was a fateful day when the Church decided to rule a line under the last book to gain entry to the Bible, and to declare the canon of Scripture closed.”⁴⁷ Both Barr and Barton agree that the modern notion of a cemented-closed canon does not cohere with how the earliest Christians viewed their own collection of scripture.

Perhaps the most candid discussion of how the changing face of canon studies affects the role of canon today is the final chapter of Lee M. McDonald’s *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*. Here in his “Final Remarks,” McDonald poses honest, open-ended questions concerning the long-held notion of a closed canon:

The first question, and the most important one, is whether the church was right in perceiving the need for a closed canon of scriptures.⁴⁸ If the term “Christian” is defined by the examples and beliefs passed on by earliest followers of Jesus, then we must at least ponder the question of whether the notion of a biblical canon is necessarily “Christian.” They

46. James Barr, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 24, 25; emphases in original.

47. John Barton, *People of the Book? The Authority of the Bible in Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1993), 24.

48. Here, McDonald’s historical study demonstrates that the scripture available and used by the earliest Christians was much more expansive than the present closed canon. According to McDonald, “Even in regard to the OT canon, it has been shown that the early church’s collections of scriptures were considerably broader in scope than those presently found in either the Catholic or Protestant canons and that they demonstrated much more flexibility than our present collections allow.” McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 254. McDonald recognizes a disturbing inconsistency between the content and understanding of scripture in the days of Christ and the earliest Christians and the content and understood “closed-ness” of today’s scriptures.

did not have such canons as the church possesses today, nor did they indicate that their successors should draw them up.⁴⁹

Second, one must ask whether in fact the present biblical canon has not legitimized practices that the churches today uniformly reject, namely, the practice of slavery or the inferiority and subjugation of . . . [women]. . . .⁵⁰

Third, did such a move toward a closed canon of scriptures ultimately (and unconsciously) limit the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the church? . . . Does God act in the church today and by the same Spirit? On what biblical or historical grounds has the inspiration of God been limited to the written documents that the Church now calls its Bible?⁵¹

Fourth, in regard to the OT, should the church be limited to an OT canon to which Jesus and his first disciples were clearly not limited?⁵²

49. McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 254. McDonald identifies several ancient writings which purport to tell us about Christ but were left out of the current canon of the church. He mentions specifically the Apocryphal writings and Pseudepigrapha as well as the *agrapha* (literally, unwritten or "isolated sayings of Jesus that have been found in the early church fathers, in ancient manuscripts, and in some apocryphal sources"). He suggests that inasmuch as these sources can be proven authentic and useful, they ought to inform our modern understanding of Christ. But he also firmly states, "I for one am not in favor of rejecting the present biblical canon in order to create a new closed canon of scriptures." And concerning the currently known collection of non-canonical literature, he concludes "that there are no other ancient documents which are on the whole more reliable in informing the church's faith than our present biblical canon, even though we have suggested that some noncanonical sources are as reliable in their portrayal of the teaching and preaching of early Christianity." McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 257; emphasis in original. It would seem, then, that he would leave the canon open for early documents which would add to our understanding of Christ.

50. McDonald quotes Krister Stendahl, who explains that "there never has been an evil cause in the world that has not become more evil if it has been possible to argue it on biblical grounds." McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 254. Stendahl's main emphasis is on slavery, which he argues would have disappeared more quickly in our Western world were it not for the Bible's perceived condoning of the practice. Clearly, McDonald is concerned with the way in which a closed canon needlessly perpetuates outdated practices.

51. These are apparently very sobering questions for McDonald even though he provides no direct answer or further commentary.

52. In light of such information, McDonald pointedly asks, "What obligations does the church have today to limit itself to a canon of OT scriptures that was not the precise canon of the earliest Christians?" McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 255. Again, McDonald emphasizes the disparity between the ancient canon and the modern closed canon and questions the canonization process of the church that established such.

Fifth, if apostolicity is still a legitimate criterion for the canonicity of the NT literature, . . . should the church today continue to recognize the authority of . . . [the] nonapostolic literature of the NT? If the Spirit's activity was not considered to be limited to apostolic documents, . . . can we and should we make arguments for the inclusion of other literature in the biblical canon?⁵³

Sixth, one must surely ask about the appropriateness of tying the church of the twentieth century to a canon that emerged out of the historical circumstances in the second to the fifth centuries CE. How are we supposed to make the experience of that church absolute for all time? . . .⁵⁴

Finally, if the Spirit inspired only the written documents of the first century, does that mean that the same Spirit does not speak today in the church about matters that are of significant concern, for example, the use of contraceptives, abortion, liberation, ecological irresponsibility, equal rights, euthanasia, nuclear proliferation, global genocide, economic and social justice, and so on?⁵⁵

McDonald and other scholars continue to work through these types of pointed questions, endeavoring to consider carefully the issue. On one hand, says McDonald, "all contemporary churches have essentially closed their biblical canons claiming that God has spoken through prophets of old and they wrote down what was communicated to them." On the other hand, however, "there is no way to argue biblically or theologically that the biblical canon is closed if there is still the activity of God among us. If this is still the age of the Spirit, there is little argument theologically to say that God has stopped speaking."⁵⁶

53. McDonald uses as an example the epistle to the Hebrews: "Although there was considerable doubt about the authorship of Hebrews among the church fathers, the book nevertheless was included into the biblical canon because its message was both relevant and important to the Christian communities that adopted and preserved it as scripture." McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 255. Perhaps McDonald reveals his own opinion in his concluding question on the issue: "Is it not the intrinsic worth of the writing to the church in establishing its identity and facilitating its ministry that is the ultimate criterion for canonicity?" McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 255.

54. As McDonald shows, the Bible as closed canon is not accepted on the authority of the Biblical writings themselves, but on the decisions of a collection of Church leaders hundreds of years removed from the time of Christ. Thus, the legitimacy of a closed canon rests heavily on one's answer to his question: "Was the church in the Nicene and post-Nicene eras infallible in its decisions or not?" McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 256.

55. McDonald, *Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, 254–56.

56. Lee M. McDonald, email correspondence with the author, July 21, 2005. McDonald's email continues:

D. Conclusion

The cautious, forward movements of Christian theology and scholarship toward an expanded view of the workings of the gifts of the Holy Spirit and a reworked understanding of canonical dynamics certainly lean (however warily) in the direction of Joseph Smith's admittedly radical throwing open of the heavens. Few Christian scholars are so brazen as to go so far. However one chooses to view Joseph Smith's claim to have received new revelation and scripture, one thing is clear: Joseph never felt the need to

All Christians add unconsciously to the biblical canons—that is, their respective authorities—of their respective communities even though they would not put it in such terms. Most of us have heard Christians say such things as “Billy Graham says . . .” or citing some other well known figure who resonates well with the Christian community. The real question is, if canons are open, what are they open to? On what basis do we determine whether something is sacred and authoritative for the Christian community? I think the answer lies in the coherence of the new writings with what the believing community believed was sacred and from God in their sacred scriptures. Historically, it had more to do with coherence to the “apostolic deposit” that was passed on in the churches long before there was a biblical canon. If it does not cohere, or reflect that which has already been received as true and faithful, then it cannot be canon. I think that this is a part of the matter that divides some Christians from accepting the writings of Joseph Smith and others, namely they are not able to see the seamless connection with the sacred tradition already received in the church.

In the *Canon Debate*, the last two articles are by two very significant opposites in biblical scholarship, namely, Robert Funk of the Jesus Seminar who wants to have no canon in some cases and a very restrictive canon in others, and still a more inclusive canon in others. James D. G. Dunn's article is more about a “canon within the canon” which is the practice of many Christians. Without theological support, they simply gravitate toward the Gospels and Paul and largely ignore vast segments of the OT and also the NT. Karen King at Harvard would like to have the Gnostic *Gospel of Mary* included because it includes something from a woman. The agenda of each group that wants a different canon varies and Dunn's is the most commonly practiced, namely ignore what does not fit well into our current mode of thinking.

I think that it is too early to say that we will have a new biblical canon that will gain wide acceptance. Any changes in the current biblical canon are likely to take years to gain wide acceptance and will cause considerable division in the existing churches and the various communities of faith. In this sense, the biblical [canon] is complete and not likely to change. On the other hand, it is difficult biblically and theologically to argue that what we have is all there should be.

apologize for adding new scripture to the canon. To Mormons, the Book of Mormon and Pearl of Great Price (each containing ancient records) make clear that ancient documents outside of the Bible do exist that have substantial truths to share in shedding greater light upon God's dealing among men for their salvation through the mediation of Jesus Christ. The basic premise of the Book of Mormon—that a small group of Israel who had their own scripture and prophets existed apart from the Jews at Jerusalem—is not as anomalous today as it was two centuries ago when Joseph first brought forth the Book of Mormon. The revelations of the Doctrine and Covenants, those received by Joseph Smith in these days, demonstrate a profound belief that God has meaningful things to say to humankind in our present age. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is a church founded upon revelation—past, present, and future.

Joseph's work anticipated the discoveries of ancient documents such as the Dead Sea Scrolls and the renewed interest in New Testament charismata, and yet anticipates that God has many more such divine disclosures to bring forth for our knowledge—both “a voice of mercy from heaven [as in continuing divine revelation]; and a voice of truth out of the earth [as in ancient divinely inspired documents such as the Book of Mormon]” (D&C 128:19). No longer must Mormons entertain such hopes in total isolation from the rest of the Christian world.

II. GOD AS PERSONAL AND PASSIBLE

A. Joseph's Views

As Joseph Smith walked out of the grove of trees following his first supernal encounter with God the Father and God the Son, he announced an unqualified testimony that God is a person. Since that time, Mormonism has been distinguished by its belief in a Godhead of three separate persons.⁵⁷ Conventional Christianity used the word “person”—and still does—in describing God, “but only in a most attenuated form, ascribing to Deity a consciousness, will, some kind of individuality, but denying the full-bodied characteristics of personality that we associate with the word.”⁵⁸ John Sanders, in explaining the discrepancy between merely using the word and allowing the word its full expression has commented,

57. Paul E. Dahl, “Godhead,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, ed. Daniel H. Ludlow, 4 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1992), 2:552–53.

58. Truman G. Madsen, “Are Christians Mormon?” *BYU Studies* 15, no. 1 (1974): 74.

"A person is not primarily an isolated *cogito* but an agent who acts, wills, plans, loves, creates, and values in relation to other persons."⁵⁹

Without the full characteristics associated with the word "person," many question whether the God of traditional Christianity is capable of such agentive functions, particularly love. Charles Hartshorne articulated the problem in this manner:

What it comes to is that in retreating from popular anthropomorphism classical theology fell backward into an opposite error. Intent on not exaggerating the likeness of the divine and the human, they did away with it altogether, if one takes their statements literally. Using the word "love," they emptied it of its most essential kernel, the element of sympathy, of the feeling of others' feelings. It became mere beneficence, totally unmoved (to use their own word) by the sufferings or joys of the creatures. Who wants a friend who loves only in that sense?⁶⁰

This theological axiom is known as impassibility, which means that God is "not capable of being affected or acted upon," explained Van A. Harvey. "The presupposition of this attribution is the Greek idea that passibility involves potentiality, and potentiality, change."⁶¹ T. E. Pollard articulated Hartshorne's point, stating that ascribing to God the characteristics of immutability and impassibility "ends inevitably in the use of terms which are not supra-personal but sub-personal."⁶² Thus, an impassible God is a sub-personal God.

Joseph's First Vision revealed a God that is radically different from the impassible, unmoved mover of traditional Christianity. God is not only seeable, but also an approachable and extremely passible person.⁶³ One of the great lessons of the First Vision is the simple fact that God *responded*. Joseph learned that God is cognizant of and closely engaged in the human

59. John E. Sanders, "God as Personal," in *The Grace of God, the Will of Man*, ed. Clark H. Pinnock (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1989), 174.

60. Charles Hartshorne, *Omnipotence and Other Theological Mistakes* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 29.

61. Van A. Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 129. See (the Very Reverend) James Malloch, *A Practical Church Dictionary*, ed. Kay Smallrized (New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1964), 244: "This view seems to conflict with God's love for man, Christ's passion, and other doctrines of mercy and sympathy."

62. T. E. Pollard, "The Impassibility of God," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955): 361.

63. For especially helpful treatments of the nature of personhood, see John Macmurray, *The Self as Agent* (London: Faber and Faber, 1969); *Persons in Relation* (London: Faber and Faber, 1966); and Peter A. Bertocci, *The Person God Is* (New York: Humanities, 1970).

predicament.⁶⁴ The Prophet's witness speaks powerfully for a God who is affected by human petition. Of his experience, Joseph concludes, "I had found the testimony of James to be true—that a man who lacked wisdom might ask of God, and obtain, and not be upbraided" (JS-H 1:26, alluding to James 1:5).

Joseph taught that believing in God's passibility has profound influence on Christian living. The *Lectures on Faith*, compiled under Joseph's direction, list *mercy* among the six attributes that man must believe God to possess in order to exercise faith in Him unreservedly. "For," the *Lectures* teach, "without the idea of the existence of this attribute in the Deity, the spirits of the saints would faint" amid their tribulations. But when the existence of this attribute "is once established in the mind it gives life and energy to the spirits of the saints, believing that the mercy of God will be poured out upon them in the midst of their afflictions, and that he will compassionate them in their sufferings."⁶⁵ Joseph further viewed God's acute passibility as the pattern that the Saints should emulate in their own lives. In personal correspondence, Joseph wrote, "Inasmuch as long-suffering, patience, and mercy have ever characterized the dealings of our heavenly Father towards the humble and the penitent, I feel disposed to copy the example, [and] cherish the same principles."⁶⁶

Joseph Smith viewed God above all else as a heavenly *Father*. Accordingly, God exhibits those same instinctive cultivating impulses of any loving father, feeling both the joy and pain of his children as he witnesses both their triumphs and failures; sadly, all too often God looks in genuine sadness upon the lamentable condition of our world. Yet Joseph taught that still God's love remains constant:

64. After all, how can a timelessly immutable Being plan, anticipate, remember, respond, punish, warn, or forgive, since all such acts involve temporality and mutability? Stephen T. Davis, *Logic and the Nature of God* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1983), 14. A timelessly immutable God cannot "answer" prayer, as this would imply that God "responds" to our prayer. The absolutistic God only seems, from a human perspective to answer prayer. At this point many try to escape to "mystery" or "paradox" to avoid admitting a contradiction. Concerning the invalidity of this tactic, see Davis, *Logic and the Nature of God*, 16, 78, 140–45; and Sanders, "God as Personal," 172–73 and note 27.

65. Joseph Smith, *Lectures on Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 4:15. Current scholarship suggests that Joseph Smith may not have been the only or primary author of the *Lectures*; however, he was assuredly familiar with them and even aided in their publication. See Larry E. Dahl and Charles D. Tate Jr., eds., *The Lectures on Faith in Historical Perspective* (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, 1990), 10.

66. *History of the Church*, 4:163.

But while one portion of the human race is judging and condemning the other without mercy, the Great Parent of the universe looks upon the whole of the human family with a fatherly care and paternal regard; He views them as His offspring, and without any of those contracted feelings that influence the children of men, causes "His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."⁶⁷

The scriptures that Joseph Smith brought forth are replete with testimony of God's personal passibility. Enoch became an eyewitness of the Father's loving vulnerability and of his sensitive and responsive nature, when he saw the God of heaven weep over the wickedness and suffering of his children (Moses 7:28–29, 32–33, 37).

LDS scripture also alludes to the passibility of God in the agony of Jesus' atonement, consistent with a theopaschite view (that God suffers). The Book of Mormon speaks of the "condescension of God" wherein God himself "should be oppressed and afflicted," ultimately to die for the sins of the world.⁶⁸ In a prophetic foretelling of his mortal ministry, Alma (circa 120 BC) foretold that Christ would "go forth, suffering pains and afflictions and temptations of every kind," he would "take upon him the pains and the sicknesses of his people," and he would "take upon him death" and infirmity, all so that "his bowels may be filled with mercy, according to the flesh, that he may know according to the flesh how to succor his people according to their infirmities" (Alma 7:11–12).

The passibility of God created a dynamic interplay of overture and response when the resurrected Lord appeared to a gathering of ancient Americans. When his visit was drawing to a close, he advised the multitude that he was leaving. But seeing the multitude in tears, the Lord instead tarried longer and consoled them with compassion and miraculous healings. Only when he saw that the multitude's joy was full did he respond, "And now behold, *my* joy is full. And when he had said these words, he wept" (3 Ne. 17:1–25; emphasis added).

Throughout the Book of Mormon narrative, we see portrayed the tender and profound passibility of God the Son, who is in the express image of His Father's person (Heb. 1:3). As Joseph taught, to see how the Son walks and acts among men is to see how the Father walks and acts.⁶⁹

67. *History of the Church*, 4:595.

68. 1 Ne. 11:16, 26; Mosiah 13:28, 34–35; compare 15:1; 17:8; Alma 42:15.

69. Larry E. Dahl and Donald Q. Cannon, eds., *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1997), 230 (compare John 14:9). See also Jeffrey R. Holland, "The Grandeur of God," *Ensign* 33 (November 2003): 70–73.

B. Christian Divergence and Criticisms

As with most doctrines espoused by traditional Christianity, belief in an impassible God developed through centuries of thought. That the doctrine is foreign to the Hebrew prophets is attested by Abraham Heschel, who noted, “Quite obviously in the biblical view, man’s deeds may move [God], affect Him, grieve Him or, on the other hand, gladden and please Him. This notion that God can be intimately affected, that He possesses not merely intelligence and will, but also pathos, basically defined the prophetic consciousness of God.”⁷⁰

However, for the influential Jewish philosopher Philo, the passible God of the prophets is far too human. For Philo, the scriptural denial of the likeness of God to any other being implies a complete lack of emotion. Why, then, does Moses speak “of His jealousy, His wrath, His moods of anger, and the other emotions similar to them, which he describes in terms of human nature?” To this Philo replied, “He hoped to be able to eradicate the evil, namely by representing the Supreme Cause as dealing in threats and oftentimes showing indignation and implacable anger. . . . For this is the only way in which the fool can be admonished.”⁷¹ Thus, scripture describes the divine Being in human terms in order to educate man. Philo’s interpretation of biblical anthropopathy would become standard in Jewish and Christian literature.

After the close of the apostolic era, the idea of an impassible God surfaces again in the writings of the early Church Fathers. However, for the Fathers, impassibility was compatible with emotional states such as love, mercy, and compassion. Their primary purpose in describing God as impassible was to “distance God the creator from the gods of mythology.”⁷² For the Fathers, the God of Christians is impassible in that he is free from passions exhibited by the pagan gods. For them, God is obviously not full of debauchery and corruption as are Dionysius, Apollo, Persephone, Aphrodite, and Zeus. Nevertheless, by the early twelfth century divergence from passibility was widespread; St. Anselm stated what for centuries to come would be axiomatic of God, namely that he is “not afflicted with any feeling of compassion for sorrow.”⁷³

70. Abraham Heschel, *The Prophets: Part II* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 4.

71. Philo, *Quod Deus Immutabilis Est*, section 8, lines 60, 68.

72. Paul L. Gavrilyuk, *The Suffering of the Impassible God: The Dialectics of Patristic Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 48.

73. Anselm, *Proslogion*, trans. Thomas Williams (Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 1995), 104.

In proclaiming God to be personal and passible to the extent that he did, Joseph contradicted centuries of Christian thought. Indeed, Christianity had thought of God as an impassible, immutable, omnipotent will for so long that, as John Sanders comments, "We now take this way of thinking for granted."⁷⁴ Thus, when Joseph declared God to be a passible person, commentators described the new Church and its doctrine to be "monstrous and absurd."⁷⁵ As one writer jeered, "Mormonism tells you that a man is our God."⁷⁶ The attack on Joseph's "anthropomorphic" God continued throughout the nineteenth century. For example, a magazine article published in 1850 called the idea that God does "possess passions" as not only "retrogressive" but profane.⁷⁷ The article concluded that "[God] possesses the body and passions of a man, so his relations to his creatures are purely human." Thus, a doctrine "stated as an absurdity in the fourth century, the Mormons embrace as an axiom in the nineteenth."⁷⁸

C. Contemporary Christian Convergence

Since the writing of the above 1850 article, the Christian world has experienced a theological shift unparalleled in its history. This shift began in England in the 1890s as a steady stream of English theologians began to advocate a doctrine of divine suffering.⁷⁹ These theologians included Andrew Fairbairn who wrote, "Theology has no falsier idea than that of the impassibility of God."⁸⁰ In fact, in 1924 the Archbishops' Doctrine Commission directed a study into the English theological interest in the

74. Sanders, "God as Personal," 169.

75. LaRoy Sunderland, *Mormonism Exposed* (New York: Piercy and Reed, 1838), preface. Sunderland's text first appeared in articles published by his *Zion's Watchman* in 1837–38, and was written partly in response to Parley P. Pratt's 1837 *A Voice of Warning*. Pratt countered Sunderland with his own *Mormonism Unveiled* in 1838 and Sunderland came out with an entirely new edition of *Mormonism Exposed* in 1842.

76. Robert B. Neal, "Smithianity; . . . OR . . . Mormonism Refuted by Mormons" (Cincinnati, Ohio: Christian Leader Print, 1898), 24; emphasis in original.

77. E. Littell, "Mormonism, part 2," in *The Living Age*, no. 531 (July 22, 1854): 147–62.

78. Littell, "Mormonism, part 2," 149.

79. It should be noted that the work of American theologian Horace Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1866), had a good deal of influence on the English tradition. For more on Bushnell, see F. W. Dillistone, *The Christian Understanding of Atonement* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 243–46.

80. A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), 483.

suffering of God.⁸¹ In 1986, Ronald Goetz described this shift as the “rise of a new orthodoxy.”⁸²

Listing every thinker or theologian since Joseph’s day to ascribe to God the full-bodied characteristics of personhood, most especially passibility, would not only be impractical, but impossible. The list crosses all denominational and national boundaries.⁸³ A brief listing of some of the most distinguished include Berdyaev, Tennant, Hartshorne, Brunner,⁸⁴ Aulén, Barth, Bonhoeffer, Cobb, Cone, Küng, Moltmann,⁸⁵ Reinhold Niebuhr, Pannenberg, Ruether, Temple, Teilhard, and Unamuno.⁸⁶ Moltmann explains the downfall of classical Christianity thus:

Christian theology acquired Greek philosophy’s ways of thinking in the Hellenistic world; and since that time most theologians have simultaneously maintained the passion of Christ, God’s Son, and the deity’s essential incapacity for suffering—even though it was at the price of having to talk paradoxically about “the sufferings of the God who cannot suffer.”⁸⁷ But

81. The result of this commission was in chapter two of J. K. Mozley’s *The Impassibility of God: A Survey of Christian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926). Mozley’s survey does not, however, include all important contributions within his period. For example, he misses Hastings R. Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* (London: Macmillan, 1925), 450–54, and Arthur Michael Ramsey, *An Era in Anglican Theology: From Gore to Temple* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1960), 58–59.

82. Ronald Goetz, “The Suffering God: The Rise of a New Orthodoxy,” *Christian Century* 103, no. 13 (April 16, 1986): 385–89.

83. Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno developed a doctrine of the infinite sorrow of God in *Tragic Sense of Life* (London: Constable, 1954). Russian theologian Nicolas Berdyaev vigorously rejected impassibility in favor of a doctrine of tragedy within the divine life in *The Meaning of History* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1939). Japanese Lutheran theologian Kazoh Kitamori published a book embracing passibility in *Theology of the Pain of God* (London: SCM, 1966).

84. Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of God: Dogmatics*, trans. Olive Wyon, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1950), 1:183; see entire chapter 15.

85. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, trans. R. A. Wilson and John Bowden (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), 218.

86. As listed by Goetz, “Suffering God,” 385.

87. According to Irenaeus the *Deus impassibilis* has become *passibilis*. According to Melito, “The One who cannot suffer, suffers.” In his famous treatise Gregory Thaumaturgus describes “the Suffering of Him who cannot suffer.” Compare H. Crouzel, “La passion de l’impassible,” in *L’homme devant Dieu I* (Paris: Aubier, 1964), 269–79, and Von Luise Abramowski, “Die Schrift Gregors des Lehrers ‘Ad Theopompum’ und Philoxenus von Mabbug,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 89 (1978): 273–90. Out of the abundance of typical titles we may mention here G. Stanihurstius’s cumbersome *Historia von dem heiligen Leiden des unsterblichen Gottes im sterblichen Leibe* (Kempten, 1678). The last great treatment of the

in doing this they have simply added together Greek philosophy's "apathy" axiom and the central statements of the gospel. The contradiction remains—and remains unsatisfactory.⁸⁸

"Just as significant" as the list of contemporary proponents of divine passibility, according to Goetz, "is the fact that even those theologians who have not embraced modern theopaschism have failed to develop a creative restatement of the older dogma" (von Hilgel and Thomas Weinandy being, perhaps, the significant exceptions).⁸⁹ Yet, even in repudiating a passible God, Weinandy effectively states my thesis:

From the dawn of the Patristic period Christian theology has held as axiomatic that God is impassible—that is, He does not undergo emotional changes of state, and so cannot suffer. Toward the end of the nineteenth century a sea change began to occur within Christian theology such that at present many, if not most, Christian theologians hold as axiomatic that God is passible, that He does undergo emotional changes of states, and so can suffer.⁹⁰

In 1959 Daniel Day Williams described the growing belief that God suffers as a "structural shift in the Christian mind."⁹¹ In a similar vein, M. Sarot writes, "During the present century the idea that God is immutable and impassible has slowly but surely given way to the idea that God is sensitive, emotional and passionate. . . . By now the rejection of the ancient doctrine of divine impassibility has so much become a theological commonplace, that many theologians do not even feel the need to argue for it."⁹² Finally, Moltmann is so convinced of the rejection of divine impassibility that he writes, "The doctrine of the essential impassibility of the divine nature now seems finally to be disappearing from the Christian doctrine of God."⁹³

subject by B. R. Brasnett is also entitled *The Suffering of the Impassible God* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1928).

88. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1981), 22.

89. See Thomas G. Weinandy, *Does God Suffer?* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000). Dr. Goetz, a Century Editor at large, holds the Niebuhr Distinguished Chair of Theology and Ethics at Elmhurst College in Elmhurst, Illinois.

90. Thomas G. Weinandy, "Does God Suffer?" *First Things* 117 (November 2001): 35.

91. Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), 138.

92. Marcel Sarot, "Suffering of Christ, Suffering of God?" *Theology* 95 (1992): 113.

93. Jürgen Moltmann, *History and the Triune God* (London: SCM, 1991), xvi. See also Weinandy, *Does God Suffer?* 1.

If twentieth-century theologians were not influenced by Joseph Smith's revelations, "What has brought about such a radical reconception of God? How, in only one hundred years, has the Christian theological tradition of almost two thousand years, so readily and so assuredly, seemingly been overturned?"⁹⁴ Goetz finds four primary reasons⁹⁵ for this fundamental shift in thinking:

1) *The decline of Christendom.* From Augustine's "theocratic hope that the church as the earthly City of God would gradually come to rule the world to the liberal dream that the Kingdom of God would be established on earth through the liberal's persuasive evangelism, Christians have been united in the conviction that God's eternal rule is confirmed by world events."⁹⁶ According to Goetz, this Christian triumphalism is becoming increasingly rare. While Christians continue to avow the reality of God, many are unable to recognize and affirm his sovereign lead in the events of history.

2) *The rise of democratic aspirations.* These democratic aspirations have contributed to the problem of belief in an impassible, immutable God. For if God is conceived of as an unmoved mover—the unaffected source of the world—he is irrelevant to what free men and women do in the world.

3) *The problem of suffering and evil.* As the traditional belief in a world that was created out of nothing about six thousand years ago with all species intact began to give way to an evolutionary view of creation, many twentieth-century theologians found belief in an impassible, immutable God to be inconceivable. It was indeed unacceptable to believe in a God who impassibly constructed a world through billions of years of slow and painful evolution driven by the principle of "the survival of the fittest." The brutalities of World War I gave further cause for rethinking the doctrine of God. It appeared that humanity could be more brutal than the beasts, that human moral progress was a charade, and that evil and suffering were a fundamental part of human existence. Talk about an impassible, immutable God was for many simply inconceivable. Warren McWilliams has suggested that "a recognition of divine suffering may be an intrinsic part of a comprehensive Christian response to the theodicy issue."⁹⁷

94. Weinandy, *Does God Suffer?* 1.

95. Goetz, "Suffering God," 386–88.

96. Goetz, "Suffering God," 386.

97. Warren McWilliams, *The Passion of God: Divine Suffering in Contemporary Protestant Theology* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1985), preface. For an example of a theodicy in light of a suffering God, see Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, 47–52.

4) *The scholarly reappraisal of the Bible.*⁹⁸ Goetz asserts that “biblical interpretation is no longer bound by patristic and scholastic presuppositions about the divine aseity, nor is it bound by the deistic assumptions of liberal scholars. Some find the God of the Bible not to their taste, but today few scholars would disagree that the God of the Bible is a personal, passionate, jealous, concerned, and suffering God.”⁹⁹

This also applies to the biblical perception of God's possession of a human form. Many scholars now believe that the Genesis pronouncement of man being created in the “image of God” was first understood as a reference to the visible similitude of the human body to the form of God.¹⁰⁰ This corresponds to the early Hebrew view of an anthropomorphic God, but “as Judaism collided with the Hellenistic world many Jews became more consciously uncomfortable with the idea that God might possess a physical form and that a human was in some way similar to this form. Hence, the image of God was reinterpreted to mean other immaterial qualities which humanity shared in common with his creator.”¹⁰¹

D. Conclusion

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the worldwide acceptance of a passible God is that it came without the councils, name-calling, and bloodshed that have characterized significant doctrinal shifts of the past. This peaceful and almost imperceptible change is described by Goetz:

No one of whom I am aware has quite said that the rejection of the ancient doctrine of divine impassibility has become a theological commonplace. (Yet when one ventures to make this claim in the presence of theologians, one is invariably met with a slightly surprised expression, followed by an assenting, “Of course.”)¹⁰²

98. For an excellent presentation of the scriptural foundations of such a move, see Clark H. Pinnock, *Most Moved Mover* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2001), 26–31, 56–60.

99. Goetz, “Suffering God,” 387–88.

100. D. J. A. Clines, “The Image of God in Man,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968): 56–58; Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. John Baker, vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Library*, ed. G. Ernest Wright, John Bright, and James Barr (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 122–24.

101. Eric R. Montgomery, “The Image of God as a Resurrected State in Pauline Thought,” http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=2806 (accessed March 11, 2005).

102. Goetz, “Suffering God,” 385.

It is this anthropomorphic and anthropopathic God of the Bible that Joseph taught long before it was reaccepted by Christianity.¹⁰³ Thus, Harold Bloom writes,

I think transumptively of the Prophet Joseph's God when I read the text of the Yahwist, or J Writer, author of the earliest tales of the Pentateuch. The Yahweh who closes Noah's ark with his own hands, descends to make on-the-ground inspections of Babel and Sodom, and who picnics with two angels under Abram's terebinth trees at Mamre is very close, in personality and dynamic passion, to the God of Joseph Smith, far closer than to the Platonic-Aristotelian divinity of Saint Augustine and Moses Maimonides.¹⁰⁴

While Joseph did find this personal, dynamic, and passible God implicit in the Bible, his declarations rest on God's self-revelatory manifestations to him, person to person. Mormons rejoice in seeing other Christians moving more and more away from the "unblinking cosmic stare,"¹⁰⁵ that is the philosophers' god, toward the personal, passible God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

III. A SOCIAL MODEL OF THE GODHEAD

A. Joseph's Views

In 1842, as part of his response to a Chicago newspaperman's inquiry as to what Mormons believed, Joseph penned the Articles of Faith. Though not intended as such, they remain the closest Mormon analog to a creed. The first of these articles affirms Mormon belief in the New Testament Godhead: "We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." Joseph's revelations repeatedly declare that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God" (see 2 Ne. 31:21; Mosiah 15:2–5; Alma 11:44; 3 Ne. 11:27, 36; Mor. 7:7). But in his later noncanonized discourse, he explicitly stated that the Godhead consists of "three distinct

103. "The age-old dogma that God is impassible and immutable, incapable of suffering, is for many no longer tenable. The ancient theopaschite heresy that God suffers has, in fact, become the new orthodoxy." Goetz, "Suffering God," 385.

104. Harold Bloom, *The American Religion* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992), 101.

105. This is how Dallas Willard characterized the timeless, immutable, impassible God of conventional Christian theology. Dallas Willard, *The Divine Conspiracy: Rediscovering Our Hidden Life in God* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1998), 245.

personages and three Gods.”¹⁰⁶ Starting from the premise that three distinct personages make up the Godhead, Joseph understood their oneness or unity to consist of something other than metaphysical or psychical identity.¹⁰⁷ Rather, Joseph saw their oneness as a unity of heart, mind, purpose, and mutual indwellingness. Joseph’s Book of Mormon translation emphasized their oneness with words such as one “doctrine,” “judgment,” “baptism,” and “record” (2 Ne. 31:21; Alma 11:44; 3 Ne. 11:27; 3 Ne. 11:36).

Seeing the Godhead as three distinct personages in no way diminishes their collective unity of mind, glory, and power, as repeatedly declared in the *Lectures on Faith* and LDS-specific and biblical scripture.¹⁰⁸ Joseph taught, “everlasting covenant was made between three personages [Father, Son and Holy Ghost] before the organization of this earth.”¹⁰⁹ In short, the persons of the trinity are bound by genetics, by “everlasting covenant,” and by “the same fullness” or set of divine attributes. Moreover, there is a synergetic bond between the Father and his Only Begotten, which is altogether peculiar to them. This bond was forged not only out of their oneness of mind and genetic¹¹⁰ relationship but also out of their interdependent

106. Joseph Fielding Smith, comp., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976), 370.

107. Compare Christopher Stead, who writes, “Theologians have been rightly convinced that the ultimate effect of Nicaea has been to assert, not merely the equality, but also the essential unity, of the three Persons; and they have attempted, I think incautiously, to represent this as the original and express intention of the Nicene fathers. In support of this view, it has been argued that *homoousios* was adopted at Nicaea to express the form of trinitarian theology prevailing in the West.” Christopher Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 251.

108. Dahl and Tate, *Lectures on Faith in Historical Perspective*, 83–84.

109. Dahl and Cannon, *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings*, 712.

110. In accordance with Joseph’s teachings, Church leaders in 1916 made the following statement which clearly and emphatically sets forth the doctrine that God is not only the Father of the spirits of all men, but that he is the Father of both the Spirit and the body of the Lord Jesus Christ:

Scriptures embodying the ordinary signification—literally that of Parent—are too numerous and specific to require citation. The purport of these scriptures is to the effect that God the Eternal Father, whom we designate by the exalted name-title “Elohim,” is the literal Parent of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and of the spirits of the human race. Elohim is the Father in every sense in which Jesus Christ is so designated, and distinctively He is the Father of spirits. . . .

Jesus Christ is the Son of Elohim both as spiritual and bodily offspring; that is to say, Elohim is literally the Father of the spirit of Jesus Christ and also of the body in which Jesus Christ performed His mission in the flesh.

missions. As the Father needed the Son to accomplish his purposes, so did the Son need the Father for direction, power, and exaltation. By their acts of mutual service, each fulfilled, and was fulfilled, in the other. Hence, Jesus' prayer: "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee."¹¹¹ In addition to his testimony of direct experience, Joseph defends such a view biblically, "I want to read the text to you myself [John 17:21]—'I am agreed with the Father and the Father is agreed with me, and we are agreed as one.' The Greek shows that it should be agreed."¹¹² Thus, Joseph explicitly rejected the traditional belief that the Godhead, or trinity, was comprised of a single being.¹¹³

In his revelations, the word "God" has dual meaning; it designates the divine community as well as each individual divine person. In order to avoid misunderstanding, it is imperative to keep this dual use of the word "God" in mind. When Joseph declares there are "three Gods," he means that there are three distinct personages, each of whom is divine. When he affirms that there is "one God," he means that there is one perfectly united mutually indwelling divine community.¹¹⁴

Joseph held and his successors hold to a "one perfectly united, mutually indwelling divine community" model of the unity of Godhead rather

"The Father and the Son: A Doctrinal Exposition by the First Presidency and the Twelve," in *Messages of the First Presidency*, comp. James R. Clark, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965), 5:23–34 (June 30, 1916). Yet, even prior to Christ's being spiritually begotten by the Father, his eternal or uncreate nature is divine and partakes of the light and glory of the Father. A revelation states that Jesus was in the beginning with the Father as "Spirit, even the Spirit of truth" (D&C 93:23).

111. John 17:1; compare D&C 88:60. See Rodney Turner, "The Doctrine of the Firstborn and Only Begotten," in *The Pearl of Great Price: Revelations from God*, ed. H. Donl Peterson and Charles D. Tate Jr. (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Center, 1989).

112. Smith, *Teachings of the Prophet*, 372. Modern translations of the Bible corroborate Joseph's rendering; see John 17:21 in *The Message* and *Worldwide English Bible*.

113. "Many men say there is one God; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are only one God. I say that is a strange God anyhow—three in one, and one in three! It is a curious organization. 'Father, I pray not for the world, but I pray for them which thou hast given me.' 'Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are.' All are to be crammed into one God, according to sectarianism. It would make the biggest God in all the world. He would be a wonderfully big God—he would be a giant or a monster." Smith, *Teachings of the Prophet*, 372.

114. See my interview, "Are Mormons Trinitarian?" in *Modern Reformation* (November/December 2003): 40–43, wherein I answer common questions concerning the LDS understanding of the Godhead.

than a “one metaphysical substance” model.¹¹⁵ Thus, the Latter-day Saints do not see the doctrine of the trinity as a mystery in the sense of a doctrine that is incomprehensible, but in the sense of a spiritual truth that was once hidden but now re-revealed through Joseph Smith.

B. Christian Divergence and Criticisms

Except for the claim to continuous revelation and the reopening of the canon, perhaps no other Mormon doctrine has received as much criticism as the conception and formulation of the trinity by Joseph Smith and his successors.

Speaking of the Latter-day Saint model of the trinity, Evangelical Craig Blomberg has written:

If we are prepared to accept as inspired something that is so divergent from all other religions, what would ever disqualify an idea from being a true revelation from God? . . . Which is more likely—that everyone in the entire modern world was wrong and Joseph Smith got it right or that the tenets of monotheism shared by Jews, Christians, Muslims and other theists are right and Mormonism is wrong?¹¹⁶

Such criticism has been ongoing since Joseph Smith first declared that God the Father and Jesus Christ had appeared to him as two distinct personages in the spring of 1820 (JS-H 1:15–17). In 1849, T. W. P. Taylder, a noted British theologian, asserted that Mormon doctrine was tritheistic because it denies the “unity of the Godhead.”¹¹⁷ Recently, Stephen E. Parrish asserted in *The New Mormon Challenge* that the LDS trinity is a form of tritheism.¹¹⁸ In fact, both the United Methodist Church and Catholic

115. James E. Talmage, *A Study of the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988), 37.

116. Craig L. Blomberg and Stephen E. Robinson, *How Wide the Divide? A Mormon and an Evangelical in Conversation* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997), 121. Cyril Van der Donckt makes a similar assertion: “If God so emphatically declares, both in the Old and in the New Testament, that there is but one God, has anyone the right to contradict him and to say that there are several or many Gods? But Mr. Roberts insists that the Bible contradicts the Bible; in other words, that God, the author of the Bible, contradicts himself. To say such a thing is down-right blasphemy.” Cyril Van der Donckt, in B. H. Roberts, *The Mormon Doctrine of Deity* (Salt Lake City: Horizon, 1903), 60.

117. T. W. P. Taylder, *The Materialism of the Mormons, or Latter-day Saints Examined and Exposed* (Woolwich: E. Jones, 1849), 8, as cited in Craig L. Foster, *Penny Tracts and Polemics: A Critical Analysis of Anti-Mormon Pamphleteering in Great Britain, 1837–1860* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2002), 124.

118. Stephen E. Parrish, “A Tale of Two Theisms,” in Beckwith, Mosser, and Owen, *New Mormon Challenge*, 203–4.

Church have recently declared that they will not accept Mormon baptisms as valid, citing in large part the Mormon doctrine of the trinity.¹¹⁹ One Christian polemical essay “seeks to expose the heresy that exists in Mormon Doctrine as it pertains to the Godhead,” stating, “Throughout history many movements have sought to diminish God and define him in rational, human terms. So it is in the Mormon Doctrine of the Godhead. Holding the God that is revealed in Scripture to ‘natural’ standards creates a god that is not worthy of our praise.”¹²⁰

C. Contemporary Christian Convergence

Despite such avid criticism, many Christian thinkers are showing a renewed interest in Joseph’s kind of trinitarian thought. The social analogy of the Trinity reasserts the religious teaching that the Godhead is composed of three substantively separate and distinct persons¹²¹ who are perfectly one in thought, word, intention, and action. Essentially, social trinitarianism begins with the construct of a “divine society” and then bases the oneness of the Persons in the harmony and union of activity of that society.¹²² Its methodology is explained by Moltmann: “We are

119. On July 17, 2001, *L’Osservatore Romano* reported that, according to the directive, Mormon baptisms did not involve a true invocation of the Trinity because Latter-day Saints perceive the Godhead as consisting of three separate divine beings rather than as one God existing within three persons of one substance. See “Why Mormon Baptism Is Invalid,” *L’Osservatore Romano*, July 17, 2001; Gustav Niebuhr, “Vatican Decides to Rebaptize Mormons Who Are Converting,” *New York Times*, July 24, 2001, A-17; Bob Mims, “Catholics Demote LDS Baptism,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, July 19, 2001, A-1. In their general conference (May 2–12, 2000), the United Methodist Church voted that following a period of catechesis (a time of intensive exploration and instruction in the Christian faith), such a convert (baptized LDS) should receive the sacrament of Christian baptism. Conference proceedings available online at <http://www.gc2000.org> (accessed February 13, 2006).

120. Richard C. Jackson, “Mormon Doctrine of the Godhead: A Biblical Critique,” Christian Information Ministries, <http://www.christianinformation.org/article.asp?artID=84> (accessed February 7, 2006).

121. For Pannenberg the divine persons are not three modes of being in the one divine subject. They are rather three separate and dynamic centers of action. They can be considered three separate centers of consciousness and thus can be distinctively described as persons on the basis of their unique self-relations that are mediated through their relationships with each other. Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1988), 1:384. See also William J. La Due, *The Trinity Guide to the Trinity* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003), 134.

122. Paul L. Owen, “Reflections on the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity,” *Mormons in Transition*, <http://www.irr.org/mit/trinity1.html> (accessed February 15, 2006).

beginning with the trinity of the Persons and shall then go on to ask about the unity.”¹²³ Clark Pinnock articulates social trinitarianism as a “transcendent society or community of three personal entities. Father, Son and Spirit are the members of a divine community, unified by common divinity and singleness of purpose. The Trinity portrays God as a community of love and mutuality.”¹²⁴

In fact, John Hicks, a non-Mormon scholar, describes the “revival” of social trinitarianism as “one of the most significant developments in contemporary theology.”¹²⁵ Hicks calls it a “revival” because most scholars of Christian beginnings acknowledge that the social model predated the creedal “one substance” view. Indeed, most attribute this understanding to New Testament writers and the earliest Church Fathers, particularly the fourth- and fifth-century Cappadocian fathers.¹²⁶ Yet this view is hardly

This article aims to “lay some groundwork which may help Latter-day Saints appreciate exactly what mainstream Christians mean when they speak of the Holy Trinity.”

123. Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, 19.

124. Clark H. Pinnock, *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1996), 29. Those who affirm this doctrinal notion of deity base their perspective largely on the economic vision of the Trinity, which describes the acts of the triune God with respect to the creation, history, salvation, and daily lives of human beings. It refers to how the Trinity operates within redemptive history in regards to the roles or functions performed by each of the persons of the Trinity. The economic is contrasted by the ontological Trinity, which speaks of the essence, nature or attributes of the Trinity. Simply—the ontological Trinity focuses on who God is, while the economic Trinity focuses on what God does.

125. John Mark Hicks, “An Introduction to the Doctrine of God” (paper presented at Harding University Graduate School of Religion, “Theology in Service of the Church” seminar held in conjunction with the 1996 Christian Scholars Conference, Nashville, Tenn.), July 18, 1996.

126. “In the fourth and fifth centuries, when the doctrine of the Trinity was being fully developed, there were particular limits on orthodoxy and, accordingly, particular positions outside orthodoxy. As already suggested, virtually everybody who writes on the Trinity during this period identifies the monist heresy as some form of modalism (Sabellianism, for instance), and then specifies that modalism is unacceptable because it allows belief in only one person. I now want to add that the heresy on orthodoxy’s pluralist side is specifiable as well. And it is surely not the view that God includes three distinct persons: that view lies at the heart of orthodoxy, agreed to by Cappadocians and Augustinians alike. . . . For the whole Augustinian age, and for centuries afterward, modalism and Arianism are the opposite trinitarian heresies and here again, social trinitarianism affirms the standard trinitarian tradition.” Cornelius Plantinga Jr., “Social Trinity and Tritheism,” in Feenstra and Plantinga, *Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 34.

universal. For example, in treating the trinitarianism of the Cappadocians, Roger Olsen states:

Throughout centuries of theology many critics have found it simply too ambiguous to accept without further clarification. When examined closely, it seems either that the Cappadocians were affirming God's oneness to the exclusion of real threeness or else affirming God's threeness to the exclusion of real oneness. Their analogies tend to emphasize threeness. Thus they are often treated as the source of the modern "social analogy" of the Trinity. . . . But their abstract explanations tend to emphasize oneness.¹²⁷

Even more prevalent than appealing to the Church Fathers as support for embracing a social model of the trinity is an appeal to the Bible. Jürgen Moltmann argues, "It seems to make more sense theologically to start from the biblical history, and therefore to make the unity of the three divine Persons the problem, rather than to take the reverse method—to start from the philosophical postulate of absolute unity, in order then to find the problem in the biblical testimony." The biblical beginnings of the doctrine should take precedence over the philosophical argument, "for ultimately we must always see to it that the liberating force of the biblical witness is preserved and not obscured."¹²⁸

Others offer existential reasons for rethinking the doctrine of the Trinity. For example, in his critique of the social and political effects of monotheism, Leonardo Boff writes:

It is not surprising, then, that Immanuel Kant should have written: "The doctrine of the Trinity provides nothing, absolutely nothing, of practical value, even if one claims to understand it; still less when one is convinced that it far surpasses our understanding. It costs the student nothing to accept that we adore three or ten persons in the divinity. One is the same as the other to him, since he has no concept of God in different persons (hypostases). Furthermore, this distinction offers absolutely no guidance for his conduct." This observation shows that the Trinity, for most people, has become a problem in logic and has ceased to be the mystery of our salvation. It has been reduced to a curiosity rather than being a reality that matters to us because it sheds light on our own existence and tells us the ultimate structure of the universe and of human life: communion and participation.¹²⁹

127. Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1999), 194.

128. Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, 149, 65.

129. Leonardo Boff, *Trinity and Society*, trans. Paul Burns (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988), 19–20, quoting Immanuel Kant, *Der Streit der Fakultäten* 8 (Berlin, 1917), 38–39. Jürgen Moltmann expresses similar thoughts, writing:

The distinguished contemporary proponents of a social model of the divine unity represent every major Christian theological tradition and include Cornelius Plantinga Jr.,¹³⁰ C. Stephen Layman,¹³¹ Richard Swinburne,¹³² David Brown,¹³³ Joseph A. Bracken,¹³⁴ Jürgen Moltmann,¹³⁵ Leonardo Boff,¹³⁶ Clark H. Pinnock,¹³⁷ Thomas V. Morris,¹³⁸

Many people view the theological doctrine of the Trinity as a speculation for theological specialists, which has nothing to do with real life. That is why modern Protestants like to content themselves with the young Melancthon's maxim: "We adore the mysteries of the Godhead. That is better than to investigate them." It is difficult enough to believe that there is a God at all and to live accordingly. Does belief in the Trinity not make the religious life even more difficult, and quite unnecessarily? Why are most Christians in the West, whether they be Catholics or Protestants, really only "monotheists" where the experience and practice of their faith is concerned?

Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, 1, quoting P. Melancthon, *Loci Communes*, 1521, *Melancthon's Werke* 2, ed. R. Stupperich (Gütersloh, 1952), 7. Karl Rahner also complains about this in his "Remarks on the Dogmatic Treatise 'De Trinitate,'" *Theological Investigations* 4 (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1966), 77–102.

130. Plantinga, "Social Trinity and Tritheism," 21–47; Cornelius Plantinga Jr., "The Threeness/Oneness Problem of the Trinity," *Calvin Theological Journal* 23 (April 1998): 37–53.

131. C. Stephen Layman, "Tritheism and Trinity," *Faith and Philosophy* 5, no. 3 (July 1988): 291–98.

132. Richard Swinburne, "Could There Be More Than One God," *Faith and Philosophy* 5, no. 3 (July 1988): 225–41; Richard Swinburne, *The Christian God* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 170–92.

133. David Brown, "Trinitarian Personhood and Individuality," in Feenstra and Plantinga, *Trinity, Incarnation, and Atonement*, 48–78; David Brown, *The Divine Trinity* (LaSalle, Ill.: Open Court, 1985), 272–301.

134. Bracken represents process thought by arguing, "They [Father, Son and Holy Spirit] represent three different subjective foci or centers of activity within the field. Thus, they are three separate 'personalities,' exercising interrelated but still different functions within one and the same field of activity." Joseph A. Bracken, "Panentheism from a Process Perspective," in *Trinity in Process: A Relational Theology of God*, ed. Joseph A. Bracken and Marjorie Hewitt Suchocki (New York: Continuum, 1997), 101.

135. Jürgen Moltmann was a professor of systematic theology at Tübingen for twenty-seven years and presently a professor emeritus. See Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*.

136. Leonardo taught for many years at the Franciscan Institute in Petropolis. See Boff, *Trinity and Society*, 119.

137. Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 21–48.

138. Thomas V. Morris, *Our Idea of God* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1991), 174–84.

John Richardson Illingworth,¹³⁹ Timothy R. Bartell,¹⁴⁰ William Hasker,¹⁴¹ Wolfhart Pannenberg,¹⁴² William Lane Craig,¹⁴³ and Stephen T. Davis.¹⁴⁴

In discussing the question of the trinity, Cornelius Plantinga writes: "The main problem or puzzlement here is that of threeness and oneness. Suppose the divine life includes both a three and one. What are the referents of these numbers? Three what? One what? And especially, how are these three and this one related?"¹⁴⁵ Social trinitarianism answers Plantinga's questions by explaining that the "Father, Son, and Spirit are distinct centers of knowledge, will, love, and action. Since each of these capacities requires consciousness, it follows that, on this sort of theory, Father, Son, and Spirit would be viewed as distinct centers of consciousness or, in short, as *persons* in some full sense of that term."¹⁴⁶ Boff concludes, "To sum up, we can say that in God there are three *prosopa* or *personae*; that is, three specific individualities, which the New Testament calls Father, Son and Holy Spirit."¹⁴⁷ In regards to the Greek New Testament text, Boff gives a persuasive explication that mirrors that of Joseph Smith:

139. Richard Hoskins, *The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Works of John Richardson Illingworth and William Temple, and the Implications for Contemporary Trinitarian Theology* (London: Edwin Mellen, 2000).

140. Timothy R. Bartell, "The Plight of the Relative Trinitarian," *Religious Studies* 24 (1988): 129–55.

141. See William Haskers's essay in *Searching for an Adequate God: A Dialogue between Process and Free Will Theists*, ed. John B. Cobb Jr. and Clark H. Pinnock (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000).

142. Pannenberg is a leading systematic theologian at the international and ecumenical level. See also Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Trinity and Religious Pluralism* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004), 81.

143. J. P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2003), 575–96.

144. Davis is the Russel K. Pitzer Professor of Philosophy at Claremont McKenna College. See Stephen T. Davis, "Perichoretic Monotheism: A Defense of a Social Theory of the Trinity," in *The Trinity: East/West Dialogue*, ed. Melville Stewart (Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003), 35–52.

145. Plantinga, "Social Trinity and Tritheism," 21.

146. Plantinga continues delineating the remaining conditions a theory must meet to be classified as "social": "Any accompanying sub-theory of divine simplicity must be modest enough to be consistent with condition (1), that is, with the real distinctness of trinitarian persons. . . . (3) Father, Son, and Spirit must be regarded as tightly enough related to each other so as to render plausible the judgment that they constitute a particular social unit." Plantinga, "Social Trinity and Tritheism," 22.

147. Boff, *Trinity and Society*, 59–60.

The basic reason for this choice is to be found in John 10:30: "The Father and I are one" (*hen*). Note that Jesus is not saying, "The Father and I are numerically one" (*heis*), but uses a term meaning "we are together" (Greek *hen*, as used again in v.38: "The Father is in me and I am in the Father"). The union of the Father and Son does not blot out the difference and individuality of each. Union rather supposes differentiation. Through love and through reciprocal communion they are one single thing, the one God-love.¹⁴⁸

Besides speaking of one God-love, Social Trinitarians answer the question, "One what?" in three specific ways. There is "only one font of divinity, only one Father, only one God in *that* sense of God," there is "a set of excellent properties severally necessary and jointly sufficient for their possessor to be divine," and there is "only one divine family or monarchy or community, namely, the Holy Trinity itself."¹⁴⁹ And especially, how are these three and this one related? Social Trinitarians answer, "The mysterious in-ness or oneness relation in the divine life is short of personal identity, but much closer than mere common membership in a class. For it includes a divine kinship relation as well."¹⁵⁰ While traditional Christianity (aided by modern translations of the Bible) has downplayed the familial relationship of the Son to the Father,¹⁵¹ Social Trinitarians cautiously assert doctrine

148. Boff, *Trinity and Society*, 5.

149. Plantinga, "Social Trinity and Tritheism," 31. In accordance with Plantinga, Moltmann writes:

We have to talk about the unity of the triune God in three respects.

In respect of the constitution of the Trinity the Father is the 'origin-without-origin' of the Godhead. According to the doctrine of the two processions, the Son and the Spirit take their divine hypostases from him. So in the constitution of the Godhead, *the Father* forms the 'monarchial' unity of the Trinity.

But in respect of the Trinity's inner life, the three Persons themselves form their unity, by virtue of their relation to one another and in the eternal perichoresis of their love. . . .

Finally, the mutual transfiguration and illumination of the Trinity into the eternal glory of the divine life is bound up with this. (Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, 177–78)

150. Plantinga, "Social Trinity and Tritheism," 28–29.

151. In the American Standard Version translation of John 1:14, 18 and John 3:16, 18 the "only begotten" Son is now the "only" while the New International Version translates "only begotten" as "one and only" Son.

parallel to Joseph's. Consider Plantinga on the relationship between God the Father and Jesus:

Such biblical language as Son 'of the Father' still suggests, however, both kinship and derivation. One might suppose, therefore, that these two persons are essentially related to each other not only generically but also in some quasi-genetic way. For the Son is not only equally divine with the Father; he is also the *Father's* Son. He is, so to speak, his Father all over again. We could say, then, that Father and Son are not just members of the class of divine persons, but also members of the same family.¹⁵²

Furthermore, Leonardo Boff writes, "The Gospels preserve the originality of Jesus' relationship to his God. This is something extremely intimate and unique; thus Jesus describes God with a word drawn from the language of family relationships, *Abba*, a childish expression of affection for a father."¹⁵³

In an unprecedented move, Plantinga and others propose getting rid of simplicity theory altogether as it "ends up complicating trinity doctrine quite needlessly."¹⁵⁴ (Simplicity theory holds that a perfect being must be absolutely simple or incomposite, inasmuch as anything composed of parts is susceptible of being decomposed or destroyed.) At the very least, Plantinga argues, any subtheory of divine simplicity must be modest enough to be consistent with there being distinct persons within the trinity.¹⁵⁵ Moltmann argues from a biblical standpoint:

If we search for a concept of unity corresponding to the biblical testimony of the triune God, the God who unites others with himself, then we must dispense with both the concept of the one substance and the concept of the identical subject. All that remains is: the unitedness, the at-oneness of the three Persons with one another, or: the unitedness, the at-oneness of the triune God.¹⁵⁶

152. Plantinga, "Social Trinity, and Tritheism," 28.

153. Boff continues, "We also know that the Son proceeds and comes from the Father (John 8:42) and that the Holy Spirit is sent by the Son from the Father. . . . There is an order in the three Persons: the Father first, the Son second and the Holy Spirit third. The witness of revelation of this mystery further testify that the Persons proceed one from another. 'Procession' (*processio* or *emanatio* in Latin, *ekporeusis* or *probolē* in Greek) designates the origin of one Person from another." Boff, *Trinity and Society*, 29, 90. For another Social Trinitarian view on the Fatherhood of God, see Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, 162–66.

154. Plantinga, "Social Trinity and Tritheism," 43.

155. Plantinga, "Social Trinity and Tritheism," 22.

156. Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, 150.

D. Conclusion

A comparison of the conception and explication of the trinity by Social Trinitarians and Joseph's revelations yields the conclusion that an increasing number of respected orthodox Christian scholars are now holding and defending what was, for a long time in the West, a uniquely Mormon doctrine.¹⁵⁷

IV. DEIFICATION

A. Joseph's Views

On February 16, 1832, Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon received a revelation from God indicating that those who attained the highest level of glory in the heavens would receive God's "fulness, and of his glory," becoming "gods, even the sons of God" (D&C 76:56, 58). This event marked the beginning of the gradual unfolding of a significant doctrine taught by Joseph Smith: deification—the doctrine that man can become like God. This gradual unfolding became a mainstream doctrine of the Latter-day Saints.¹⁵⁸

To understand Joseph's doctrine of deification, it is necessary to set forth a few of the unique aspects of his theological anthropology. First, Joseph taught that the "mind" or "intelligence" of man is eternal. In the King Follett Discourse¹⁵⁹ delivered in the spring of 1844, Joseph Smith

157. For example, Paul Owen has written, "Again, the point being made here is that *both* the social model and the modal/psychological model are approaches which are taken by mainstream, orthodox Christians; all of whom would quickly affirm their commitment to the belief that God is essentially one, but personally differentiated. Therefore, discussions between traditional Christians and Latter-day Saints need to take into consideration the *spectrum* of possibilities within the framework of historic, orthodox Christianity. Mainstream Christians should not give the misleading impression that there is no theological 'breathing room' for different trinitarian perspectives underneath the umbrella of 'orthodoxy.'" Owen, *Reflections on the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, part 2.

158. K. Codell Carter, "Godhood," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, ed. Daniel H. Ludlow, 4 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1992), 2:553–55.

159. More than any other sermon, the "King Follett Discourse" more fully presented the parameters of the origin, nature, and eventual divinity of man. This discourse would come to be known as the Prophet Joseph Smith's greatest sermon. Donald Q. Cannon, "The King Follett Discourse: Joseph Smith's Greatest Sermon in Historical Perspective," *BYU Studies* 18, no. 2 (1978): 179–92; Van Hale, "The Doctrinal Impact of the King Follett Discourse," *BYU Studies* 18, no. 2 (1978): 209–23. See also Jordan Vajda, "Partakers of the Divine Nature,"

taught, “The mind of man—the intelligent part—is as immortal as, and is coequal [co-eternal] with, God himself. I know my testimony is true. . . . Intelligence is eternal and exists upon a self-existent principle . . . and there is no creation about it.”¹⁶⁰ The assumption that man is uncreate and eternal provides a unique anthropological foundation for Joseph’s doctrine of deification.¹⁶¹ Madsen shows that a close reading of Joseph Smith’s teachings yields four insights into man’s spirit intelligence: Man inherently has individuality, autonomy, consciousness, and capacity of development.¹⁶²

Second, at some stage in man’s premortal existence, his spirit body is spiritually begotten by heavenly parents.¹⁶³ Spirit birth does not mark the

FARMS Occasional Papers 3 (2002): 27; and M. Gerald Bradford and Larry E. Dahl, “Doctrine: Meaning, Source, and History of Doctrine,” in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 1:396.

160. Stan Larson, “The King Follett Discourse: A Newly Amalgamated Text,” *BYU Studies* 18, no. 2 (1978): 203–4. Elsewhere, speaking of our conscious identity or spirit, Joseph taught: “Where did it come from? All learned men and doctors of divinity say that God created it in the beginning; but it is not so: the very idea lessens man in my estimation. . . . We say that God himself is a self-existent being. Who told you so? It is correct enough; but how did it get into your heads? Who told you that man did not exist in like manner upon the same principles? Man does exist upon the same principles. The mind or the intelligence which man possesses is co-equal with God himself.” Dahl and Cannon, *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith’s Teachings*, 340.

161. There are differences of opinion among students of the Prophet’s teachings as to whether humans always existed as individual intelligences or were part of a pool of intelligence or spirit matter that became intelligences as a result of spirit birth. The Church has taken no official position on this issue. As Joseph Fielding Smith explained, “Some of our writers have endeavored to explain what an intelligence is, but to do so is futile, for we have never been given any insight into this matter beyond what the Lord has fragmentarily revealed.” Joseph Fielding Smith, *The Progress of Man* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1936), 11. In any case, the intelligence of man is as eternal as God and capable of enlargement until, like God, it attains a fullness of glory.

162. Truman G. Madsen, *Eternal Man* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1970), 25, quoting *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 353.

163. Spirit birth is not a doctrine explicitly found in Joseph Smith’s writings or recorded sermons. It is, however, easily extrapolated from his teachings and reflects the way most of his closest associates understood them. Joseph taught that God is an exalted man and that, in order to become like God, men and women must enter the new and everlasting covenant of marriage, which will enable them to “bear the souls of men” in the eternal world (D&C 132:63). Joseph also taught that one of the keys to understanding the spiritual realm is to look at the nature of things in the temporal world since “that which is spiritual [is] in the likeness of that which is temporal” (D&C 77:2).

beginning of man's consciousness, but rather it constitutes a transformation or enlargement of the uncreate "intelligence." Says Madsen:

In mortal birth, inherent physical and personality traits of the father and mother are transmitted to their son or daughter. . . . More, one's bodily inheritance and then his environment mold him and largely condition his destiny.

It is exactly so with man's spirit. Long before mortality, in a process of actual transmission, there were forged into man's spirit the embryonic traits, attributes, and powers of God Himself! And in the surroundings of that realm man was nurtured in the Divine image.¹⁶⁴

Indeed, Joseph boldly proclaimed that humans are of the same origin and species as God: "God himself was once as we are now, and is an exalted man, and sits enthroned in yonder heavens!"¹⁶⁵ And thus the powerful corollary: humankind, as uncreate intelligences who become the literal, spiritual offspring of God, inherits the potential to become like God, able to attain his same knowledge, power, glory, and intelligence. But they cannot achieve this status on their own. God's fundamental purpose in creating the world was to bring about the "immortality and eternal [God-like] life" of his spirit children (Moses 1:39). On this point, Joseph taught:

God himself, finding he was in the midst of spirits and glory, because he was more intelligent, saw proper to institute laws whereby the rest could have a privilege to advance like himself. The relationship we have with God places us in a situation to advance in knowledge. He has power to institute laws to instruct the weaker intelligences, that they may be exalted with Himself, so that they might have one glory upon another, and all that knowledge, power, glory, and intelligence, which is requisite in order to save them in the world of spirits.¹⁶⁶

Third, according to Joseph's revelations, the fall of Adam and Eve and the freedom to choose between good and evil are both essential to the synergistic process of man's growth into God's likeness. Lehi informed us that "Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy" (2 Ne. 2:25). But to attain this joy, Lehi explains that "it must needs be, that there is an opposition in all things. If not so . . . righteousness could not be brought to pass, neither wickedness, neither holiness . . . neither good nor bad . . . [neither] happiness nor misery" (2 Ne. 2:11). Lehi continued:

And to bring about his eternal purposes in the end of man, after he had created our first parents, . . . it must needs be that there was an

164. Madsen, *Eternal Man*, 35.

165. Joseph Fielding Smith, comp., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976), 345.

166. *History of the Church*, 6:312.

opposition; even the forbidden fruit in opposition to the tree of life; the one being sweet and the other bitter. Wherefore, the Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself. Wherefore, man could not act for himself save it should be that he was enticed by the one or the other (2 Ne. 2:15–16).

Even God, though omnipotent, cannot by divine fiat bring about joy without moral holiness, moral holiness without moral freedom, moral freedom without an opposition in all things (see 2 Ne. 2:25–26).

Given man's initial moral imperfection, together with moral freedom and opposition as essential variables in the divine equation for man, two consequences stand out saliently: (1) the inevitability and universality of human sin, and (2) our need for a Redeemer and ongoing sanctification. Accordingly, the fourth foundational principle for Joseph's doctrine of deification is centered in Christ's incarnation and atonement. These afford man redemption from sin, immortality, and the ability to grow in holiness through the sanctifying work of the Holy Ghost. Joseph recognized the untoward consequences of man's fallen status, yet did not attribute to man an essentially evil nature. He stated, "I believe that a man is a moral, responsible, free agent; that although it was foreordained he should fall, and be redeemed, yet after the redemption it was not foreordained that he should again sin."¹⁶⁷ Thus, through the sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost, Christ's atonement makes it possible for man to transcend his fallen state and become a partaker of the divine nature. To refer again to Lehi: "And the way is prepared from the fall of man, and salvation is free . . . Wherefore, redemption cometh in and through the Holy Messiah; for he is full of grace and truth" (2 Ne. 2:4–6).

Finally, Joseph realized that an essential property of divinity is a relationship of sacred and intimate unity with the persons of the Godhead. As Joseph stated in an 1833 revelation:

[Christ] received a fulness of the glory of the Father; and he received all power, both in heaven and on earth, and the glory of the Father was with him, *for he dwelt in him*, and it shall come to pass that if you are faithful . . . you shall receive of his fulness, and be glorified *in me as I am in the Father*; therefore, I say unto you, you shall receive grace for grace (D&C 93:16–17, 20; emphasis added).

The stunning reality, according to Joseph Smith, is that the very purpose of human life consists in the fact that humankind has been invited "into" this relationship through the atonement of Jesus. God wants to relate to us just

¹⁶⁷ Joseph Smith Jr., *The Words of Joseph Smith: The Contemporary Accounts of the Nauvoo Discourses of the Prophet Joseph*, comp. and ed. Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook (Orem, Utah: Grandin Book, 1991), 33.

as the divine persons relate to one another; God wants us to be one in the Father and the Son as they are one in each other. God desires to be “at-one-ment” with persons. Deification, according to Joseph, is dependent upon our acceptance of and obedience to Jesus, thereby making his atonement personally and fully efficacious. As the *Lectures on Faith* explain:

And all those who keep his commandments shall grow up from grace to grace, and become heirs of the heavenly kingdom, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ; possessing the same mind, being transformed into the same image or likeness, even the express image of Him who fills all in all; being filled with the fullness of his glory, and become one in him, even as the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one.¹⁶⁸

Although Joseph taught a very lofty view of man's eschatological potential in asserting that man has the potential to become a god and enter into close association with the Godhead, he also made clear that those who become gods will be forever subordinate to the Godhead. As we progress and attain God's present glory, God progresses also to reach a higher exaltation and remains our God. Said Joseph of eternal progression,

“When I [Jesus] get my kingdom, I will give it to the Father and it will *add to and exalt* His glory. *He will take a higher exaltation and I will take His place and am also exalted*, so that He obtains kingdom rolling upon kingdom.” So that Jesus treads in His tracks as He had gone before and then inherits what God did before. God is glorified in the salvation and exaltation of His creatures.¹⁶⁹

Joseph's doctrine of deification was boldly original and quite distinct from that of the Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant traditions (this will be explored more fully below). For example, one difference between Orthodoxy's *theosis* and Joseph Smith's doctrine of deification regards what deified persons actually *do*. Orthodox doctrine sheds little light on this matter, whereas Joseph's recorded revelation of God's word reads that humankind “shall come forth in the first resurrection; . . . and shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers, dominions, all heights and depths.” The faithful will pass by the angels and receive exaltation and glory in all things, “which glory shall be a fulness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever. Then shall they be gods, because they have no end.” Because these gods have progeny, “they continue.” Then are they “above all” and have “all power, and the angels are subject unto them.”¹⁷⁰

168. Joseph Smith, *Lectures on Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1985), 5:2.

169. Larson, “King Follett Discourse,” 201.

170. D&C 132:19–20. Elsewhere Jordan Vajda summarizes: “[Deified persons] will do all those things that their own Heavenly Parents have done: they will organize matter into universes and worlds; they will produce spirit children; they will

In addition, Joseph's view of deification is both ontological and participatory while conventional Christianity's view is merely participatory.¹⁷¹ Conventional Christianity sees deification as a change in which the deified being takes on divine attributes but essentially is still of a different species than God.¹⁷² Vladimir Lossky writes of human beings, "We might say that by creation *ex nihilo* God 'makes room' for something which is wholly outside of Himself; that, indeed, He sets up the 'outside' or nothingness alongside of His plenitude. The result is a subject which is entirely 'other,' infinitely removed from Him, 'not by place but by nature.'"¹⁷³

Three analogies presented by Jordan Vajda, Rene Krywult, and Blake Ostler underscore the differences between Joseph's and the Orthodox view. The Orthodox view¹⁷⁴ of man's becoming God, said Vajda, is analogous to iron being forged in a fire.

provide a plan whereby their spirit children can attain divinization also." Vajda, "Partakers of the Divine Nature," 46.

171. It is helpful to realize that there are two strands to the classical patristic view of deification, one emphasizing the communication of divine attributes to Christians, the other concentrating on the Christian's participation in intra-divine relationship. Williams notes that "these are not seen as contradictory by the Fathers, though we can learn a good deal about the general cast of a writer's thought by observing which strand predominates." Rowan Williams, "Deification," in *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, ed. Gordon S. Wakefield (London: SCM, 1983), 106.

172. After the Orthodox acceptance of the views of Gregory Palamas (1296–1359) on the distinctions between divine energies and divine essence, the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of theosis became defined as a union (of energies) without confusion (of essence) in which the essential distinction between Creator and creature eternally remains. As Orthodox Bishop Kalistos Ware writes: "In the Age to come God is 'all in all,' (1 Cor. 15:28); yet Peter is Peter and Paul is Paul." Each retains his or her own nature and personal identity. Yet all are filled with God's Spirit and perfected as creature. Kallistos Ware, *The Orthodox Way* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1999), 125. Ware also emphasizes that deification implies neither a change in God's nature nor a loss in our status as creature: "'We remain creatures while becoming god by grace, as Christ remained God when becoming man by the Incarnation.' Man does not become God *by nature*, but is merely a 'created god', a god *by grace* or *by status*." Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, rev. ed. (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), 237.

173. Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (England: James Clarke, 1968), 92–93.

174. See Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 97. Also Daniel B. Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity: A Western Perspective*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2003).

Reflect on what occurs when iron is plunged into fire, as happens when a sword is being shaped. A definite change takes place. The fire penetrates the metal and communicates to it some of its own properties. The metal begins to glow. It becomes hot and burning. It becomes malleable. None of these things is a natural property of iron; . . . It is only when the iron participates in the nature of the fire that it becomes what it was not while still retaining its essential identity as iron.¹⁷⁵

Adding another analogy, Ostler saw the relational aspect of the process of deification as analogous to chemical reaction in the combination of atoms:

Consider the element hydrogen. If we heat the hydrogen, it becomes “hot,” but at a certain point the hydrogen atoms fuse and give off energy. A single atom of hydrogen does not have the ability to fuse and create thermonuclear power, but two hydrogen atoms together can become together what alone they cannot be—a source of power and light. The properties of divinity emerge from the relationship of divine unity and supervene on persons-in-relationship and not just on a person simpliciter.¹⁷⁶

By contrast, Krywult noted that many LDS Church leaders have likened Joseph's conception of man's becoming God to the development and growth of a human embryo.¹⁷⁷ As gods in embryo, we are dependent on God for our subsistence, just as an embryo is to his mother. Once born, an infant gradually becomes aware of his inherited attributes and capacities, which are refined and enlarged as he grows to full maturity. Similarly, we come alive to our divine potential as we are born through receipt of the spirit of God and rise in the resurrection with bodies “fashioned like unto his [Jesus'] glorious body” (Philip. 3:21). Thus growth from embryo to godhood is a lengthy process not to be achieved in this world. Joseph taught that “it will be a great work to learn our salvation *and exaltation even beyond the grave*.”¹⁷⁸

175. Vajda, “Partakers of the Divine Nature,” 24–25.

176. Blake Ostler, email correspondence to author, July 26, 2005.

177. Church leaders who have used this metaphor include Brigham Young, John Taylor, Orson Pratt, Erastus Snow, Orson F. Whitney, George F. Richards, to name a few. See numerous references in the *Journal of Discourses*.

178. Smith, *Teachings of the Prophet*, 348; emphasis in original. Vajda gives a slightly different spin to this analogy by comparing Joseph's conception of man's becoming God to the growth of an infant into an adult. He writes:

The infant and its parent look different, sound different, are amazingly unequal as to their abilities or actual capacities. Apart from some knowledge and experience, one could never guess that the infant has *already* the inborn capacity to grow and develop into the maturity and capacity of the adult parent. . . . In a similar way, the LDS doctrine of exaltation explains human salvation as being fundamentally about a process of human growth and progress. Being literal spirit children of

In summary, Joseph Smith taught a unique form of human deification which emphasizes the genetic principle that humans are essentially the same species as God. He would have agreed most with the “gods in embryo” analogy. He rejected the traditional creator/creature distinction and boldly affirmed man’s eschatological divine potential which becomes fully actualized only when man becomes “one” with the persons of the Godhead. Claiming authority from God, Joseph invites us to take Athanasius’ aphorism quite literally: “God was made man that we may be made gods.”

B. Christian Divergence and Criticisms

For traditional Christianity, the doctrine of theosis or deification¹⁷⁹ has a unique history. Biblically, Peter, John, and Paul all spoke of the idea that man can become God (2 Pet. 1:4; Rom. 8:16–17). In the writings of Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, and Cyril of Alexandria, one can find references to the idea that “God became man, that man might become God.”¹⁸⁰ From the initial scholarly attention deification received in the first century to its integration in the Byzantine Church in the fourth century, the doctrine experienced numerous developments at the hands of many influential Church Fathers.¹⁸¹ Maximus the Confessor (580–682) was primarily responsible for the elucidation of deification that eventually led to its eventual level of acceptance in Eastern Orthodox religions.¹⁸² Gregory

divine parentage, all persons who come into this world possess *already* the capacity to grow up and become just like their Heavenly Parents—with all the same powers and abilities. (Vajda, “Partakers of the Divine Nature,” 40)

179. To follow suit with recent theologians, I will use the terms “deification” and “theosis” as synonyms in this paper. Carl Mosser points out, however, that traditionally the term *theosis* “has been uniquely associated with the classical tradition of Byzantine theology represented by such figures as Pseudo-Dionysius, Maximus Confessor, and Gregory Palamas.” Carl Mosser, “The Earliest Patristic Interpretations of Psalm 82, Jewish Antecedents, and the Origin of Christian Deification,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 56 (April 2005): 31 n. 3.

180. See Norman Russell’s “‘Partakers of the Divine Nature’ (2 Pet. 1:4) in the Byzantine Tradition,” in *Kathegetria: Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for Her 80th Birthday* (Camberley, UK: Porphyrogenitus Publications, 1998), 51–67, for arguably the best treatment of deification in the Patristic Fathers. See also *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3d ed., ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), s.v. “Deification.”

181. See Norman Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1–16, for a brief overview of *theosis* among the Church Fathers.

182. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification*, 262–63.

Palamas (1296–1359) elaborated the doctrine further for the East by stressing that mankind can be deified by the Holy Spirit; thus deified man can participate in God's divine attributes.¹⁸³ But, according to Palamas, the attributes of God that man participates in consist of God's *energies*, or knowable attributes, workings, activities, and so forth. Man cannot participate in God's *essence*, or unknowable attributes—such as omnipresence or timelessness—for these represent an ontological gap between the Creator (God) and the creature (man) that cannot be crossed.¹⁸⁴ After having made explicit the essence/energies distinction, Palamas provided an ontological framework through which the Eastern Orthodox Church could interpret the numerous references made to deification by the Patristic Fathers. Consequently, deification has been explicitly significant in the East; indeed, one influential Orthodox scholar, Vladimir Lossky referred to deification as the “very essence of Christianity.”¹⁸⁵

By contrast, however, deification in the Roman Catholic and Protestant West has received mixed reviews. It would be incorrect to say the doctrine has been altogether abandoned by western theologians. A number of Catholic scholars have recognized the centrality of deification, at least to the Patristic Fathers.¹⁸⁶ Also Protestants such as Jürgen Moltmann,¹⁸⁷

183. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. “Deification.”

184. Vladimir Lossky, *The Vision of God*, trans. Asheleigh Moorhouse (Bedfordshire, UK: Faith, 1963), 132–33.

185. Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God*, 97. Also Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 121.

186. French Jesuit Henri Rondet wrote that “this doctrine is found henceforward in all the Fathers,” both the Alexandrians as well as the Antiochenes. Henri Rondet, *The Grace of Christ* (Paris, 1948; rpt. New York: Newman, 1967), 80. Michael Azkoul wrote that it was the “universal teaching of the Catholic Church and her Fathers.” Michael Azkoul, *St. Gregory of Nyssa and the Tradition of the Fathers* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1995), 15 n. 6, where he cites, with references, the following fathers as having taught deification: Ignatius, Dionysius the Areopagite, Irenaeus, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzus (the Theologian), John Chrysostom, Maximus the Confessor, Hippolytus, Cyprian of Carthage, Hilary of Poitiers, Pope Leo the Great, Ambrose of Milan, Peter Chrysologus, Ephraim the Syrian, Tertullian, and Augustine. Jesuit Jacques Dupuis has written that it was one of the “fundamental axioms for the early Church Fathers.” Jacques Dupuis, *Who Do You Say I Am? Introduction to Christology* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1994): 77. Jesuit Frans Jozef van Beeck wrote that it was the “most central theological theme of the patristic tradition . . . a patristic commonplace.” Frans Jozef van Beeck, *God Encountered: A Contemporary Catholic Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, “Understanding the Christian Faith” (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998), 63, 87.

187. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992): 299. See also the comments by

Wolffhart Pannenberg,¹⁸⁸ and Reinhold Niebuhr¹⁸⁹ admit importance to the patristic version of deification. But the doctrine certainly has not been accepted in the West as in the East, and numerous scholars from both sides have inquired as to why deification has muted acceptance in the West.¹⁹⁰ Catholic writer Hans Küng suggests that as early as the Augustine-Pelagius controversy, deification in the Latin tradition was being replaced with milder doctrines of grace, focusing on how God saves rather than on what the condition of the saved will be.¹⁹¹ In response to some of Pelagius' claims, Augustine said regarding deification:

Moltmann, quoted favorably, and interpreted as referring to *theosis*, by Lutheran writer Kenneth L. Bakken, "Holy Spirit and *Theosis*: Toward a Lutheran Theology of Healing," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38 (1994): 411.

188. Wolffhart Pannenberg, *Jesus—God and Man*, trans. Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 39–40, 347 n. 45. The term he uses here is *theopoiesis*, also frequently used by the early Fathers.

189. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964), 1:173. Clement of Alexandria is quoted at 1:144, 2:58, and 2:131; Irenaeus at 1:173; Gregory of Nyssa at 2:77 n. 8, 2:132; Origen at 2:131 n. 6; Tertullian at 2:131.

190. Petro B. T. Bilaniuk, "The Mystery of *Theosis* or Divinization," in *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*, ed. David Nieman and Margaret Schatkin (Roma: Pontifical Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973), 335–36; Benjamin Drewery, "Deification," in *Christian Spirituality: Essays in Honour of Gordon Rupp*, ed. Peter Brooks (London: SCM, 1975), 37; Joseph Frary, "Deification and Human Freedom," *Sobornost*, series 7 (1975): 118–19; Frederick W. Norris, "Deification: Consensual and Cogent," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 49 (1996): 411–12; A. D. Nock, review of *The Epistle to Diognetus*, by Henry G. Meecham, *Journal of Religion* 31 (1951): 214–16; James G. M. Purves, "The Spirit and the *Imago Dei*: Reviewing the Anthropology of Irenaeus of Lyons," *Evangelical Quarterly* 68, no. 2 (1996): 102; Christoph Schönborn, *From Death to Life: The Christian Journey*, trans. Brian McNeil (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1995), 45–46; C. R. B. Shapland, trans., *The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1951), 125; Carl A. Volz, *Faith and Practice in the Early Church: Foundations for Contemporary Theology* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1983), 76.

191. Hans Küng, *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection* (London: Burns and Oates, 1964), 215–16. According to A. N. Williams, Orthodox writer Paul Evdokimov took the same position, claiming that "after Augustine and Ambrose, Latin theology replaced the theology of theosis with the theology of filiation and grace," an interpretation [Williams continues] that essentially faults the West for infidelity to the true theological tradition." A. N. Williams, *The Ground of Union: Deification in Aquinas and Palamas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 6, citing Paul Evdokimov, *L'Orthodoxie* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Niestlé, 1959): 93 n. 214.

For my part I hold that, even when we shall have such great righteousness that absolutely no addition could be made to it, the creature will not be equal to the creator. But if some suppose that our progress will be so great that we will be changed into the divine substance and become exactly what he is, let them see how they may support their view. I confess that I myself am not convinced of it.¹⁹²

Adolf Von Harnack would later claim that due to the Pelagian affair Augustine successfully brought an end to the doctrine of deification in the West.¹⁹³ Also, mention of deification or theosis is totally absent in any of the early church's ecumenical councils and creeds. If the doctrine was admittedly so central in the Patristic Fathers' writings, why was it not explicated in a more official venue? Maximus the Confessor, "the last common Father" who straddled both Eastern and Western theologies,¹⁹⁴ wondered the same thing. Jaroslav Pelikan reported Maximus saying in regards to the Creeds, "If this dogma [of theosis] belongs to the mystery of the faith of the Church, it was not included with the other [dogmas] in the symbol expounding the utterly pure faith of Christians, composed by our holy and blessed fathers."¹⁹⁵ Catholic Christoph Schönborn responded that it is not the purpose of a Council to define the doctrines of the Church: "It is the role of a council to *profess* the Faith, not to explain it: this would be the task of theologians and doctors of the Church."¹⁹⁶ Thus the problem Maximus dealt with: the Fathers clearly taught the doctrine; the Councils and Creeds did not. Also, the Creeds (Apostolic or Nicene [AD 325], Constantinople [381], and Chalcedon [451]) were not intended to be full expressions of the Catholic faith. Jesuit Roger Haight writes, "The logic of salvation, a way of understanding how it unfolded, is absent in the creed. . . . The creed

192. Augustine, Nature and Grace 33.37 in *Answer to the Pelagians*, part 1, volume 23 of John E. Rotelle, ed. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, trans. Roland J. Teske (Hyde Park, N.Y.: New City, 1997), 244.

193. Adolf Von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. James Millar, 7 vols. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1897), 3:165, as cited in Carl Mosser, "The Greatest Possible Blessing: Calvin and Deification," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 55 (2002): 38.

194. Bernard McGinn, "Introduction: Eriugena, East and West," in *Eriugena: East and West*, ed. Bernard McGinn and Willemien Otten (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 4.

195. Jaroslav Pelikan, "'Council or Father or Scripture': The Concept of Authority in the Theology of Maximus Confessor," in *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florevsky*, ed. David Nieman and Margaret Schatkin (Roma: Pontifical Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973), 287–88, quoting *Ambigua* 42.

196. Christoph Schönborn, *God's Human Face*, trans. Lothar Krauth (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1994), 8.

does not develop in any way what it means by salvation.” Further, Father Haight writes, “Nicaea did not attempt to say everything. Its intentionality was strictly and self-consciously limited to the narrowly defined goal of refuting Arian propositions. It left many questions unaddressed.”¹⁹⁷ Orthodox scholar D. B. Clendenin picked up on this seeming lack of attention paid to deification, and compared its treatment among theologians in the West with those in the East:

Western theologians in general and Protestants in particular have given only scant attention to the central importance of theosis in Orthodox thought. Nor do they address the doctrine as an important biblical category in its own right. New Testament theologies such as those by George Ladd (1974) and Leon Morris (1986), for example, do not even mention theosis. On the other hand, as early as Gregory Palamas’s fourteenth-century work *On Divine and Deifying Participation*, Orthodox thinkers have systematically analyzed the doctrine at length.¹⁹⁸

Finding an ontological understanding of deification incompatible with traditional understandings of Augustinian theology, some assert that, in years following the adoption of the Creeds, Western theologians preferred to emphasize Christ’s soteriological or salvific role in terms of juridical categories (for example, “satisfaction” or penal substitution), rather than Christ’s role as a divinizing Redeemer.¹⁹⁹ Keith J. Egan said:

Focused on sin and weakness in the human person, students of moral theology in the centuries after Trent [1545–1563] had too little exposure to the study of holiness and not much incentive to engage the holiness tradition from a theological perspective. The presumption at least in practice, if not in theory, was that holiness was the concern of the few, namely, religious and even more restrictively, cloistered religious [as in monks]. The theology of divinization that is so much part of Eastern Christianity would have been a corrective to this overemphasis in the

197. Roger Haight, *Jesus: Symbol of God* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1999), 283–84, 285. See also “Hades and Gehenna,” *Church Quarterly Review* (London) 21 (1886): 392, which says there is nothing in the creeds as to the Sacraments. See also Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 5 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 1:141., which says there is nothing in Nicene creed regarding how salvation was accomplished.

198. Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 121. Also see *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. “Deification.” Contemporary Western theologians agree that a marginal amount of attention has been paid to deification. See A. N. Williams, “Deification in the *Summa Theologiae*: A Structural Interpretation of the *Prima Pars*,” *The Thomist* 61 (1997): 219–55; Mosser, “Greatest Possible Blessing,” 36 n. 1–2; and Robert V. Rakestraw, “Becoming Like God: An Evangelical Doctrine of Theosis,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (June 1997): 257.

199. See Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 122–23.

West on sin, guilt, and confession. But late medieval efforts at healing ties between East and West were futile and the cross-fertilization between Eastern and Western theology and spirituality had to wait for the renewed interest in that dialogue during this century.²⁰⁰

A. N. Williams attributed the very language used by Patristic Fathers to be another reason why the doctrine of deification may have been neglected. "Deification, even in its patristic form, has become virtually invisible to the eyes of modern Westerners because instead of defining deification, or providing a phenomenological description of the deified, the Fathers use a set of cognates for deification that forms a quasi-technical vocabulary."²⁰¹ A different emphasis on vocabulary, said Clendenin, partly distinguishes East from West. For the East, "the great mysteries of the faith are matters of adoration rather than analysis." For Clendenin, "The creeds describe rather than dissect the great truths of Christianity, such as the nature of the Trinity (three persons in one essence) and the relationship between the divine and human natures in Christ."²⁰² Thus, the difference in emphasis on deification between East and West may have been methodological as well as doctrinal.

But tacit acceptance, neglect, or a shift of emphasis isn't the West's only reactions to the doctrine of deification. Indeed, some Protestants in the past 150 years—particularly those influenced by Adolf von Harnack—explicitly rejected the notion of deification. Schönborn suggested Harnack "and other Church historians of his school" may have rejected deification on purely religious grounds or because the concept is ambiguous or unbiblical.²⁰³ Carl Mosser attributed Harnack's views as an influential factor leading to a Protestant interpretation that deification is a remnant of "Greco-Roman philosophy, the mystery religions, or the Imperial cult," the notion that humans could become gods "represents the climax of Hellenization of Christianity."²⁰⁴ Protestant Benjamin Drewery believed that "deification is . . . the most serious aberration to be found not only in

200. Keith J. Egan, "The Divorce of Spirituality from Theology," in *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 302.

201. Williams, "Deification in the *Summa Theologiae*," 221.

202. Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 53.

203. Schönborn, *From Death to Life*, 42. Schönborn, himself Catholic, feels such a rejection unwarranted. Elsewhere Schönborn expresses his own view that deification is "one of the most influential formulations of the Christian message in that [patristic] period." Schönborn, *From Death to Life*, 41.

204. Mosser, "Earliest Patristic Interpretations," 33.

Origen but in the whole tradition to which he contributed.”²⁰⁵ D. M. Baillie, Scottish Presbyterian professor of systematic theology at St. Andrews (1934–1954), said the belief that God became man in order that we might become God “must be suspect, because if taken strictly it would seem to imply either a pantheistic conception or the idea that there can be more gods than one.” He was particularly critical of the common interpretation of 2 Peter 1:4 (partakers of the divine nature); the testimony given there “seems alien to the New Testament writers.”²⁰⁶ Scottish Protestant David Cairns (1862–1946) believed that 2 Peter 1:4 was “open to misinterpretation, and has in fact been misinterpreted.”²⁰⁷ Eastern theologians, he felt, went “beyond the reserve of the Bible” when teaching theosis.²⁰⁸ German Protestant Dietrich Ritschl felt deification as taught by Hippolytus, third century disciple of Irenaeus, is “unbiblical” and “is actually in its origins a doctrine of participation in the (human) obedience of Christ.”²⁰⁹ But Protestants have not been alone in their criticism. Roman Catholic Cyril Van der Donckt offered this condemnation in 1901: “As to man becoming God, the idea is absurd. With far more reason might we contend that the gnat will develop into a lion, and the animalcules which we swallow in a sip of water will grow into gigantic giraffes and colossal elephants.”²¹⁰

As these examples show, the responses of traditional Christendom to the idea of deification have been anything but univocal. Most scholars

205. Benjamin Drewery, *Origen and the Doctrine of Grace* (London: Epworth, 1960), 200.

206. D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1955), 81–82, which continues:

But even to speak of a man becoming *divine* involves us in manifest errors. It is not an accident that the adjective ‘divine’ hardly occurs in the New Testament. . . . Indeed it seems alien to the New Testament writers, in all the varieties of their Christology, not only to say that Jesus *became* divine, but even to say that He was or is divine. . . . Does Christianity, then, teach that God changed into a Man? Is that the meaning of ‘and was made man’? That at a certain point of time God, or the Son of God, was transformed into a human being for a period of about thirty years? It is hardly necessary to say that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation means nothing like that. Such a conception bristles with errors.

207. David Cairns, *The Image of God in Man* (London: SCM, 1953), 43.

208. Cairns, *Image of God in Man*, 57.

209. Dietrich Ritschl, “Hippolytus’ Conception of Deification,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 12 (1959): 399: “The unbiblical idea of deification can only be replaced by a sound doctrine of Union with Christ if the humanity of the risen Lord is taken seriously in all thinking about the Church and the world.”

210. C. Van Der Donckt, in Roberts, *Mormon Doctrine of Deity*, 55.

throughout the years generally agree the idea was central to the Church Fathers. The Eastern Orthodox Church explicitly acknowledges the ontological developments in the doctrine made most notably by Maximus the Confessor and Gregory Palamas. Hence, theosis continues to play a central part in the meaning of salvation for the East. The West, on the other hand, has been riddled with varying opinions. Some have affirmed deification's importance while others prefer to speak of salvation in juridical terms of grace and justification. Still others are hostile to the idea that man could become God—they even equate the notion with Satan's lie to Eve in the Garden of Eden.²¹¹

Irrespective of the acceptance or rejection of Orthodox versions of deification, however, Joseph Smith's doctrine of deification, including his unique corresponding theological anthropology, has prompted a hailstorm of criticism from the Western Christian world. The editors of *The New Mormon Challenge* wrote, "We believe that the doctrine of the literal eternality of human persons is inimical to Christian faith." They proceed to cite Joseph's doctrine as one of "the three issues" which "are absolutely fundamental and nonnegotiable." And they concluded by saying, "We do not feel that the status of Mormonism in relation to Christianity can ever change unless there is willingness within the structures of the LDS church to reconsider those issues."²¹² Similarly, George Arbaugh wrote concerning Joseph's doctrine of the literal parenthood of God the Father: "This evil assertion says too much . . . that man is in his own nature divine. This is blasphemous impudence and conceit."²¹³

Nevertheless, it is Joseph's understanding of the *potential* of humankind that has historically received the most ardent attacks. For instance, Jason J. Barker in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Region of the Evangelical Theological Society, opined, "Few doctrines of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints appear to be more at odds with

211. See Van Der Donckt, in Roberts, *Mormon Doctrine of Deity*, 58. One argument against deification is that it seems to imply that the serpent instilled the idea into the minds of humankind, making it a source of pride. Indeed, Gregory Nazianzen wrote that the serpent "cheated us with the hope of becoming gods." But the same Church Father also taught that Christ "still pleads even now as Man for my salvation; for he continues to wear the Body which He assumed, until He make me God by the power of His incarnation." *Oration* 39.13, and *Oration* 30.14 at <http://nazianzos.flter.ucl.ac.be/traductions.htm>.

212. Beckwith, Mosser, and Owen, "Final Conclusions," in *New Mormon Challenge*, 400.

213. George B. Arbaugh, *Gods, Sex, and Saints: The Mormon Story* (Rock Island, Ill: Augustana, 1957), 44.

those of mainstream Christianity . . . than the doctrine of exaltation.”²¹⁴ Ed Decker offered one of the most famous (and disingenuous)²¹⁵ attacks upon Joseph’s doctrine in his book *The God Makers*. Decker called Joseph’s doctrine of deification “a satanic seduction to rebellion against the only true God,” asserting, “no greater lie could be conceived than that humans could become Gods.”²¹⁶ Evangelical apologist Robert M. Bowman Jr. stated that the Mormon belief in the eternal progression of man is “heretical.”²¹⁷

Evangelicals are not alone in their criticism. The Catholic Van Der Donckt, mentioned above, is one more critic that labels Joseph’s doctrine as “a mere echo of Satan’s promise in Paradise; ‘You shall be as gods.’”²¹⁸ Arbaugh echoes this oft-repeated criticism when he ascribes to Mormons “the greatest sin of all, namely pretending to be God.”²¹⁹ In a similar vein, Ron Rhodes writes that when Latter-day Saints discuss salvation and eternal life, “They completely redefine these words to fit their cultic theology.”²²⁰ Jim Adams equates LDS beliefs to those of anti-biblical “pagan

214. Jason J. Barker, “Did the Early Church Teach Theosis or Exaltation? An Analysis of Latter-day Saint Patristic Studies,” paper presented April 7, 2000, in Fort Worth, Texas. Similarly, Paul Owen and Carl Mosser wrote, “Perhaps the doctrine that has generated the most controversy between Latter-day Saints and Evangelicals is the notion of ‘deification’ or ‘theosis.’ Can human beings be exalted to such a state as to be properly termed *gods*?” Paul Owen and Carl Mosser, review of *How Wide the Divide? A Mormon and an Evangelical in Conversation*, by Craig L. Blomberg and Stephen E. Robinson, *FARMS Review of Books* 11, no. 2 (1999): 16.

215. The National Conference of Christians and Jews characterized the book as making “extensive use of ‘half-truth’, faulty generalizations, erroneous interpretations, and sensationalism. It is not reflective of the genuine spirit of the Mormon faith.” A detailed report of the committee’s membership and report can be found online at <http://www.lightplanet.com/response/nccj.htm> (accessed January 5, 2006). For a critique of Decker’s book, see Gilbert W. Scharffs, *The Truth about “The God Makers”* (Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1986).

216. Ed Decker and Dave Hunt, *The God Makers* (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 1984), 27–28, 29.

217. Bowman asserts that Joseph’s doctrine fails to uphold the four essential elements to an orthodox view of the relationship between God and man: monotheism, Trinitarianism, Incarnationalism, and evangelicalism. He concludes, “Mormonism . . . fails on all four counts.” Robert M. Bowman Jr., “‘Ye Are Gods?’ Orthodox and Heretical Views on the Deification of Man,” *Christian Research Journal* (Winter/Spring 1987): 22.

218. Van Der Donckt in Roberts, *Mormon Doctrine of Deity*, 57–58.

219. Arbaugh, *Gods, Sex, and Saints*, 57.

220. Ron Rhodes and Marian Bodine, *Reasoning from the Scriptures with the Mormons* (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House Publishers, 1995), 311.

religions”²²¹ and then charges Joseph’s doctrine that humans are gods in embryo as “going a step beyond pagan thought.”²²² While some characterize Joseph’s doctrine as rebellious, heretical, satanic, cultic, and pagan, some argue that it is philosophically unsound. Francis J. Beckwith and Stephen E. Parrish argue in *The Mormon Concept of God: A Philosophical Analysis* that the LDS view “seems to be fundamentally irrational.”²²³

C. Contemporary Christian Convergence

But things are changing. While I am not attempting to show that the Christian world has become more receptive of Joseph’s specific version of deification, the past fifty years reflect a steadily increasing amount of general interest in the issue of Orthodox and Patristic deification from Catholics and Protestants alike.²²⁴ In the preface to his seminal work, *The*

221. Adams defines *pagan* as “shorthand for ancient non-Israelite cultures and their religious beliefs” yet, clearly condemns any such beliefs as nonbiblical and erroneous by later stating that these are views “the Old Testament patriarchs, prophets, and psalmists intentionally rejected in light of the revelation they received from the one true and living God.” Jim W. Adams, “The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Joseph Smith?” in Beckwith, Mosser, and Owen, *New Mormon Challenge*, 155, 191.

222. Adams, “God of Abraham, Isaac, and Joseph Smith?” 188.

223. Francis J. Beckwith and Stephen E. Parrish, *The Mormon Concept of God: A Philosophical Analysis* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1991), 63. Beckwith and Parrish criticize the LDS understanding of God. Their purpose is to show “(1) that the Mormon concept of God differs radically from the classical concept of God, (2) that the Mormon concept of God contains many philosophical flaws, and (3) that the classical concept of God is more consistent with the Christian Scriptures than the Mormon view.” Beckwith and Parrish, *Mormon Concept of God*, 1. Their philosophical arguments against the LDS concept of God are directed mainly against Mormon eternalism. Their central criticism stems from an argument by William Lane Craig that it is impossible for an actual infinite number of things to exist in the real world.

For responses and rebuttals to Beckwith and Parrish’s arguments, see James E. Faulconer, review of *The Mormon Concept of God*, by Francis J. Beckwith and Stephen E. Parrish, *BYU Studies* 32, no. 1–2 (1992): 185–95; Blake Ostler, “Review of *The Mormon Concept of God: A Philosophical Analysis*,” *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 8, no. 2 (1996): 99–146; David Paulsen and Blake Ostler, “F. J. Beckwith and S. E. Parrish, *The Mormon Concept of God: A Philosophical Analysis*,” *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 35, no. 2 (1994): 118–20; and L. Shane Hopkins, “Assessing the Arguments in *The Mormon Concept of God: A Philosophical Analysis*” (honors thesis, Brigham Young University, 1999).

224. Explanations for this renewal of interest are varied. Some suggest that the rise of the Soviet Union may have engendered increased study of deification. As scholars came out of the Soviet Union to settle in Europe and other places, they

Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition, Norman Russell points out:

It is becoming less necessary in the English-speaking world to apologize for the doctrine of deification. At one time it was regarded as highly esoteric, if it was admitted to be Christian at all. . . . In recent years a succession of works on deification in individual Fathers from Irenaeus to Maximus the Confessor has confirmed the patristic basis of the doctrine. Since the 1950s several studies have shown how deification, in a more muted way, is also at home in the Western tradition.²²⁵

Some scholars are asserting that deification is not only compatible with Augustinian theology, it is central to it.²²⁶ References to deification have even been found in Aquinas's *Summa Theologica*.²²⁷ Russell suggests that renewed interest in the patristic writings and the translation into English of several Orthodox scholars have contributed to the increase

had access to Western publications in which they were able to contribute. As Russian scholars of Orthodox background, they were able to introduce the doctrine of deification to a wider audience. Yet others suggest that the *fall* of the Soviet Union contributed to greater awareness of deification. Carl Mosser, for instance, in a personal letter to the author, August 3, 2005, said:

I think the renewal of interest comes from a variety of places. A lot of credit has to be given to the resurgence in patristic scholarship among Protestants. Some must be given to ecumenical dialogue between the West and East. For example, the re-discovery of deification in Luther happened because of dialogue between Lutherans and Orthodox in Finland. Some credit goes to the fall of the Soviet Union. As Protestant missionaries began to work in former Soviet lands that have been historically Orthodox, they have been exposed to Orthodox theology, including theosis, and have researched the issue.

As to his own interest in the subject, Mosser credits his confrontation with LDS apologetics.

225. Russell, *Doctrine of Deification*, vii. Russell suggests the translation and publication of works by Vladimir Lossky, Mantzaridis, Nellas, and Yannaras, as well as the publication of studies by John Zizioulas and Dumitru Staniloae, have all brought "deification (or theosis) in Orthodox soteriology to the attention of a wide readership." Russell, *Doctrine of Deification*, vii.

226. David L. Balas, "Divinization," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, Everett Ferguson, 2d ed., 2 vols. (New York: Garland, 1997), 1:339; Gerald Bonner, "Augustine's Conception of Deification," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 37, no. 2 (1986): 369–86.

227. A. N. Williams, "Deification in the *Summa Theologiae*," 219–55, which states: "Where the conventional wisdom errs, however, is in locating the break in the Middle Ages, for the greatest of all medieval Western theologies, the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas, contains a highly developed doctrine of deification."

in attention paid to deification.²²⁸ The result of this awakening has been a virtual explosion of research, dialogue, and publication regarding the doctrine of deification. A current bibliography of articles, books, chapters in books, and dissertations reveals 222 publications. Of these, 195 (or 88 percent) were published since 1950, 104 (nearly half of the total) were published since 1990, and at least twenty more have come off the press in the last four and a half years. Interest in deification remains high, indeed. And it crosses every denominational line.

In May of 2004, Drew University hosted a conference with the theme "Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification/Theosis in the Christian Traditions." There scholars representing every major Christian theological tradition—Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Russian Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, Wesleyan, Calvinist, and Evangelical—presented papers.²²⁹ While topics ranged from historic theories of deification—ancient, patristic, and medieval—to modern interpretations, one point was salient: the presenters were nearly all claiming ownership of some variant of the doctrine for their respective traditions.

An important instance of dialogue on the issue is the ongoing consultation between the Finnish Lutheran Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church. To facilitate the incorporation of theosis into Lutheran doctrine, the Finns have discovered and emphasized explicit references to theosis in Luther's writings that had long been overlooked. Jonathan Linman suggests that reading some of Luther's sermons with a "new set of hermeneutic lenses" exposes Luther's understanding of theosis. For instance, in his Christmas sermon of 1514 Luther wrote:

Just as the word of God became flesh, so it is certainly also necessary that the flesh may become word. In other words: God becomes man so that man may become God. Thus power becomes powerless so that weakness may become powerful. The Logos puts on our form and pattern, our image and likeness, so that it may clothe us with its image, its pattern, and its likeness. Thus wisdom becomes foolish so that foolishness may become wisdom, and so it is in all other things that are in God and in us, to the extent that in all these things he takes what is ours to himself in order to impart what is his to us.²³⁰

228. Russell, *Doctrine of Deification*, vii.

229. Presenters included James Starr, Nathan Kerr, Paul Collins, Stephen Davis, Fr. Francis Caponi, Gosta Hallonsten, Andrew Louth, S. T. Kimbrough, Jonathan Linman, Sr. Nonna Verna Harrison, Todd Billings, and Robert Bird. A book containing conference addresses is forthcoming.

230. Jonathan Linman, "Christs for the World: Reflections on Faith and the Sacraments as Means to *Theosis* in the Writings of Martin Luther," paper delivered May 21–22, 2004, at the Partakers of the Divine Nature Conference, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey. Copy in author's possession.

While differences remain between Lutheranism's rendering of the doctrine and that of Orthodox theologians,²³¹ the fact remains that "the Finnish dialogue with Lutherans . . . [has] therefore made the notion of deification a center of their discussions."²³²

Perhaps a telling sign of the extent to which deification has reentered Christian theology is the way in which it has reemerged in Catholic thought and rhetoric. In the Catechism of the Catholic Church, revised in 1993, the fourth reason the Word was made flesh is described thus:

The Word became flesh to make us "partakers of the divine nature" [2 Pet. 1:4]: "For this is why the Word became man, and the Son of God became the Son of man: so that man, by entering into communion with the Word and thus receiving divine sonship, might become a son of God" [Irenaeus, *Adv. haeres.* 3, 19, 1: PG 7/1, 939]. "For the Son of God became man so that we might become God" [Athanasius, *De inc.* 54, 3: PG 25, 192B]. "The only-begotten Son of God, wanting to make us sharers in his divinity, assumed our nature, so that he, made man, might make men gods" [Thomas Aquinas, *Opusc.* 57, 1-4].²³³

231. Lutheran Ross Aden observes that Orthodox theologians, such as John Breck, use the expression "communion with God" to mean "ontological participation." In contrast to Lutheranism, "the Orthodox hope of salvation in its broadest sense is more than hope of a divine sentence of 'not guilty' or even of a beatific vision; it is 'human participation in the being of God . . . a total sharing in the Triune life.' . . . Created in the *image* of God, human beings are called to become *like* God by realizing the potential for ontological sharing in the life of God," yet never in such a way that theosis means sharing in God's essence (nature). "Lutherans and Orthodox would agree that the essence of God is utterly transcendent and therefore inaccessible to any created reality." Ross Aden, "Justification and Sanctification: A Conversation Between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (1994): 96-98. See also John Meyendorff and Robert Tobias, eds., *Salvation in Christ: A Lutheran-Orthodox Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1992). "While theosis theologians do not espouse a fusion of deity with humanity in deified believers, they at times do speak of ontological change in them. Jaroslav Pelikan observes that in the Cappadocians there does seem to be some sort of a fundamental ontological change in the theosis experience. . . . Krivocheine states that in the thought of St. Symeon, deification refers to 'an ontological rather than to a purely spiritual transformation, although Symeon does not pretend that man abandons his created nature when he becomes a god through adoption.'" Rakestraw, "Becoming Like God," 261 and note.

232. Robert W. Jenson, "Theosis," *Dialog* 32, no. 2 (1993): 108.

233. The Catechism of the Catholic Church is available online via the archive of the official site of the Vatican: <http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/p122a3p1.htm>.

Pope John Paul II has given further credence to the reemerging role of deification in Catholic doctrine:

This is the central truth of all Christian soteriology that finds an organic unity with the revealed reality of the God-Man. God became man that man could truly participate in the life of God—so that, indeed, in a certain sense, he could become God. The Fathers of the Church had a clear consciousness of this fact. It is sufficient to recall St. Irenaeus who, in his exhortations to imitate Christ, the only sure teacher, declared: “Through the immense love he bore, he became what we are, thereby affording us the opportunity of becoming what he is.”²³⁴

After noting that “reference to deification is virtually absent from the major Roman Catholic ascetical and mystical manuals of this century,” Catholic theologian Mark O’Keefe mourns its loss and the fact that it “could not regain a central place in Roman Catholic spiritual theology.”²³⁵ He speaks repeatedly of “retrieving” the idea of theosis and believes that this doctrine contains a powerful pragmatic punch, which should be vital in spurring believers to live a more moral and spiritual life. He explains:

To understand the Christian life as path of theosis is to suggest that the human person called not “merely” into relationship with God—as truly incredible as that is in itself—but that human persons are invited and called into a share in the divine life itself, into the very inner life of the triune God.

Because *theosis* is a present reality—though only partially realized—Christians strive to live a life in conformity to the awesome dignity to which they are called. . . .

To believe that one already shares in the divine life demands of the Christian an authentic response to the divine life and love, especially as this has been revealed in Jesus Christ. Christians strive to model in their lives those perspectives, dispositions, virtues, attitudes, intentions, and affections that seem authentically conformed to the deified life which they have already begun to live, although as yet incompletely and imperfectly. Believers strive to decide and to act in a way consistent with their new life and with the character which flows from it. Christian ethics—both of doing and of being—must be profoundly rooted in the reality of *theosis*.²³⁶

It is indeed stunning that the notion of deification could go from being largely ignored in past Catholicism to being labeled by Pope John Paul II

234. John Paul II, *Jesus, Son and Savior* (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 1996), 215.

235. Mark O’Keefe, “Theosis and the Christian Life: Toward Integrating Roman Catholic Ethics and Spirituality,” *Eglise et Théologie* 25 (1994): 56.

236. O’Keefe, “Theosis and the Christian Life,” 61.

as “the central truth of all Christian soteriology” in addition to being recognized as a powerful doctrine with which to shape one’s ethics and fuel one’s spirituality.

Enthusiasm for deification is widespread. Robert Rakestraw, an Evangelical professor of theology at Bethel Theological Seminary, spoke of theosis as, above all, “the restoration and reintegration of the ‘image’ or, as some prefer, ‘likeness’ of God, seriously distorted by the fall, in the children of God. In this life Christians grow more and more into the very likeness and character of God as God was revealed in the man Jesus Christ.”²³⁷ Rakestraw considers the “strengths” of theosis theology to be that it is biblically supported, it offers “hope to some Christians who despair of finding the truly abundant life here on earth,” and that it defines theology itself.²³⁸

Carl Mosser has attempted to show that the doctrine of theosis was both understood and taught by John Calvin.²³⁹ Mosser points out that for Calvin “partaking of the divine nature” is that “which nothing more outstanding can be imagined.”²⁴⁰ In conclusion Mosser states of Calvin: “It must be remembered that deification is a part of the catholic tradition that Calvin and the other Reformers inherited, affirmed and defended. One should never be surprised to find elements of this tradition in the writings of the Reformers.”²⁴¹

Methodists have also joined the search for a place for deification in Western theology. Charles Wesley’s hymns, asserts Rakestraw, “contain a strong element of the life of God in our souls now.”²⁴² One such hymn reads:

Made Flesh for our Sake,
That we might partake
The Nature Divine,
And again in his Image, his Holiness shine.²⁴³

237. Rakestraw, “Becoming Like God,” 261.

238. Rakestraw, “Becoming Like God,” 267–69.

239. Mosser, “Greatest Possible Blessing,” 36–57.

240. Mosser, “Greatest Possible Blessing,” 40.

241. Mosser, “Greatest Possible Blessing,” 55–56.

242. Rakestraw, “Becoming Like God,” 265.

243. “Away with Our Fears.” This hymn is taken from a list of Wesleyan hymns relating to theosis compiled by S. T. Kimbrough Jr. of the General Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church. The hymn can be found in *Short Hymns on Select Passages of the Holy Scriptures*, 2 vols. (Bristol: Farley, 1762), 2:12, hymn 8, stanza 5.

Charles Ashanin suggests that 2 Peter 1:4 played a significant part in John Wesley's conversion and no doubt influenced his theology. Ashanin explains, "This Biblical statement, incidentally, led John Wesley to the advocacy of the doctrine of Sanctification. This doctrine is probably Wesley's adaptation of the Patristic doctrine of *Theosis*."²⁴⁴

The Anglican tradition also claims insight to the doctrine of deification. A. M. Allchin has written that "unless we affirm with Athanasius that God became man in order that man might become God, the language of incarnation is likely to lose its true significance, as unfortunately it too often has done."²⁴⁵ Philip Edgecumbe Hughes clarified Athanasius' couplet mentioned above by defining theosis as "the reintegration of the divine image of man's creation through the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit conforming the redeemed into the likeness of Christ, and also of the believer's transition from mortality to immortality so that he is enabled to participate in the eternal bliss and glory of the kingdom of God."²⁴⁶ Anglican theologian Kenneth Leech expounds on Maximus the Confessor's idea of deification in that "deification is the work of divine grace by which human nature is so transformed that it 'shines forth with a supernatural light and is transported above its own limits by a superabundance of glory.'"²⁴⁷ Finally, the words of popular Anglican writer C. S. Lewis reflect how an acceptance of deification influences our view of human dignity: "It is a serious thing to live in a society of possible gods and goddesses, to remember that the dullest and most uninteresting person you can talk to may one day be a creature which, if you saw it now, you would be strongly tempted to worship."²⁴⁸

D. Conclusion

The Mormon doctrine of deification as revealed to and taught by Joseph Smith has been met throughout the years with labels of heresy, pantheism, and philosophical unsoundness. But these denigrations are not original; older and less robust Orthodox versions of the doctrine have

244. Charles Ashanin, *Essays on Orthodox Christianity and Church History* (Indianapolis: Broad Ripple Laser Type, 1990), 90.

245. A. M. Allchin, *Participation in God: A Forgotten Strand in Anglican Tradition* (Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse-Barlow, 1988), 69.

246. P. E. Hughes, *The True Image* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989), 281, quoted in Rakestraw, "Becoming Like God," 261.

247. Kenneth Leech, *Experiencing God: Theology as Spirituality* (San Francisco: Harper, 1985), 258, quoted in Rakestraw, "Becoming Like God," 260.

248. C. S. Lewis, *The Weight of Glory* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1976), 45.

also suffered the same criticisms at the hands of scholars and theologians throughout the years. It seems that as contemporary scholarship continues to take a broader interest in deification, as old teachings continue to be interpreted through a “new hermeneutical lens,” and as interfaith dialogue and inquiry continue to reap a rich harvest of understanding, deification will continue to enjoy greater attention in the Christian community. Likewise, perhaps in the future, Joseph’s more robust version of the doctrine will follow suit and eventually gain greater attention and acceptance from Christian thinkers.

V. THE DIVINE FEMININE

A. Joseph’s Views

The idea of a Mother in Heaven is deeply enshrined in Mormon thought and even hymnody. Indeed, the idea found its clearest and most moving expression in a poem written by Eliza R. Snow,²⁴⁹ first published November 15, 1845, in the *Times and Seasons*. It was subsequently set to music and included in an LDS hymnal first published in 1851 in Liverpool,²⁵⁰ and today is one of the most beloved LDS hymns:

In the heav’ns are parents single?
No, the thought makes reason stare!
Truth is reason; truth eternal
Tells me I’ve a mother there.
When I leave this frail existence,
When I lay this mortal by,
Father, Mother, may I meet you
In your royal courts on high?²⁵¹

The belief that we have a Mother in Heaven was officially accorded doctrinal status in 1909 when the Church’s First Presidency, in a statement called the “Origin of Man,” declared: “All men and women are in

249. For an overview of Eliza R. Snow’s life, see Jill Mulvay Derr, “Eliza R. Snow,” in *Encyclopedia of Latter-day Saint History*, ed. Donald Q. Cannon, Arnold K. Garr, and Richard O. Cowan (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2000), 1148–50.

250. Jill Mulvay Derr, “The Significance of ‘O My Father’ in the Personal Journey of Eliza R. Snow,” *BYU Studies* 36, no. 1 (1996–97): 98.

251. “O My Father,” in *Hymns of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1985), no. 292. For a classical parallel to Eliza’s poem, see John W. Welch and James V. Garrison, “The ‘Hymn of the Pearl’: An Ancient Counterpart to ‘O My Father,’” *BYU Studies* 36, no. 1 (1996–97): 127–38.

the similitude of the universal Father and Mother, and are literally the sons and daughters of Deity.”²⁵² The doctrinal status of a Heavenly Mother was again officially reaffirmed in the “Proclamation on the Family” issued in 1995 by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve: “All human beings—male and female—are created in the image of God. Each is a beloved spirit son or daughter of heavenly parents, and, as such, each has a divine nature and destiny. Gender is an essential characteristic of individual premortal, mortal, and eternal identity and purpose.”²⁵³

However, since the doctrine is explicitly stated neither in any LDS scripture that came to or through Joseph Smith nor in any of his writings or sermons, at least one scholar has questioned whether the doctrine can be credibly ascribed to him.²⁵⁴ Others find convincing the total evidence—circumstantial, testimonial, and otherwise—that Joseph taught the doctrine.²⁵⁵ Still others, including myself, simply argue that

252. “The Origin of Man,” in *Messages of the First Presidency of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, comp. James R. Clark, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965–75), 4:203 (November 1909). In 1925, the First Presidency in another official declaration reaffirmed the Mother in Heaven doctrine using the exact language of the 1909 statement. See “‘Mormon’ view of evolution,” in *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5:244 (September 1925).

253. “The Family: A Proclamation to the World,” *Ensign* 25 (November 1995): 102.

254. Blake Ostler, “The Idea of Pre-existence in the Development of Mormon Thought,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 15 (Spring 1982): 59–78, 76 n. 28. In a footnote to his study Ostler raises the issue of the development of the doctrine of premortal existence. He says, “Although Joseph Smith may have secretly taught the doctrine of Mother in heaven, he did not bifurcate the pre-existent state of man into a period of existence as intelligences and existence as spirits after spiritual birth through a heavenly mother. All sources attributing the idea of a heavenly mother to Joseph Smith are late and probably unreliable.”

255. Among the scholars who attribute this idea to Joseph Smith are Jill Mulvay Derr and Linda P. Wilcox. Derr argues that Eliza R. Snow could not have been the originator of the idea, pointing out, among other data, that W. W. Phelps, before Snow wrote “O My Father,” wrote a poem referencing our Mother in Heaven and presented it at the dedication of the seventies hall. She concludes that Joseph Smith was the source for the Mormon belief of a Mother in Heaven. See Derr, “Significance of ‘O My Father,’” 85–126. Linda Wilcox provides a comprehensive study of the subject of a Mother in Heaven in Mormon history, doctrine, and theology. She sets out the testimonies of those who were close to Joseph Smith, who affirmed that he taught the Mother in Heaven doctrine. These witnesses include Susa Young Gates, who was told by Zina Diantha Huntington of a time when she was consoled by Joseph on the death of her mother in 1839. Zina had asked whether she would know her mother again on the other side, Joseph said, “More than that, you will meet and become acquainted with your eternal

the doctrine was implicit in Joseph's revelations regardless whether he explicitly drew it out.²⁵⁶

Indisputably, the idea of a Mother in Heaven was openly expressed and published within months of Joseph's death. W. W. Phelps referred to the idea in a poem that he composed and read at the dedication of the Nauvoo Seventies Hall on December 26, 1844. The poem was published in the Church newspaper the following month.²⁵⁷ It seems especially

Mother." David McKay (father of President David O. McKay) recorded that during a buggy ride on which he accompanied Eliza Snow, he asked if the Lord had revealed the doctrine to her. She replied, "I got my inspiration from the Prophets teachings; all that I was required to do was to use my Poetical gift and give that Eternal principal in Poetry." In his journal, Abraham H. Cannon gives a third-hand account of a vision Zebedee Coltrin had with Joseph Smith in which they saw "the Father seated upon a throne; they prayed again and on looking saw the Mother also; after praying and looking the fourth time they saw the Savior added to the group." Linda B. Wilcox, "The Mormon Concept of a Mother in Heaven," in *Women and Authority: Re-emerging Mormon Feminism*, ed. Maxine Hanks (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1992), 5–6.

256. Linda Wilcox states, "The Mother in Heaven concept was a logical and natural extension of a theology which posited both an anthropomorphic god, who had once been a man, and the possibility of eternal procreation of spirit children." Wilcox further explains that the idea of a Mother in Heaven was considered by the leaders of the Church in the nineteenth century to be "commonsensical." Wilcox quotes Brigham Young as saying that God "created man, as we create our children, for there is no other process of creation." She quotes the apostle Erastus Snow as saying, "Now, it is not said in so many words in the Scriptures that we have a Mother in heaven as well as a Father. It is left for us to infer from what we see and know of all living things in the earth, including man. . . . To our minds the idea of a Father suggests that of a Mother." Wilcox, "Mormon Concept of a Mother in Heaven," 4, 6. Charles Harrell addresses the issue in the context of tracing the development of the doctrine of the premortal existence in Mormon theology. He argues that since "spirit birth" was known and taught by close associates of Joseph like Orson Pratt, who had a book published at the printers with the doctrine contained therein as early as June 22, 1844, and since "spirit birth" presupposes a mother, the doctrine could have been known and taught by the prophet prior to his death. He notes that at the very least, Joseph must be credited with having provided the impetus that led to the formulation of the doctrine of spirit birth. Charles R. Harrell, "The Development of the Doctrine of the Preexistence, 1830–1844," *BYU Studies* 28, no. 2 (1988): 75–96.

257. Part of the W. W. Phelps poem reads:

Come to me; here's the myst'ry that man hath not seen:
Here's our Father in heaven, and Mother, the Queen,
Here are worlds that have been, and the worlds yet to be:
Here's eternity,—endless; amen: Come to me.

W. W. Phelps, "A Voice from the Prophet. 'Come to Me,'" *Times and Seasons* 6 (January 15, 1845): 783.

significant that this first known publication of the idea had presented the doctrine matter-of-factly, as if commonplace, not novel. Several months later, in October 1845, Eliza R. Snow composed "O My Father." But I will not rehearse here fully the evidence and arguments pertaining to the provenance of the doctrine. Readers interested in this question can peruse the studies referenced in the relevant footnotes. For purposes of this article, I presume that the idea was known to Joseph and was integral to his understanding of deity.

Joseph's successors in the prophetic office have provided some elaboration into the nature of our Heavenly Mother.²⁵⁸ For example, Spencer W. Kimball said, "When we sing that doctrinal hymn and anthem of affection, 'O My Father,' we get a sense of the ultimate in maternal modesty, of the restrained, queenly elegance of our Heavenly Mother, and knowing how profoundly our mortal mothers have shaped us here, do we suppose her influence on us as individuals to be less if we live so as to return there?"²⁵⁹

258. Wilcox, a firm believer and advocate for believing in a Mother in Heaven, wrote the following concerning the reason for the lack of information regarding a Heavenly Mother: "One reason why little theology was developed about a Heavenly Mother is that the scriptural basis for the doctrine was very slim. But Joseph Fielding Smith noted that 'the fact that there is no reference to a mother in heaven either in the Bible, Book of Mormon or Doctrine and Covenants, is not sufficient proof that no such thing as a mother did exist there.'" One LDS scholar provides an insightful answer to the question "So how do we handle the absence of information about our Heavenly Mother, the divine being who could embody the spiritual identity of women?" She answers:

Perhaps it is easier to understand this absence when we realize that we lack a detailed description of our Heavenly Father as well. The Savior spoke of the Father at every turn, but when Philip asked to be shown the Father, Jesus replied that the Father was made manifest through the Son. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?" (John 14:9.) When we ask about the Mother, might not the Lord give us a similar reply? "He that hath seen me hath seen the Mother." We think of the Godhead as united in purpose and similar in character. If we as Mormons are going to assert the existence of a female Deity, shouldn't we assume that her Son mirrors her perfection as well as that of the Father? (Kathryn H. Shirts, "Women in the Image of the Son: Being Female and Being Like Christ," in *Women Steadfast in Christ: Talks Selected from the 1991 Women's Conference*, ed. Dawn Hall Anderson and Marie Cornwall [Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992], 96)

259. Spencer W. Kimball, "The True Way of Life and Salvation," *Ensign* 8 (May 1978): 6.

Much has been said also by way of the existential meaning of Joseph's doctrine; that a heavenly mother has a direct bearing on the very existence and nature of mankind, particularly women. In speaking to the women of the Church, Kimball said, "God made man in his own image and certainly he made woman in the image of his wife-partner. . . . You [women] are daughters of God. You are precious. You are made in the image of our heavenly Mother."²⁶⁰ Harold B. Lee observed:

Sometimes we think the whole job is up to us, forgetful that there are loved ones beyond our sight who are thinking about us and our children. We forget that we have a Heavenly Father and a Heavenly Mother who are even more concerned, probably, than our earthly father and mother, and that influences from beyond are constantly working to try to help us when we do all we can.²⁶¹

Another Church leader, Vaughn J. Featherstone, strongly linked mortal women to the divine feminine:

Women are endowed with special traits and attributes that come trailing down through eternity from a divine mother. Young women have special God-given feelings about charity, love, and obedience. Coarseness and vulgarity are contrary to their natures Theirs is a sacred, God-given role, and the traits they received from heavenly mother are equally as important as those given to the young men.²⁶²

This existential meaning is deeply significant to Latter-day Saints.²⁶³

B. Christian Divergence and Criticisms

The unique Mormon version of the divine feminine has long been opposed by both Protestant and Roman Catholic critics. In March 2004, before a meeting of the Society for Mormon Philosophy and Theology, Clark Pinnock summarized the traditional Christian view concerning

260. Spencer W. Kimball, *The Teachings of Spencer W. Kimball*, ed. Edward L. Kimball (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982), 25.

261. Harold B. Lee, *The Teachings of Harold B. Lee* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1996), 70.

262. Vaughn J. Featherstone, "A Champion of Youth," *Ensign* 17 (November 1987): 28.

263. Carol Lynn Pearson, "Healing the Motherless Home" in Hanks, *Women and Authority: Re-emerging Mormon Feminism*, 231–245; "Emerging Discourse of the Divine Feminine," in Hanks, *Women and Authority*, 257–96; Cheryl B. Preston, "Feminism and Faith: Reflections on the Mormon Heavenly Mother," *Texas Journal of Women and Law* 2 (1992): 337–86; Margaret Merrill Toscano, "Is There a Place for Heavenly Mother in Mormon Theology?" *Sunstone* no. 133 (July 2004), 14–22.

God and gender. Answering his self-imposed question, "What (if any) sexual characteristics apply to God?" he said: "[We] assume that none literally do, except in sociological ways." He continued: "That is, we have taken the term 'Father' to be indicating, not a sexual being²⁶⁴ so much as a patriarch, which points to qualities in God of leadership, headship, and transcendence. We have not and do not think of God as having a consort."²⁶⁵ While Pinnock was conciliatory and courteous in approaching this delicate subject, others in the Christian world have not greeted the Mormon belief in a Mother in Heaven with as much tolerance. Some have even considered the belief as a basis for the exclusion of Latter-day Saints from the class of Christians. For instance, in 1907 in Salt Lake City the Protestant *Ministerial Review* published a statement in the Salt Lake Tribune in which the editors charged Mormons with believing and teaching controversial doctrines, including belief in a Mother in Heaven, a doctrine not shared with the world abroad. The *Review* concluded, "When the full doctrine of the Deity, as taught in Mormon congregations, is known, it will at once be seen that no Christian can accept it."²⁶⁶

More recently, the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith said the church could not accept Mormon belief that "God the father had a wife, the Celestial Mother, with whom he procreated Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit." On the basis of these doctrinal suppositions and other considerations, the body decided that Mormon baptism "is not the baptism that Christ instituted."²⁶⁷

264. For example, the apologist Aristides of Athens, opened his *Apology* with a description of God stating, "He has no form, no limits, no sex." J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), 84.

265. Clark Pinnock, "Open and Relational Theologies among Evangelicals and Other Christians," given March 19, 2004, at the first annual meeting of the Society for Mormon Philosophy and Theology, Utah Valley State College, Orem, Utah.

266. *Ministerial Review*, quoted in B. H. Roberts, *Defense of the Faith and the Saints*, 2 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1907), 2:267–68.

267. For a detailed discussion on the Vatican's decision, see Fr. Luis Ladaria, "The Question of the Validity of Baptism Conferred in the *Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*," available online at <http://www.ewtn.com/library/Theology/MORMBAP1.HTM> (accessed February 24, 2006). According to Ladaria, "The similarities with the formula used by the Catholic Church are at first sight obvious, but in reality they are only apparent." He then cites differences in the conception of the Trinity as the ultimate reason for the decision, with the LDS doctrine of a Heavenly Mother contributing to those differences. Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano* said Tuesday (July 17) that Pope John Paul II personally approved the ruling, dated June 5, at an audience with Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, prefect of the congregation. English translation available at <http://www.ewtn.com/library/Theology/MORMBAP1.HTM>

Other criticisms are aimed at the idea of a divine feminine in general rather than the LDS concept of a Mother in Heaven. Vern Poythress and Wayne Grudem, in their book titled *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words*, address the issue of the new translations of the Bible which are changing the general pronouns of the Bible, such as *he*, when used hypothetically, into gender neutral pronouns such as *they*: "There are a few radical-feminist versions that even undertake to call God the Father 'Father and Mother' or to eliminate 'Father' language altogether. But these versions clearly reject the authority of the Bible and its claim to be the Word of God." The authors thankfully note that "most modern versions" of the Bible "have attempted to preserve the language about God, including masculine pronouns referring to God."²⁶⁸

C. Contemporary Christian Convergence

Despite such declarations, some scholars agree with Paul Tillich in lamenting the "intolerable male character" of Protestant symbolism. Too often, God is thought of only as "he." Somehow, maintains Tillich, "she" and "they" ought to become more common—that is, a representation of Deity both male and female.²⁶⁹ "At a 'Women's Liberation Day' rally in New York City in 1970, Betty Friedan proposed that the question for the new decade was 'Is God He?'"²⁷⁰ With the rise of feminine theology,²⁷¹ the Christian world has struggled to find a place for the feminine in God. Since traditional theology assigns no literal sexual characteristics to God, the most common route has been to change how one *speaks* about God. As the evangelical scholar Donald G. Bloesch wrote in 1985, "Two decades ago the principal issues in the church were whether the Bible should be demythologized (Bultmann) or deliteralized (Tillich). Now the

vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20010605_battesimo_mormoni_en.html (accessed February 26, 2006).

268. Vern Poythress and Wayne Grudem, *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2000), 5.

269. Tillich speaks of this "in his lectures on religious symbolism at Harvard." Truman G. Madsen, "Are Christians Mormon?" *BYU Studies* 15, no. 1 (1974): 90 n. 70.

270. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *The Doctrine of God: A Global Introduction* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2004), 225.

271. For the distinction between European/North American, African, Latin American and Asian feminine theologies, see Kärkkäinen, *Doctrine of God*, 225–27, 261–63, 296.

main issue is whether the Bible should be resymbolized.”²⁷² Rosemary Radford Ruether²⁷³ argues that monotheistic religions tend to influence societies to be “monarchial” and when we ascribe a masculine gender to the one God, it places men in a position to rule absolutely.²⁷⁴

Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen notes that “Elizabeth A. Johnson’s book *She Who Is*, a massive study in Scripture, Christian tradition, and other traditions, suggests that there are basically three ways to deal with sexist language if one wants to stay within the Christian theological tradition,” the first way being to “add feminine traits to God such as nurture and care.” This approach may be limited, as it “still implies that God is Father,” though he may possess many gentler attributes. “The second way is to seek a more ontological footing for the existence of the feminine in God; here the main route has been to speak of the Spirit in feminine terms (the Hebrew *ruach* is feminine). The Spirit is often linked with events and features typical of women such as protecting and bringing forth life.” This approach is also limited “because it maintains the duality of male-female in the divinity. A third approach, favored by Johnson, is to seek equivalent images of God as male and female.” Quoting Johnson directly, “The mystery of God is properly understood as neither male nor female but transcends both in an unimaginable way.”²⁷⁵

Johnson attributes an example of the first model to Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Augustine, arguing that these theologians were writing about the feminine side of God. They all espoused an inclusive model of God including both genders, referring to

272. Donald G. Bloesch, *The Battle for the Trinity: The Debate over Inclusive God-Language* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Vine Books, 1985), 1.

273. Rosemary Radford Ruether, a highly distinguished Catholic theologian and prolific author explores the influence that our “God-talk” has on our society and gender relations in her book *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon, 1983). Other related books by Ruether are *Sexism and God-talk*; *Woman-Church: Theology and Practice of Feminist Liturgical Communities* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985); and *Gaia and God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992).

274. Mary Daly opposes the image of the Father God because it makes “the ‘mechanisms for the oppression of women appear right and fitting’; the father image, in her opinion, has legitimized male domination in society. Even more critically, ‘If God is male, then male is God.’” As quoted in Kärkkäinen, *Doctrine of God*, 229.

275. Elizabeth A. Johnson, *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 47–57, as quoted in Kärkkäinen, *Doctrine of God*, 229.

God as both father and mother, and using such descriptions as “mother wisdom under whose wings we flee for protection.”²⁷⁶

Joan Chamberlain Engelsman models the second approach by writing, “It might be possible to describe one member of the trinity as feminine. Because the Holy Spirit is the least sexually defined member of the trinity, and because it is often symbolized by feminine images—by fire and the dove—I imagine that the Spirit would be chosen.”²⁷⁷ In a more radical example of the second route, Elizabeth Cady Stanton wrote late in the nineteenth century concerning the first chapter of Genesis, “Instead of three male personages, as generally represented, a Heavenly Father, Mother, and Son would seem more rational.” Her reasoning for this is that Genesis says that we are created in God’s image, both *male* and *female*. “If language has any meaning,” she said, “we have in these texts a plain declaration of the existence of the feminine element in the Godhead, equal in power and glory with the masculine. The Heavenly Mother and Father!”²⁷⁸ Engelsman also posits an ontological footing for the divine feminine writing: “[A] final choice, and the most radical, would be the addition of a feminine image of God and the creation of a quaternity.”²⁷⁹

Ruether, in espousing the third option, does not think that we should ascribe a male or female gender to God, but that we should include both. She says, “God is both male and female and neither male nor female.”²⁸⁰

While there is certainly no consensus concerning which approach to take, Engelsman is confident the Christian world will one day embrace the idea of the divine feminine. “I do foresee, nevertheless, that some approach will be found which will assist us in lifting the repression of the feminine, and permit the development of a feminine image of God. The center of that storm will probably be the doctrine of the trinity and the definition of monotheism just as it was in the early centuries of the Christian era.”²⁸¹

Perhaps more surprising than present Christian theological interest in a divine feminine is the emerging body of scholarship which indicates that the idea of a Heavenly Mother is no modern innovation but has biblical

276. Elizabeth A. Johnson, “The Incomprehensibility of God and the Image of God Male and Female,” *Theological Studies* 45, no. 3 (1984): 451.

277. Joan Chamberlain Engelsman, *The Feminine Dimension of the Divine: A Study of Sophia and Feminine Images in Religion* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979), 152.

278. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *The Woman’s Bible* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1999), 14.

279. Engelsman, *Feminine Dimension of the Divine*, 153.

280. Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk*, 67.

281. Engelsman, *Feminine Dimension of the Divine*, 153.

support.²⁸² The least that can be said is that a great many Bible scholars believe that ancient Israel believed in a goddess named Asherah. Mark S. Smith goes further than this, suggesting that perhaps the majority of experts in this field agree that ancient Israel believed in this goddess.

Does the biblical and extrabiblical evidence support the view that Asherah was a goddess in ancient Israel and that she was the consort of Yahweh? Or, alternatively, does the data point to the asherah as a symbol within the cult of Yahweh without signifying a goddess? The first position perhaps constitutes a majority view, represented by the older works of H. Ringgren, G. Fohrer, and G. W. Ahlström, and the more recent studies of W. G. Dever, D. N. Freedman, R. Hestrin, A. Lemaire, and S. Olyan.²⁸³

In W. G. Dever's recent book *Did God Have a Wife?* extensive archaeological evidence is presented to demonstrate that ancient Israelite belief in a divine goddess was far more extensive than previously believed. He suggests that too many biblical scholars have been slow to accept the findings of archaeology because of its uncomfortable theological implications. But the growing evidence is becoming harder to ignore.²⁸⁴

Margaret Barker has explored the issue in depth, concluding that the evidence strongly supports what Smith refers to as the "majority" report. She outlines the methodology of her inquiry:

It is an interesting exercise to try to recover the Lost Lady using the same methods as are used to reconstruct the male aspect of the God of Israel:

1. By giving priority to the evidence of the Hebrew texts, including inscriptions. There is no exact parallel to the phrasing of the Kuntillet 'Ajrud inscriptions, which shows that biblical traditions are not representative of everything about Hebrew language and religion.
2. By allowing for singular and plural forms, and for a variety of names for one figure, and for the undoubted practice of using a singular verb with a plural form for divinity.
3. By admitting that if conceptions of the male aspect of deity moved away from anthropomorphism, then the female must have had the

282. LDS scholar Daniel Peterson explores this issue in conjunction with the Book of Mormon passage 1 Ne. 1:8–23. See Daniel C. Peterson, "Nephi and His Asherah: A Note on 1 Ne. 11:8–23," in *Mormons, Scripture, and the Ancient World: Studies in Honor of John L. Sorenson*, ed. Davis Bitton (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1998), 191–243.

283. Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God* (New York: Harper and Row, 1990), 88–89. Smith himself holds to a minority position held by B. Lang, P. D. Miller, J. Tigay, and U. Winter, who maintain that on the paucity of evidence that Asherah neither referred to a goddess nor symbolized the goddess of Israel.

284. William G. Dever, *Did God Have a Wife?* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005).

same fate. There are unlikely to have been simultaneous movements away from anthropomorphism for the male but towards personification for the female.²⁸⁵

Barker's research reveals many ancient sources that speak of a divine feminine. In addition to Ugaritic tablets, Hebrew graffiti that associates Yahweh and Asherah, and the hundreds of pillar figurines from Jerusalem that date to the time of Josiah, Barker enumerates many biblical texts that allude to a feminine deity, including many from the Targums. Barker presents important evidence from the Book of Enoch describing the forsaking of Wisdom at the end of the first temple period, corresponding accounts in 2 Kings 23:6 of the destruction of the Asherah (the tree of life that had been in the Holy of Holies during the first temple period), passages in Proverbs which speak of forsaken Wisdom, and the Qumran Isaiah scroll, "which differs from the Masoretic Hebrew by one letter, and reads: 'Ask a sign from the *Mother of the LORD your God*.'" ²⁸⁶ In addition, Barker also discovers the divine feminine in the New Testament. For instance, in her commentary on Revelation 12:1–2, Barker draws on a wide range of evidences to discuss the significance and the identity of the woman clothed with the sun who appears at the exact center of Revelation. As she reads the passage, "The Woman clothed with the sun is not the Ugaritic goddess, but the Hebrew goddess who was worshipped in Jerusalem until the temple purges in the seventh century BCE."²⁸⁷ She also finds further illumination in passages from Philo, the Gnostic texts about Sophia, many early Christian writings, and even Orthodox and Catholic icons.

Barker was a featured speaker at the Joseph Smith Conference hosted May 5–6, 2005, by the Library of Congress. There she commented directly on how the portrait of the Heavenly Mother which she found in her explorations compared with passages in the Book of Mormon.

Imagine my surprise when I read the account of Lehi's vision of the tree whose *white fruit* made one happy, and the interpretation, that the Virgin in Nazareth was the mother of the Son of God after the manner of the flesh.²⁸⁸ This is the Heavenly Mother, represented by the tree of life, and then Mary and her Son on earth. This revelation to Joseph Smith

285. Margaret Barker, *The Great High Priest: The Temple Roots of Christian Liturgy* (London: T and T Clark, 2003), 233.

286. Margaret Barker, *Temple Theology: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2004), 80.

287. Margaret Barker, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000), 201–2.

288. Discussed by Daniel C. Peterson in "Nephi and His Asherah," in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 9, no. 2 (2000): 16–25.

was the ancient Wisdom symbolism, intact, and almost certainly as it was known in 600 BCE.²⁸⁹

D. Conclusion

Of all these contemporary Bible scholars and theologians, few approach the radical level to which Joseph's understanding of Deity points us. His revelations disclose an embodied Heavenly Father who is gendered and masculine as well as directing us towards an embodied Heavenly Mother who is gendered and feminine. Yet in insisting on a divine feminine, a growing number of both Christian theologians and Bible scholars are leaning significantly in Joseph's direction in a way few dared lean 160 years ago.

VI. GOD AS ETERNALLY SELF-SURPASSING

A. Joseph's Views

Joseph Smith and the scriptures he brought forth teach that God is perfect. *The Lectures on Faith* declare: "We here observe that God is the only supreme governor and independent being in whom all fullness and perfection dwell."²⁹⁰ But what does it mean to be perfect? For the ancient Greeks, perfection meant static "completeness." As Plato argued in the *Republic*, a perfect being must be immutable—incapable of any kind of change.²⁹¹ Plato's notion of perfection was appropriated by early Christian thinkers and has been integral to the traditional Christian understanding of God. To Joseph Smith, however, God consistently revealed himself as a concrete person: dynamic, passible, relational, and, in some respects, as

289. Margaret Barker, "Joseph Smith and the Preexilic Israelite Religion," *BYU Studies* 44, no. 4 (2005): 76.

290. Larry E. Dahl and Donald Q. Cannon, eds., *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1997), 291. The Book of Mormon for example teaches that God is perfect: "And now, the plan of mercy could not be brought about except an atonement should be made; therefore God himself atoneth for the sins of the world, to bring about the plan of mercy, to appease the demands of justice, that God might be a *perfect*, just God, and a merciful God also" (Alma 42:15); emphasis added. See also 3 Ne. 12:48.

291. In Plato's *Republic*, Socrates argues, "If he [God] change at all he can only change for the worse, for we cannot suppose him to be deficient either in virtue or beauty." To which Plato replies, "Then it is impossible that God should ever be willing to change; being, as is supposed, the fairest and best that is conceivable, every god remains absolutely and for ever in his own form." Plato, *The Republic* 2.3.

continuously self-surpassing; or, as the idea is more commonly expressed in LDS discourse, as “eternally progressing.”

But in what respects did Joseph view God endlessly progressing? First of all, in his creations. In the Pearl of Great Price, God declared to Moses: “The heavens, they are many, and they cannot be numbered unto man; but they are numbered unto me, for they are mine. And as one earth shall pass away, and the heavens thereof even so shall another come, and there is no end to my works, neither to my words.”²⁹² In his King Follett discourse, Joseph Smith indicated additional ways in which God is self-surpassing. He asked: “What did Jesus do?” And he had Jesus answer:

Why; I do the things I saw my Father do when worlds came rolling into existence. My Father worked out his kingdom with fear and trembling, and I must do the same; and when I get my kingdom, I shall present it to my Father, so that he may obtain kingdom upon kingdom, and it will exalt him in glory. He will then take a higher exaltation, and I will take his place, and thereby become exalted myself.²⁹³

Thus, God is eternally self-surpassing in kingdoms, glory, and degree of exaltation. Joseph continued, “God himself, finding he was in the midst of spirits and glory, because he was more intelligent, saw proper to institute laws whereby the rest could have a privilege to *advance like himself*.”²⁹⁴

Brigham Young and Wilford Woodruff apparently understood Joseph’s affirmation of divine advancement in a way that included the principles of power and knowledge. Young once commented that “according to [Orson

292. Moses 1:37–38. Also in the Book of Moses is written, “And, behold, thou art my son; wherefore look, and I will show thee the workmanship of mine hands; but not all, for my works are without end, and also my words, for they never cease” (Moses 1:4).

293. Smith, *Teachings of the Prophet*, 347–48.

294. *History of the Church*, 6:312; emphasis added. Stan Larson amalgamated the original texts of the King Follett Discourse, and in his reconstruction this passage reads as follows: “Because He was greater He saw proper to institute laws whereby the rest, who were less in intelligence, could have a privilege to *advance like Himself and be exalted with Him*, so that they might have one glory upon another in all that knowledge, power, and glory. So he took in hand to save the world of spirits.” The original notes that were taken during the discourse speak in this same language; Wilford Woodruff’s notes read, “God has power to institute laws to instruct the weaker intelligences that they may *be exalted with himself*.” William Clayton’s notes read, “That God himself find himself in the midst of spirit and glory because he was greater saw proper to institute laws whereby the rest could have a privilege to *advance like himself*.” Donald Q. Cannon and Larry E. Dahl, *The Prophet Joseph Smith’s King Follet Discourse: A Six-Column Comparison of Original Notes and Amalgamations* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 2001), 50–51; emphasis added.

Pratt's] theory, God can progress no further in knowledge and power; but the God that I serve is progressing eternally, and so are his children: they will increase to all eternity, if they are faithful."²⁹⁵ Young also taught:

If we continue to learn all that we can, pertaining to the salvation which is purchased and presented to us through the Son of God, is there a time when a person will cease to learn? Yes, when he has sinned against God the Father, Jesus Christ the Son, and the Holy Ghost—God's minister; when he has denied the Lord, defied Him and committed the sin that in the Bible is termed the unpardonable sin—the sin against the Holy Ghost. That is the time when a person will cease to learn, and from that time forth, will descend in ignorance, forgetting that which they formerly knew. . . . They will cease to increase, but must decrease. . . . These are the only characters who will ever cease to learn, both in time and eternity.²⁹⁶

And similarly, Woodruff observed, "If there was a point where man in his progression could not proceed any further, the very idea would throw a gloom over every intelligent and reflecting mind. God himself is increasing and progressing in knowledge, power, and dominion, and will do so, worlds without end."²⁹⁷ Other Church leaders have passionately denied that God can surpass himself in knowledge, but the idea that God progresses eternally in other aspects such as exaltation and dominion has near-universal acceptance among Latter-day Saints.²⁹⁸

Joseph, then, rejected the Greek and conventional Christian notion of perfection as total static completeness. For him, a perfect being was dynamic—indeed, in some respects, eternally progressing.

295. Brigham Young, in *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. (Liverpool: F. D. Richards, 1855–86), 11:286, January 13, 1867.

296. Brigham Young, in *Journal of Discourses*, 3:203, February 17, 1856.

297. Wilford Woodruff, in *Journal of Discourses*, 6:120, December 6, 1857.

298. President Joseph Fielding Smith asserted, "Do we believe that God has all 'wisdom'? If so, in that, he is absolute. If there is something he does not know, then he is not absolute in 'wisdom,' and to think such a thing is absurd." Joseph Fielding Smith, *Doctrines of Salvation*, 3 vols., compiled by Bruce R. McConkie (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1954), 1:6. Elder Bruce R. McConkie expressed a similar sentiment: "There are those who say that God is progressing in knowledge. . . . This is false—utterly, totally, and completely. There is not one sliver of truth in it. . . . God progresses in the sense that his kingdoms increase and his dominions multiply. . . . God is not a student. . . . He has indeed graduated to that state of exaltation that consists of knowing all things." Bruce R. McConkie, "The Seven Deadly Heresies," *Devotional Speeches of the Year 1980* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1981), 75. See also Lisa Ramsey Adams, "Eternal Progression," *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 2:465–66.

B. Christian Divergence and Criticisms

Conventional Christian theology has long been opposed to the idea that God is a dynamic being. According to a great many Christian theologians, God is static and immutable. Philo, a Jewish Neo-Platonist, though a non-Christian, influenced a great many Christian theologians after him. Philo clearly believed God to be a being who transcended temporal succession. He said, “The great Cause of all things does not exist in time, nor at all in place, but he is superior to both time and place. . . . God is the creator of time also . . . so that there is nothing future to God, who has the very boundaries of time subject to him; . . . and in eternity nothing is past and nothing is future, but everything is present only.”²⁹⁹ St. Augustine, in one of the most brilliant treatises on the nature of time, addressed the question “What was God doing before the creation of the world?” For Augustine, the question becomes absurd when one realizes that for God there is no “before” creation. For God created time, and there can be no before and after without temporal succession.³⁰⁰ St. Thomas Aquinas reasoned, “The idea of eternity follows immutability, as the idea of time follows movement. . . . Hence, as God is supremely immutable, it supremely belongs to Him to be eternal.”³⁰¹ John Calvin reiterated this concept: “When we attribute foreknowledge to God, we mean that all things have ever been, and perpetually remain, under his eyes, so that to his knowledge nothing is future or past, but all things are present.”³⁰²

Joseph’s teaching that even God eternally progresses starkly contradicts the conventional notion of divine perfection. It is no surprise, then, that it has come under sustained attack by conservative Christian critics. James White sets out clearly what he sees as the theoretical superiority of the more orthodox view:

We can believe in His promises because He has eternally been what He is today. Can you say this about the LDS concept of God . . . ? Has God eternally been what He is today? . . . If you believe that God has ever been in a state of “progression” how can you be *sure* that He will not change again tomorrow? I have confidence in my salvation because it is based upon the words of an unchanging, eternal God. How about you?

299. Philo Judaeus, *Works of Philo Judaeus*, trans. C. D. Yonge, 4 vols. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1890), 1:289, 1:139.

300. *Confessions of St. Augustine*, 11.10.

301. Thomas Aquinas, *The “Summa Theologica” of St. Thomas Aquinas* (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1916), 1, q. 10, a. 1.

302. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. John Allen, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), 2:175.

White concludes, "As we have noted already, God did not 'acquire' this knowledge over time through some process of learning or progressing as Joseph Smith taught, and as modern Mormons affirm."³⁰³

C. Contemporary Christian Convergence

Joseph's dynamic view of divine perfection may have been unpopular among the religious thinkers of his day,³⁰⁴ and, as White's critique makes clear, with some today. But it did not take long for others to begin to entertain the idea. Among the first was the German philosopher and psychologist Gustav Theodor Fechner (1801–1887).³⁰⁵ Fechner explained that "the perfection of God . . . is not in reaching a definite or limited maximum but in seeking an unlimited progress. Such a progress, however, that God in each time is the maximum not only of all the present, but also of all the past; he alone can surpass himself, and does it continually."³⁰⁶

William James (1842–1910), the American pragmatist, further developed Fechner's vision of God as dynamic and in process. On pragmatic grounds, he explicitly rejected the classical conception that God is timelessly eternal and thereby immutable and impassible. As such, James argued, God could not enter into an authentic social relation with us, or be moved by the feelings of our infirmities, or be involved in the sweat and dirt of our daily human trials. He could not be a co-laborer with us in the vast task of building a moral universe, for he would have neither history nor future.³⁰⁷ But James notes that "all the categories of my sympathy

303. James R. White, *Letters to a Mormon Elder* (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1993), 182, 189.

304. Some who were present at the King Follett sermon later expressed their feelings. "Granville Hedrick once declared it to be 'one of the most infamous sermons of blasphemy ever preached from the pulpit,' and on another occasion stated, 'A more high handed and degrading infamous attempt in blasphemy never was uttered by mortal tongue.' William Cadman even claimed a revelation concerning it, 'That Joseph Smith (in that case) taught a worse doctrine than the Devil did in the Garden of Eden. The Devil only taught that men should be as Gods. But Joseph taught that men should be Gods.' The doctrines of the sermon were declared 'false and damnable' in a resolution by another group of dissenters." Van Hale, "The Doctrinal Impact of the King Follett Discourse," *BYU Studies* 18, no. 2 (1978): 211–12.

305. For more on Gustav Theodor Fechner, see "Gustav Theodor Fechner," in *The 1911 Edition Encyclopedia Britannica*, available at http://67.1911encyclopedia.org/F/FE/FECHNER_GUSTAV_THEODOR.htm (accessed March 6, 2006).

306. Charles Hartshorne, *Creative Synthesis and Philosophic Method* (London: SCM, 1970), xi.

307. William James, *A Pluralistic Universe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), 27.

are knit up . . . with things that have a history. . . . I have neither eyes nor ears nor heart nor mind for anything of an opposite description, and the stagnant felicity of the absolute's own perfection moves me as little as I move it."³⁰⁸

In his classic defense of free will, "The Dilemma of Determinism," William James argued that given human freedom, the future is in some respects open and indeterminate. Hence, he concluded, God's knowledge of the future is, like ours, knowledge of both what will be (actualities) and what may be (possibilities). God's knowledge increases as agents freely make choices.³⁰⁹

These ideas of process and progress—even for God—became dominant in two contemporary movements in Christian thought: process theology, which emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century; and openness theology, which made its appearance as the century came to a close. These two movements—since both have much in common with Joseph's revelations of God's nature—deserve closer scrutiny.

308. James, *Pluralistic Universe*, 27, as quoted in David W. Paulsen, "The God of Abraham, Isaac and (William) James," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 13, no. 2 (1999): 123.

309. Contrary to Craig L. Blomberg's argument, James proceeded to show that God's ever-increasing knowledge is fully compatible with divine providence. He argued:

The belief in free-will is not in the least incompatible with the belief in Providence, provided you do not restrict the Providence to fulminating nothing but *fatal* degrees. If you allow him to provide possibilities as well as actualities to the universe, and to carry on his own thinking in those two categories just as we do ours, chances may be there, uncontrolled even by him, and the course of the universe be really ambiguous; and yet the end of all things may be just what he intended it to be from all eternity. . . . The creator's plan of the universe would thus be left blank as to many of its actual details, but all possibilities would be marked down. The realization of some of these would be left absolutely to chance; that is, would only be determined when the moment of realization came. Other possibilities would be *contingently* determined; that is, their decision would have to wait till it was seen how the matters of absolute chance fell out. But the rest of the plan, including its final upshot, would be rigorously determined once for all. So the creator himself would not need to know *all* the details of actuality until they came; and at any time his own view of the world would be a view partly of facts and partly of possibilities, exactly as ours is now. (William James, "The Dilemma of Determinism," *William James, Writings 1878–1899* [New York: Library of America, 1992], 592–94)

Process theologians reject many of the fundamental assumptions of conventional Christian theology—most notably that God is timeless and, hence, metaphysically immutable and impassible—while acknowledging that God is constant in his loving concern for the welfare of human agents. Process theism is, more specifically, “a product of theorizing that takes the categories of becoming, change, and time as foundational for metaphysics.”³¹⁰

The metaphysical framework for process thought was established by the great mathematician-philosopher Alfred North Whitehead (1861–1947). Within that framework, Whitehead introduced a radically unorthodox way of understanding God's nature. He rejected the absolute, static God of traditional theology, calling this type of God *monopolar*, or consisting of one nature entirely. To the contrary, he asserted that God's nature is *dipolar*; he has both a primordial nature (the nature that traditional theology espouses) and a consequent nature. His primordial nature includes all possibilities, or what could be, and his consequent nature is dependent on the decisions of nondivine actual entities, what Whitehead calls “actual occasions.”³¹¹ Whitehead's model of God gave theologians a new perspective and a new way of answering the questions and contradictions that plagued theology.

Whitehead's creative vision of God influenced a great many theologians after him, especially Charles Hartshorne (1897–2000), who systematized and popularized Whitehead's process thought. In accord therewith, Hartshorne redefined divine perfection in order to avoid the contradictions inherent in the Greek conception:

If perfection is defined as that which in no respect could conceivably be greater, and hence is incapable of increase, then we face paradox on either hand. But suppose we define the perfect, or supremely excellent or good, as that individual being (in what sense “individual” will appear later) than which no *other individual* being could *conceivably* be greater, but which itself, in another “state,” could become greater (perhaps by the creation within *itself* of new constituents). Otherwise expressed, let us define perfection as an excellence such that rivalry or superiority on the part of other individuals is impossible, but self-superiority is not

310. Donald Viney, “Process Theism,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2004 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2004/entries/process-theism> (accessed February 21, 2006).

311. Viney, “Process Theism.” Two of Whitehead's most significant contributions to process theology are: Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, corrected ed., David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1978); and Alfred North Whitehead, *Religion in the Making: Lowell Lectures, 1926* (New York: Macmillan, 1957).

impossible. Or again, let us say that the perfect is the “self-surpassing surpasser of all.”³¹²

To the question “Is there a strictly immutable yet living being?” Hartshorne answers, “No, life in any sense, no matter how exalted, implies some form of real change or becoming—indeed some form of real growth.” To Hartshorne, “the history of natural theology from Aristotle, Philo, and Augustine to Hume and Kant” has brought out a theism of paradox that “has no rational content.” The error “is one of the penalties we have had to pay for putting too much trust in the first form of rational metaphysical thought, the Greek.”³¹³ Hartshorne concluded that God must be self-surpassing in knowledge:

Consider the traditional transcendent property of omniscience or cognitive infallibility. Whatever exists, the infallible (analogically speaking) knows this existence; yet not even the infallible can know the possible but non-existent as existent, for this would be error, not knowledge. The infallible must, of course, be *capable* of knowing and certain to know the actuality of the possible should it be actual. To be infallible, then, is to be actually in cognitive relation to what actually exists, and potentially in relation to what could exist. The duality of actual and possible, or of concrete and abstract, cannot be suspended even with reference to the omniscient.³¹⁴

Other process thinkers concur. For example, Tyron Inbody interprets Job’s encounter with God using the language of process theology: “In this encounter with Job, God learned to recognize, to acknowledge, and to accept the antinomies that so far have been hidden in God’s own unconsciousness. In this moment of self-reflection God discovers that if Job gains knowledge of God, God must also learn to know Godself.”³¹⁵

In a co-authored book, two of the most influential process thinkers, John Cobb and David Ray Griffin, defined omniscience in the following way:

To say that God is omniscient means that in every moment of the divine life God knows everything which is knowable at that time. The concrete actuality is temporal, relative, dependent, and constantly changing. In each moment of God’s life there are new, unforeseen happenings in the

312. Charles Hartshorne, *The Divine Relativity: A Social Conception of God* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), 19–20.

313. Hartshorne, *Creative Synthesis and Philosophic Method*, 38.

314. Hartshorne, *Creative Synthesis and Philosophic Method*, 234; emphasis in original.

315. Tyron Inbody, *The Transforming God: An Interpretation of Suffering and Evil* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 101.

world which only then have become knowable. Hence, God's concrete knowledge is dependent upon the decisions made by the world actualities. God's knowledge is always relativized by, in the sense of internally related to, the world.³¹⁶

In addition, Shubert Ogden argues that God is both perfect and in process, and that the one implies the other:

The point is not that God is growing and therefore is "a God who is not or who is not yet completely perfect," but that "growing" is itself a wholly positive conception, of which, as of *all* positive conceptions, God is the eminent or perfect exemplification. In other words, the new theism asserts that God is "completely perfect" in *whatever sense these words have any coherent meaning* and then questions whether the old use of the words is not, in part, meaningless.³¹⁷

The philosophers who have put forth these arguments would be considered by most conservative Christians to be far too liberal in their views. But a much more conservative movement within evangelical Christianity known as "open theism" has begun to develop within the last two decades, and it has much in common with process theology, though it nonetheless claims to be biblically based.³¹⁸ Indeed, the basic primer of this movement, *The Openness of God*, has as its subtitle *A Biblical Challenge to the Traditional Understanding of God*.³¹⁹ Clark Pinnock, John Sanders, David Basinger, Richard Rice, Gregory A. Boyd, Terence Fretheim, and William Hasker are among the most influential thinkers in this movement. John Sanders argues:

According to openness theology, the *triune* God of love has, in *almighty* power, created all that is and is *sovereign* over all. In *freedom* God decided to create beings capable of experiencing his love. God loves us and desires for us to enter into reciprocal relations of love with God as well as our fellow creatures. In creating us the divine intention was that we would come to experience the triune love and respond to it with love

316. John B. Cobb Jr. and David Ray Griffin, *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 47–48.

317. Shubert M. Ogden, *The Reality of God and Other Essays*, 1st ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 59–60 n. 97; emphasis in original.

318. For careful comparisons between process and openness thought, see J. B. Cobb and C. H. Pinnock, *Searching for an Adequate God: A Dialogue between Process and Free Will Theists* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000); and Pinnock, *Most Moved Mover*, 140–51.

319. Clark Pinnock, Richard Rice, John Sanders, William Hasker, and David Basinger, *The Openness of God: A Biblical Challenge to the Traditional Understanding of God* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1994).

of our own and freely come to collaborate with God towards the achievement of his goals.³²⁰

Central to open theism is the self-limiting God (as opposed to the ontologically limited God of process theology). According to openness theists, God limits his knowledge of the future in order that we may be truly free agents that can enter into a reciprocally loving relationship with God.

In speaking of the reasons why openness theologians have decided to take the route they have taken, Clark Pinnock says: "Love and not freedom was our central concern because it was God's desire for loving relationships which required freedom. In a controversial move, we also envisaged God making a world, the future of which was not yet completely settled, again to make room for the input of significant creatures."³²¹ And again, "According to openness theism, for example, the future is partly settled and partly unsettled, partly determined and partly undetermined and, therefore, partly unknown even to God and it holds that God himself has a temporal aspect."³²² John Sanders defines God's omniscience in the following way:

The *omniscient* God knows all that can be known or all that he wants to know. . . . In the openness debate the focus is on the nature of the future: is it fully knowable, fully unknowable or partially knowable and partially unknowable? Even if the future is fully knowable does God choose not to know it? According to open theism God knows the past and present with exhaustive definite knowledge and knows the future as partly definite (closed) and partly indefinite (open). God's knowledge of the future contains knowledge of what God has decided to bring about unilaterally (that which is definite or settled), knowledge of possibilities (that which is indefinite) and those events that are determined to occur (e.g. an asteroid hitting a planet). Hence, the future is partly open or indefinite and partly closed or definite. It is not the case that just anything may happen, for God has acted in history to bring about events in order to achieve his unchanging purpose. Graciously, however, God invites us to collaborate with him to bring the open part of the future into being.³²³

D. Conclusion

While many Christian thinkers still hold to the static notion of God which emerged out of the biblical/classical synthesis, significant

320. John Sanders, "Heffalumps and Heresies," *Journal of Biblical Studies* 2, no. 1 (2002): 1; emphasis in original.

321. Pinnock, *Most Moved Mover*, 202–3.

322. Pinnock, *Most Moved Mover*, 13.

323. Sanders, "Heffalumps and Heresies," 3.

movements in contemporary Christian theology, most notably process and openness thought, espouse process in God in ways closely aligned with Joseph Smith's thought.³²⁴ But new theological winds are blowing still more widely over the landscape of Christian thought. Many of them are the outgrowth of the demise of divine impassibility. With such a central doctrine being put to rest, a cluster of logically related ideas may also end up in the theological graveyard. As Clark Pinnock explains, "The conventional package of attributes is tightly woven. You cannot deny one, such as impassibility, without casting doubt on others, like immutability. It's like pulling on a thread and unraveling a sweater. A little boldness is required; tentative changes will not do."³²⁵ Similarly, Nicholas Wolterstorff:

Once you pull on the thread of impassibility, a lot of other threads come along with it. Aseity, for example—that is, unconditionedness. The biblical witness seems to me clearly to be that God allows himself to be affected by the doings of the creatures God created. What led the traditional theologians to affirm aseity was their philosophical argument that the world is such that it can only be explained if we postulate a being which is the condition of everything but itself, itself being conditioned by nothing. To give up aseity then is to give up an argument for God's existence—an argument which is questionable in any case. One also has to give up on immutability and eternity [timelessness]. If God really responds, God is not metaphysically immutable and, if not metaphysically immutable, not eternal [timeless].³²⁶

One hundred and sixty years ago, Joseph saw God as living, acting, responding, and even as continually self-surpassing. Once foreign to conventional Christian theology, this vision of God is becoming commonplace.

324. Openness thinkers have even been publicly charged with having Mormon leanings. For instance, in a review in *Christianity Today*, Pinnock's model is taken to task for suggesting that God may be an embodied person in time. According to one reviewer, "We are only a few steps away, it seems, from the assertion that God possesses a body of sorts, spiritual though it may be." Christopher A. Hall, "Openness Season," review of *Most Moved Mover: A Theology of God's Openness*, by Clark Pinnock, *Christianity Today* 47, no. 2 (2003): 92. Jeff Riddle, an evangelical pastor, writes on his Web site: "If the nascent ideas on divine corporeality in *Most Moved Mover* are any indication, it seems that the 'mature' vision of God in open theology will be more like that of Mormonism than orthodoxy." See www.jpbc.org/writings/br-most_moved_mover.html (accessed February 22, 2006).

325. Pinnock, *Most Moved Mover*, 77.

326. N. P. Wolterstorff, "Does God Suffer?" *Modern Reformation* 8.5 (1999): 47, as quoted in Pinnock, *Most Moved Mover*, 77–78.

VII. THE FATE OF THE UNEVANGELIZED

A. Joseph's Views

One of the puzzles challenging thoughtful Christians is the scriptural assertion that there is “none other name under heaven [save Jesus Christ] given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). Faithful Christians have no reservations in recognizing Christ as their sole source of salvation, yet how are they to make sense of the fate of the myriad souls who have lived and died on this earth never hearing the name of Christ nor having adequate opportunity to accept his salvific gift? Do they suffer eternally? Are they forever excluded from the joy of eternal life with God? In his book *The Logic of God Incarnate*, Thomas Morris, professor of philosophy at Notre Dame, explains that a “scandal” arises when considering “a simple set of questions” asked of theologians who assert that only through Jesus Christ can all be saved: How can any be held accountable for something of which they have no knowledge? What of those from cultures with religious traditions wholly disconnected from Christianity? If God is just, why did he give conditions for salvation that are unavailable to most people? “Is not the love of God better understood as universal,” concludes Morris, rather than “limited to a mediation through the one particular individual, Jesus of Nazareth?”³²⁷ Consideration of this challenging issue has produced a wide array of answers from Christian theologians, ranging from restrictivism (all who never hear of or accept Christ in this life are forever damned) to universalism (all will ultimately through Christ be reconciled to God and receive eternal life).

Joseph Smith's revelations from God provide a divine method of justly resolving the fate of the unevangelized without compromising Christ's unique role as Savior and Redeemer. Joseph fully grasped the despair-filled quandary of the fate of the unevangelized, but could not fathom a God who would allow such arrant injustice to exist unmitigated. As an example Joseph gave the case of two brothers, who are “equally intelligent, learned, virtuous and lovely, walking in uprightness and in all good conscience.” One brother dies without hearing the gospel, and the other hears and accepts the message of salvation. Joseph asked, “Shall the one become the partaker of glory and the other be consigned to hopeless perdition? Is there no chance for his escape?” Noting that sectarianism does not give this chance for escape, Joseph concluded, “Such an idea is worse than atheism.”

327. Thomas V. Morris, *The Logic of God Incarnate* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1986), 174–75. Morris is not sure how to resolve the “scandal,” although he offers several solutions, including universalism (176) and inclusivism (177).

Instead, Joseph taught that “there is never a time when the spirit is too old to approach God. . . . There is a way to release the spirits of the dead; that is by the power and authority of the Priesthood—by binding and loosing on earth.” The doctrine of redemption for the dead “exhibits the greatness of divine compassion” in God.³²⁸

Joseph's teachings emphasized postmortem evangelization of all those who did not hear the gospel message in this life.³²⁹ Directly linked with postmortem evangelization is the performing of vicarious baptisms for those who have died without this essential ordinance, thus preserving Christ's injunction, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” (John 3:5). Hence, Latter-day Saints today consider redeeming the dead one of the three primary missions of the Church.³³⁰ Joseph's doctrine of the redemption of the dead allows God to be both merciful and just to all men uniformly, places all mankind within equal grasp of eternal salvation through Christ, and demands and provides universal means for the selfsame ordinances required of every person regardless of the geography or chronology of that person's earthly sojourn.³³¹ In short, all human beings in all areas and ages of the world will

328. Joseph Smith Jr., *History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2d ed., rev., 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971), 4:425–26.

329. Commenting on the ministry of Christ to the disembodied spirits following his crucifixion, Joseph states:

Peter, also, in speaking concerning our Savior, says, that “He went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah,” (1 Peter 3:19, 20). Here then we have an account of our Savior preaching to the spirits in prison, to spirits that had been imprisoned from the days of Noah; and what did He preach to them? That they were to stay there? Certainly not! Let His own declaration testify. “He hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised.” (Luke iv: 18. Isaiah has it—“To bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness from the prison house.” (Isaiah xlii: 7. It is very evident from this that He went not only to preach to them, but also to deliver, or bring them out of the prison house. (*History of the Church*, 4:596–97)

330. Elma Fugal, “Salvation of the Dead,” *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 3:1257–59.

331. Joseph strongly expresses that all people will have “the same privilege” regardless of where and when they live on earth:

When speaking about the blessings pertaining to the Gospel, and the consequences connected with disobedience to the requirements, we

ultimately hear Christ's good news and have equal opportunity to accept or reject this message of salvation. Thus Joseph confirmed:

[God] holds the reins of judgment in His hands; He is a wise Lawgiver, and will judge all men, not according to the narrow, contracted notions of men, but, "according to the deeds done in the body whether they be good or evil," or whether these deeds were done in England, America, Spain, Turkey, or India. He will judge them, "not according to what they have not, but according to what they have," those who have lived without law, will be judged without law, and those who have a law, will be judged by that law. We need not doubt the wisdom and intelligence of the Great Jehovah; He will award judgment or mercy to all nations according to their several deserts, their means of obtaining intelligence, the laws by which they are governed, the facilities afforded them of obtaining correct information, and His inscrutable designs in relation to the human family; and when the designs of God shall be made manifest, and the curtain of futurity be withdrawn, we shall all of us eventually have to confess that the Judge of all the earth has done right.³³²

Joseph's view, then, does not minimize the importance of this life for those who do not hear of Christ while alive. On the contrary, he affirms that all men will be judged according to how they responded in the flesh to whatever law they had access. This will then play a significant factor in their judgment. What Joseph's position makes clear is that all men will hear the gospel and have access to its saving ordinances; thus, as Peter says, they will be able to be "judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit" (1 Pet. 4:6).

Although Joseph saw his teachings as being in substantial concordance and harmony with the Bible,³³³ he did not consider his views on the issue to be just one more human interpretation of the relevant biblical texts. No human interpretation, no matter how sincerely and carefully crafted, is ultimately compelling. Rather, his view came out of

are frequently asked the question, what has become of our fathers? Will they all be damned for not obeying the Gospel, when they never heard it? Certainly not. But they will possess the same privilege that we here enjoy, through the medium of the everlasting priesthood, which not only administers on earth, but also in heaven. (*History of the Church*, 4:598)

332. *History of the Church*, 4:595–96.

333. Scriptures in which Joseph saw biblical support for this doctrine include Isaiah 42:7; Luke 4:18; 1 Cor. 15:29; 1 Pet. 3:18–21, 4:6. See *History of the Church*, 4:595–99.

direct revelation from the risen Lord.³³⁴ Thus, divine disclosure from the Word, not a scholarly exegesis of the word, stands as the uncompromising foundation of Joseph's position.

Joseph's revelation on the fate of the unevangelized brings comforting clarity and a deeper appreciation for the equity and charity of God to an issue which otherwise challenges one's belief in the universality of God's love towards his children of all dispensations and locations. God anticipated the predicament of his many children he knew would never hear the glad tidings of the gospel while in mortality, and he prepared a way "before the world was" of equitably solving the problem in perfect love and justice.³³⁵ This doctrine has inspired one of the most exulting passages of Latter-day Saint scripture. In language that is saturated with joy, Joseph exclaimed the exciting prospects of the unfolding work for the dead:

Now, what do we hear in the gospel which we have received? A voice of gladness! A voice of mercy from heaven; and a voice of truth out of the earth; glad tidings for the dead; a voice of gladness for the living and the dead; glad tidings of great joy. . . . Let your hearts rejoice, and be exceedingly glad. Let the earth break forth into singing. Let the dead speak forth anthems of eternal praise to the King Immanuel, who hath ordained, before the world was, that which would enable us to redeem them out of their prison; for the prisoners shall go free. (D&C 128:19, 22)

Truly, then, "God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10:34) as all have equal access to his salvific gift through his plan of perfect foresight. Joseph concludes, "A view of these things reconciles the Scriptures of truth, justifies the ways of God to man, places the human family upon an equal footing, and harmonizes with every principle of righteousness, justice and truth."³³⁶

334. Canonized sections of LDS scripture revealed to Joseph Smith addressing this topic include: D&C 45:54; 76; 88:99; 124:29–44; 127:5–12; 128; 137.

335. Joseph's teachings explain that God from the beginning was aware of and accounted for the station of all nations and peoples in relation to their receiving the gospel, whether in this life or the next:

The great Jehovah contemplated the whole of the events connected with the earth, pertaining to the plan of salvation, before it rolled into existence, or ever "the morning stars sang together" for joy; . . . He was acquainted with the situation of all nations and with their destiny; He ordered all things according to the council of His own will; He knows the situation of both the living and the dead, and has made ample provision for their redemption, according to their several circumstances, and the laws of the kingdom of God, whether in this world, or in the world to come. (*History of the Church*, 4:597)

336. *History of the Church*, 4:599.

B. Christian Divergence and Criticisms

It is widely believed today that the church in ancient times held to some notion of postmortem evangelization. This theme is scattered throughout various early Christian sources and seems to suggest that the early church was in agreement that Christ “descended into hell,” per the Apostles’ Creed. According to Jeffrey A. Trumbower,

Numerous conceptions of posthumous rescue found their way into the earliest Christian speculations: an implicit universal salvation (Rom. 11:32), vicarious baptism “on behalf of the dead” (1 Cor. 15:29), talk of proclaiming the gospel among the dead (1 Pet. 4:6), the dead apostles’ baptizing the righteous dead (*Shepherd of Hermas*, *Sim.* 9.16.2–7), and even God’s granting the righteous the privilege of saving some of the damned at the final judgment (*Apocalypse of Peter* 14:1–4; *Sibylline Oracles* 2:330–38).³³⁷

All of this, suggests Trumbower, fits into the practices of the larger cultures of the time, namely the Greek, Roman, and Jewish concern and pious acts for their dead.³³⁸

Postmortem evangelization continued in the writings of early Christian thinkers such as Clement of Alexandria and Origen. A general concern for the dead and belief in Christ’s visit and release of dead souls from hell was a very popular early Christian conviction. “That the doctrine was taken for granted by A.D. 150,” says John Sanders,

is evident from the fact that the heretics Marcion and the Valentinians, who were criticized on most of their beliefs by the early Church Fathers, were not challenged at all on this point. Both the early Fathers and the heretics agreed that Christ descended into hell. Even the cautious Tertullian accepted the doctrine without squabble. In the Arian controversy again, both sides agreed on the descent into hell. It can be concluded from this that the doctrine of Christ’s descent into hell and the release of souls therefrom was well established by the end of the first century. The only question through this time involved *who* was released.³³⁹

Ignatius, Irenaeus, and Tertullian posited that the salvation proffered to the “dead” included only Old Testament patriarchs and prophets; on the other hand, the heretic Marcion, who had a strong distaste of the Old Testament, suggested the very opposite: Christ, in fact, damned all Old Testament believers and released all the Gentiles. Yet despite their differing

337. Jeffrey A. Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 33–34.

338. Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead*, 10–32, 34.

339. John Sanders, *No Other Name: An Investigation into the Destiny of the Unevangelized* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1992), 183–84; emphasis in original.

opinions, “both groups agreed that the purpose of the descent was to give salvation to the dead.”³⁴⁰

In later centuries, ideas concerning postmortem evangelization shifted. Augustine, writing in the early fifth century, marks the turning point away from postmortem evangelization. As Trumbower notes, “By the time he wrote the *City of God*, Book 21, in the mid-420s, [Augustine] had formulated what would become the clear position in the West rejecting all forms of posthumous salvation.”³⁴¹ In Roman Catholic circles, his ideas remain highly influential—a solid doctrine formed in Roman Catholicism that upon a person’s death, an immediate, unalterable decree was made concerning that person’s salvation.³⁴² Until the second half of the nineteenth century, when certain Protestants³⁴³ considered the idea, little debate for postmortem evangelization took place. In the 1830s, then, when his doctrines concerning the redemption of the dead emerged, Joseph Smith found himself treading on doctrinal ground that had been practically untouched for more than a thousand years.

C. Contemporary Christian Convergence

Postmortem evangelization (variously called “eschatological evangelization,” “future probation,” “probation after death,” or “divine perseverance”) has made a strong resurgence onto the current Christian theological scene. But this development has not occurred all at once. Despite the Apostles’ Creed mentioning that Christ “descended into hell,” Christian theologians have been unable to come to a consensus on what the creed exactly refers to. Such reticence in affirming Christ’s descent is illustrated in the following anecdote shared by Millard Erickson:

In the late 1960s the chaplain of Wheaton College decided that a series of chapel messages on the Apostles Creed would be desirable. Members of the Bible department were asked to preach, each on a different phrase of the creed. No one, however, was willing to preach on “descended into

340. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 184.

341. Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead*, 126.

342. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 178. This idea, Sanders points out, is not “contradicted by the concept of purgatory. Roman Catholic theology dictates that purgatory is a place where those who have already been saved are purified prior to their attainment of heaven.” Sanders, *No Other Name*, 178. Such a place, then, requires no evangelization.

343. Sanders in his nineteenth-century bibliography singles out John Lange, I. A. Dorner, Herbert Luckock, Frederic Huidekoper, and Egbert Smyth, among others, as those exploring this idea. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 212–13.

Hades,” because no one believed in it. Therefore that phrase was omitted from the series.³⁴⁴

Many Christian thinkers today, however, are advancing various postmortem evangelization theories based on Christ’s descent into hades. “The twentieth century,” says John Sanders, “has witnessed a tremendous proliferation of belief in eschatological evangelization among theologians and biblical commentators from diverse traditions.”³⁴⁵ Indeed, Erickson considers the wider issue of the fate of the unevangelized “one of the burning issues of the present day,”³⁴⁶ and “only recently have orthodox or evangelical Christians expressed interest in [postmortem evangelization],” which “for much of its earlier history . . . has existed virtually on the fringes of Christianity.”³⁴⁷

Among the leading theologians helping to bring postmortem evangelization from off of the fringes, Sanders lists Joseph Leckie, Gabriel Fackre, and George Lindbeck.³⁴⁸ Donald Bloesch, John Macquarrie, Stephen T. Davis, and others could be added to the list.³⁴⁹ Perhaps what appeals most to advocates of postmortem evangelization is the way in which it preserves Christ’s role as sole author of salvation (exclusivism) while yet allowing all humankind opportunity to hear of Christ. Many see no other way to solve the puzzle while maintaining these two tenets. Indeed, as Sanders points out, “If one holds (1) that salvation is universally accessible, (2) that explicit knowledge of Christ is necessary for salvation, and (3) that the only reason anyone is condemned to hell is for rejection of Jesus Christ, then it is not unreasonable to conclude that the unevangelized must receive some kind of opportunity after death to respond to Christ.”³⁵⁰ Further,

It is argued that postmortem evangelism provides the best answer as to *how* God makes salvation universally accessible. It has tremendous “theological fit” when accompanied by the control beliefs of God’s universal salvific will, the necessity of faith in Christ for salvation, the necessity that one hears about Christ in order to have faith, and the fact that God is loving, just, and fair. Furthermore, it makes use of the long-standing belief

344. Millard J. Erickson, “Is There Opportunity for Salvation after Death?” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 152 (April–June 1995): 140–41.

345. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 213.

346. Millard J. Erickson, “The Fate of Those Who Never Hear,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 152 (January–March 1995): 3.

347. Erickson, “Is There Opportunity for Salvation after Death?” 131.

348. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 195–205.

349. See Gabriel Fackre, Ronald H. Nash, and John Sanders, *What about Those Who Have Never Heard*, ed. John Sanders (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1995), 90 and n. 16.

350. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 180.

in Christ's descent into hell and the release of certain souls there. It provides a means to hold up Jesus Christ as the universal Savior without succumbing to universalism.³⁵¹

Conversely, what causes the most trepidation concerning postmortem evangelization is its lack of explicit biblical warrant. The prime biblical passages used in support of postmortem evangelization are 1 Peter 3:18–20 and 4:6. The problem is that the meaning of these passages is highly debated, and, much like the “He descended into hell” phrase of the Apostles’ Creed, no consensus has emerged on what these verses refer to. In order to claim that the passage affirms postmortem evangelization, Millard Erickson says that

it is necessary to demonstrate that 1 Peter 3:18–20 does indeed teach that Christ preached the gospel to individuals in hades between the first Good Friday and Easter, and that this was a genuine offer of salvation on the basis of belief. Second, one must demonstrate that the offer made to those Old Testament persons is also available to all persons who live and die after that time.³⁵²

This has, traditionally at least, been shaky ground.

But within the last century, more and more biblical commentators are affirming at least the first half of the equation—that Christ did indeed preach the gospel to disembodied spirits who had the choice of accepting his message.³⁵³ Many are also willing to consider the second half as well, suggesting its implicitness in 1 Peter in addition to being a natural outgrowth of God’s mighty mercy. For instance, Gabriel Fackre finds the second half implicit not only in 1 Peter, but in the whole of the Bible itself:

God’s desire to save—with our freedom to resist—is the “story line” of Scripture, clear at every turn of the tale, from creation to Fall, to the covenants with Noah and Israel, to the person and work of Jesus Christ, to the pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the church, in the redeemed, and on the world, and finally to the consummation of all things in the resurrection of the dead, the return of Christ, the final judgment and everlasting life in the reign of God.

The sweep of this story shows us that God’s pursuit of the divine purpose is indefatigable. . . . The last and least, in time and eternity, will not be overlooked or denied access to the saving Word of Jesus Christ.³⁵⁴

351. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 192–93; emphasis in original.

352. Erickson, “Is There Opportunity for Salvation after Death?” 135.

353. Sanders identifies Charles Bigg, F. W. Farrar, J. L. König, Beyschlag, E. Huther, and Ernest Best as those holding such a view and lists an impressive bibliography of twentieth-century writing on the topic. Sanders, *No Other Name*, 213.

354. Fackre, Nash, and Sanders, *What about Those Who Have Never Heard*, 86; emphasis in original.

Of those advancing postmortem evangelization, there are few, if any, who go further and additionally claim baptism as both required of all and available to all. In terms of explicit biblical support, 1 Corinthians 15:29 is the prime witness, though this passage, not unlike 1 Peter 3:18–20, is one of the most puzzling and divergently interpreted verses in the Bible. In Paul’s great defense of a physical resurrection, he mentions almost in passing those “which are baptized for the dead” as further proof of his argument. Many and varied have been the interpretations of what Paul could possibly have meant. Jeffrey Trumbower is one of many who, like Joseph Smith, sees a description of some actual early Christian practice:

Enormous vats of ink have been emptied in both pre-critical and critical scholarship speculating on precisely what those Corinthian Christians were doing, why they were doing it, and Paul’s attitude toward it. . . . I agree with [Mathis] Rissi and Hans Conzelmann (and, for that matter, with Mormon prophet Joseph Smith), that the grammar and logic of the passage point to a practice of vicarious baptism of a living person for the benefit of a dead person.³⁵⁵

This passage of scripture remains a topic of current debate. A number of scholars suggest that the Corinthians referred to were in fact practicing some form of vicarious baptism, yet scholars are unsure what to do with this puzzling occurrence. “Those who put this forward,” says R. Alistair Campbell, “do so with the air of someone making the best of a bad job. . . . [O]ne detects little actual enthusiasm for this solution even among those who propose it, and in fact many scholars remain unsatisfied with it.”³⁵⁶ This dissatisfaction is caused not by grammatical difficulties inherent in the Greek, but by the theological complications inherent in the passage’s implications. Thus, in his biblical commentary Gordon Fee notes, “The normal reading of the text is that some Corinthians are being baptized,

355. Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead*, 35. Although Trumbower agrees with Joseph Smith as to what the ancient Saints might have been doing, he does not consider likely that the ancient practice was ever as widespread as the current LDS practice. He states, “Were the Corinthians baptizing by proxy dozens or hundreds of dead Gentiles and Jews, like the Latter-day Saints began to do 1800 years later? That is certainly a possibility, but it is so alien to Paul’s theoretical statements about the effects of baptism and individuals’ acceptance of the gospel that I consider it highly unlikely. Perhaps the practice was more limited.” Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead*, 35–36.

356. R. Alistair Campbell, “Baptism and Resurrection (1 Cor. 15:29),” *Australian Biblical Review* 47 (1999): 43. Campbell’s own view rejects an actual vicarious baptism for the dead. He explains that an attraction of his view is that it “eliminate[s] the need to hypothesize an otherwise unknown group with a bizarre baptismal practice.” Campbell, “Baptism and Resurrection,” 47.

apparently vicariously, in behalf of some people who have already died. It would be fair to add that this reading is such a plain understanding of the Greek text that no one would ever have imagined the various alternatives were it not for the difficulties involved.”³⁵⁷

D. Conclusion

The number of theologians who are advancing or considering the idea of postmortem evangelization grew rapidly in the twentieth century and continues to the present. Most are drawn by its powerful “theological fit” which makes both Christ’s message and mercy ultimately available to all. Although biblical support of this view has not been part of the traditional interpretive consensus, much current scholarship has shown support for postmortem evangelization in 1 Peter 3:18–20 and other biblical passages.³⁵⁸ Despite these current developments, Joseph Smith’s doctrine remains unique in Christian thought. As mentioned above, his coupling of postmortem evangelization with vicarious baptisms for the dead reflects a position distinct among current Christian theologies. Joseph not only maintained that hearing of and accepting Christ would be a live option for all humankind, but also that the ordinance of baptism is required of and available to all who would enter Christ’s kingdom; thus the LDS emphasis on worldwide missionary efforts and vicarious baptisms for the dead. Although Joseph recognized biblical support for his doctrines, their ultimate source was the revelations he received from God.

FINAL THOUGHTS ON JOSEPH SMITH

I began this piece asking how far contemporary theologians have come in appropriating theological insights once unique to Joseph Smith. At the conclusion, two points need to be made explicit that were implicit in this study. (1) None of these spokesmen from contemporary Christianity has pulled all of these doctrines together in any comprehensive way, though pieces and fragments of the doctrines are everywhere. Joseph, however, *did* pull them together, and addressed each of these theological conundrums in revolutionary and brilliant ways. (2) The methods employed by Joseph Smith compared to the methods of contemporary spokesmen vary

357. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987), 763–64.

358. For a detailed listing of Bible passages generally used in support of this view, see Sanders, *No Other Name*, 178–88.

greatly. While these notable theologians have come to their conclusions through reason, experience, biblical exegesis, and reconsideration of tradition, Joseph bypassed any such hermeneutical exercise, instead claiming divine revelation and authority. Harold Bloom concludes his study of Joseph Smith with these words: “If one decides that Joseph Smith was no prophet . . . then one’s dominant emotion towards him must be wonder. There is no other figure remotely like him in our entire national history, and it is unlikely that anyone like him ever can come again.”³⁵⁹

Charlatan or prophet? Heresy or truth? While the reactions to Joseph’s doctrines remain clearly mixed, one thing is certain: the doctrines he proclaimed are not as “unique” as they used to be.

359. Bloom, *American Religion*, 126–27.

David L. Paulsen (david_paulsen@byu.edu) is Professor of Philosophy at Brigham Young University and a former member of the BYU Studies Academy. He received his JD at the University of Chicago Law School and his PhD in Philosophy from the University of Michigan. Student assistants Craig Atkinson, Adam Bentley, Robb Duffin, and Brett McDonald have each made major contributions to the research for and preparation of this paper. Kevin Christensen, Carl Cranney, Edward T. Jones, Carl Mosser, Blake Ostler, Tom Russon, Paul Wilson, and, especially, Charles Harrell have also made valuable contributions. Funding for this project has been generously provided by the Department of Philosophy, the College of Humanities, and the Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship—all at Brigham Young University.

A Prologue to Genesis

Moses 1 in Light of Jewish Traditions

E. Douglas Clark

Referring to ancient and long-lost scripture that Joseph Smith restored, Wilford Woodruff declared it to be part of “the rich treasures that are revealed unto us in the last days.”¹ One such treasure is Moses chapter 1, a scriptural jewel we have hardly begun to appreciate but whose luster has become more apparent in light of various ancient texts and traditions that have emerged since Joseph Smith’s day. So striking are the parallels as to recall Joseph’s own prophecy that “the world will prove Joseph Smith a true prophet by circumstantial evidence.”²

Beginning with the work of Hugh Nibley, scholars writing on Joseph Smith have focused on the Prophet’s retrieval of the ancient past, as exemplified by a session at the 2005 Library of Congress conference entitled “Joseph Smith and the Recovery of Past Worlds.”³ That Joseph’s restoration went far beyond primitive Christianity into the oldest traditions of the Hebrew Bible has been noticed by several scholars, including Yale’s Harold Bloom, who wrote that Joseph Smith “was an authentic religious genius, unique in our national history. . . . Smith’s insight could have come only from a remarkably apt reading of the Bible, and there I would locate

1. Wilford Woodruff, *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal: 1833–1893, Typescript*, ed. Scott G. Kenney, 9 vols. (Midvale, Utah: Signature Books, 1983), 2:159, as recorded by Wilford after helping set the type for the March 1842 printing of one of the original installments of the Book of Abraham.

2. Joseph Fielding Smith and Richard C. Galbraith, eds., *Scriptural Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1993), 301.

3. John W. Welch, ed., *The Worlds of Joseph Smith: A Bicentennial Conference at the Library of Congress* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 2006), 53–117.

E. Douglas Clark

“When I first set out to show the interesting parallels between Moses 1 and Jubilees 1,” says E. Douglas Clark, it was “only as an afterthought that I began to look at other sources for additional possible parallels, and I was struck by the specificity and number of what I discovered.” As with many distinguished scholars who have done careful comparative evaluations of ancient writings and Joseph Smith texts, Clark is impressed that “one cannot examine these without ending up with a profound appreciation for the authenticity and value of ancient scripture restored through the Prophet Joseph Smith.”



Clark sees Moses 1 and Jubilees 1 as prologues to Genesis. Significantly, Moses 1 appeared before the Jubilees prologue was known to exist. Clark continues, “As I see it, the emergence of numerous parallels to Moses 1 in a host of previously unknown ancient sources yields evidence for the authenticity and antiquity of Moses 1. The evidence is compelling enough that a burden of proof would now rest on those who would argue against the prophetic calling of both Moses and Joseph Smith.”

Clark hopes to continue this study with a larger work involving other passages of modern scripture. Comparing ancient texts with restored scripture not only generates circumstantial evidence but also creates opportunities for fresh insights as well: “I hope that readers will come away with a greater appreciation of the remarkable events and truths contained in Moses 1, along with a greater appreciation of the prophetic calling of the man through whom it was brought to light in our day.”

For the full text of Jubilees 1, go to byustudies.byu.edu.

the secret of his religious genius. . . . So strong was this act of reading that it broke through all the orthodoxies—Protestant, Catholic, Judaic—and found its way back to elements that Smith rightly intuited had been censored out of the stories of the archaic Jewish religion.”⁴

Moses 1 was revealed shortly after the organization of the Church to the twenty-four-year-old Joseph Smith, who prefaced the account with these words: “Amid all the trials and tribulations we had to wade through, the Lord, who well knew our infantile and delicate situation, vouchsafed for us a supply of strength, and granted us ‘line upon line of knowledge—here a little and there a little,’ of which the following was a precious morsel.”⁵ This precious morsel would be but the first chapter of what is now published in the Pearl of Great Price as the Book of Moses, which in addition to its place in the Latter-day Saint canon of scripture also constitutes the first portion of Joseph Smith’s inspired translation of our traditional Genesis account.⁶

The famous opening words of Genesis, “In the beginning,” launch the reader immediately into the creation account without any hint of authorship. Not so in the Book of Moses, whose first chapter serves as a kind of prologue⁷ to the creation account, which is a revelation to Moses when he was “caught up into an exceedingly high mountain” (Moses 1:1). Further

4. Harold Bloom, *The American Religion: The Emergence of the Post-Christian Nation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992), 82, 84. For Mormon perspectives on Bloom’s interpretation of Joseph Smith and Mormonism, see Eugene England, Truman G. Madsen, Charles Randall Paul, and Richard F. Haglund Jr., “Four LDS Views on Harold Bloom: A Roundtable,” *BYU Studies* 35, no. 1 (1995): 173–204.

5. Joseph Smith Jr., *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, ed. B. H. Roberts, 2d ed., rev., 7 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971), 1:98.

6. Moses 1 was published for the first time in Nauvoo, Illinois, in the January 16, 1843, edition of *Times and Seasons*. It was rightly placed as the first chapter of Joseph Smith’s translation of Genesis in 1867 by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. This same format was soon adopted by the Latter-day Saint Church in its 1878 edition of the Pearl of Great Price with its publication of the “Book of Moses” (comprised of the first eight chapters of Joseph Smith’s Genesis translation).

7. Nibley used the phrase “Prologue in Heaven” to describe the relationship of a few of the initial verses of Moses 1 (verses 2–8) to the rest of the chapter. He went on to point out other texts that contain similar prologues, most specifically Job. Hugh W. Nibley, *Teachings of the Pearl of Great Price: Transcripts of Lectures Presented to an Honors Book of Mormon Class at Brigham Young University, Winter Semester 1986* (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2004), 205. Other prologues include the *Shabako Stone*, the *Enuma Elish*, the *Mephite Theology*, the *Odyssey*, *Faust*, *Lokasenna*, Abraham 3:22, and 1 Nephi 1:8–15. Nibley, *Teachings of the Pearl of Great Price*, 210–12.

underscoring the importance of Moses 1 is the observation of historian Richard Bushman that it “is worth close attention because it laid down themes Joseph would return to for the rest of his life.”⁸

The prevailing academic theory of the origin of the book of Genesis denies Mosaic authorship, claiming instead that Genesis is a synthesis of several different source documents that were redacted or edited into the Pentateuch long after the time of Moses.⁹ In contrast, ancient Jewish and Christian tradition insisted on the historical Moses as the author of Genesis and the other four books of the Pentateuch. This tenet was memorialized in the thirteenth century by Maimonides as one of Judaism’s thirteen Principles of Faith: “I believe with a perfect faith that the whole Torah now in our possession is the same that was given to Moses our teacher.”¹⁰ Modern scholars have similarly noted, “For the Jewish, and to an only somewhat lesser degree, Christian religions it is axiomatic that Moses, ‘our Master’, wrote Genesis.”¹¹

Curiously, however, as pointed out in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, “Genesis itself contains no information about its authorship, nor can any biblical passage be cited in support of a tradition concerning it.”¹² The Book of Moses prologue asserting Mosaic authorship has no counterpart in any of the extant ancient Bible translations of Genesis such as the Septuagint

8. Richard Lyman Bushman, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Knopf, 2005), 134.

9. This theory, called the documentary hypothesis, sees four general strands or sources in the received text. These are the Yahwist (J), Elohist (E), Deuteronomist (D), and the Priestly (P). While the documentary hypothesis as articulated by Julius Wellhausen enjoyed unquestioned status for over a century, the hypothesis has come under critique in the past twenty-five years. John J. Collins has recently called it a “highly speculative enterprise.” Nevertheless, he and other scholars still see strands of J, E, D, and P. Today, the debate centers largely around the parsing of texts rather than the general theory. While the separation of the J and E sources is often difficult, the disentangling of the D and P sources is easier. This isn’t to say that some J and E passages are not easily separated, for example, the flood narratives, the burning bush, and the doublets throughout Genesis and Exodus. This is why some scholars prefer the identifier *JE*. John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 57–64.

10. Louis Isaac Rabinowitz, “Pentateuch: The Traditional View,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 17 vols., corrected ed. (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, n.d.), 13:262.

11. Yehuda T. Radday and Haim Shore, *Genesis: An Authorship Study in Computer-Assisted Statistical Linguistics*, *Analecta Biblica* no. 103 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985), 1.

12. Nahum M. Sarna, “Genesis, Book of: Composition—The Critical View,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 7:388.

(early Greek) or the Samaritan Pentateuch, nor in any of the Aramaic paraphrases (known as Targums). Nor is any such prologue to be found in the Genesis story as retold by the first-century historian Josephus, nor in the retellings by Pseudo-Philo, Jasher, or the Chronicles of Jerahmeel.

But the most ancient Jewish retelling of Genesis, a work called the Book of Jubilees which was unknown in Joseph Smith's day, does in fact begin with a prologue that has remarkable parallels to Moses 1. Both of these introductory texts act as prologues to writings of Moses. Other striking parallels are also found in additional ancient texts and traditions, none of which, in all likelihood, were known to Joseph Smith. This short study will explore these parallels, along with the unique value of Moses 1 for Latter-day Saints.

An Ancient Surviving Prologue to a Genesis Account

Throughout the history of ancient Israel, much of the sacred literature of the Hebrews was recorded and compiled into the Pentateuch.¹³ Many books were in circulation from the Jewish return from Babylon until the time of Jesus, a number of which books were not included in the Hebrew canon nor in later Christian canons. These unpublished books now comprise a large collection of works generally thought to date from about 200 BC to AD 200,¹⁴ but often preserving traditions far older. One of these extracanonical books is the Book of Jubilees, whose title derives from the book's divisions of time from Adam until the Exodus into forty-nine-year periods of Jubilee.¹⁵ The entire book is extant only in medieval Ethiopic texts, although a large portion of a Latin text survived. These texts were likely originally translated directly from Hebrew manuscripts.¹⁶ Fifteen older Hebrew fragments of the book were also discovered in the Qumran collection of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scroll fragments of the Book of Jubilees include chapter one, providing an important textual witness to the medieval Ethiopic text.¹⁷

13. John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 64.

14. James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 1:xxv.

15. Philip R. Davies, George J. Brooke, and Phillip R. Callaway, *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002), 102–5. See also Leviticus 25:8–16, 23–55, 27:16–25, and Numbers 36:4.

16. James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1977), 5, 16–17.

17. Jubilee fragments were found in caves 1, 2, 3, 4, and 11 at Qumran. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, xi. For an

Scholars traditionally date the composition of Jubilees to the second century BC, making it the earliest¹⁸ known retelling of Genesis. In addition, as one prominent scholar points out, “the Jubilees stories are themselves the crystallization of earlier tradition.”¹⁹ Jubilees gives an account of the creation of the world and tells stories about Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Moses. The book is of special interest to Latter-day Saints for several reasons, not the least of which is its emphasis on themes like priesthood and the latter days, and its strong affinities with early Enoch texts, most especially 1 Enoch, which also happens to be preserved in Ethiopic.²⁰ Jubilees was apparently considered authoritative among the Dead Sea community of Qumran,²¹ in whose library, discovered in 1947, the only known Hebrew manuscripts of Jubilees have been found. Although Jubilees was referred to and at times quoted by a number of early Christian authors,²² it went the way of many other important texts possessed by early Jewish and Christian communities, as explained by a modern scholar: “By the strangest quirk of fate respecting literature that I know of, large numbers of writings by Jews were completely lost from the transmitted Jewish heritage.”²³ It was only in 1844 that Western scholars even became aware of the existence of a copy of the book of Jubilees; the first modern translation from a Latin version appeared in German in 1850–51, and it was not until 1895 that the first English translation, from the Ethiopic, was published. Even now it remains little known outside of academic circles.²⁴

English translation of the Qumran book of Jubilees, see Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *Parabiblical Texts*, The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 3:38–87.

18. James C. VanderKam, “Book of Jubilees,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 434–35.

19. George W. E. Nickelsburg, quoted in Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergen, eds., *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 171.

20. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:5–89; VanderKam, “Book of Jubilees,” 436. For a development of the eschatology of the book of Jubilees, see Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: E. G. Brill, 1971). For a discussion of the cosmology of the book of Jubilees, see James M. Scott, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

21. VanderKam, “Book of Jubilees,” 437.

22. James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Vol. 511, Scriptores Aethiopici, Tomus 88 (Lovanii: In Aedibus E. Peeters, 1989), xii–xviii.

23. Samuel Sandmel, in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:xi.

24. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:42.

The first thing one notices about Jubilees is that, in contrast to Genesis, the creation account is preceded by an entire chapter of prologue that describes the setting for the subsequent divine revelation to Moses. Moses is divinely summoned to a mountain where he experiences God's glory and is instructed to record what he would be told. He is then apprised of the future apostasy of the children of Israel after they are settled in the promised land and how they would kill the prophets and go into captivity. He learns that eventually, however, the children of Israel would repent and be transplanted back as a righteous plant. Following Moses' intercessory prayer, in which he pleads with the Lord to show mercy and salvation to the people, Moses is again instructed to write everything that should be made known to him, and "the angel of the presence" is told to dictate to Moses the whole account of the creation and the division of years until all creation would be renewed by the powers of heaven.

The similarities to the prologue in the Book of Moses are striking, beginning with the fact that each of the two prologues constitutes an entire prefatory chapter providing the setting for the subsequent divine revelation to Moses about the creation and early history of the world. In addition, in both versions Moses is atop a mountain when the Lord's glory is made manifest to him (Moses 1:1–2; Jubilees 1:1–3). Both tell that Moses learned not only about what had gone before but also about things yet to come (Moses 1:41; Jubilees 1:4). In both versions Moses is instructed to write what he sees in a book for the benefit of those who would live in a future time (Moses 1:40–42; Jubilees 1:5–6). And both mention a future age of divine revelation to those who would believe (Moses 1:41–42; Jubilees 1:22–25).

There are also important differences between the two accounts, as when, for example, Moses 1 recounts that Moses was taught about the Only Begotten—a feature understandably absent from Jubilees, which came down to us through Jewish hands. Nor does Jubilees tell of Moses' encounter with Satan or of the Lord's grand purpose in his vast creations, all as chronicled in Moses 1.

Other Echoes of the Restored Prologue

Other parallels to Moses 1 absent in Jubilees are found in yet other ancient Jewish traditions, including those preserved in pseudepigraphical texts, rabbinic commentary, medieval Kabbalistic texts, and other traditions handed down. These additional parallels are remarkably specific and cumulatively impressive.

Moses' Theophany as an Ascension. In Moses 1, Moses' theophany takes place not on a mountain that he has climbed but rather on "an exceedingly high mountain" to which he has been "caught up" (Moses 1:1). One rabbinic source, commenting on what Moses beheld at the burning bush, notes that "what the righteous see ennobles them, because it elevates them to the loftiest heights."²⁵ What is implied in this source is expressly attested in others, that at the burning bush Moses was caught up from the earthly realm to a loftier place to speak directly with God.²⁶

The Transfiguration of Moses. In the Joseph Smith account, "The glory of God was upon Moses; therefore Moses could endure his presence" (Moses 1:2), and Moses later mused: "Mine own eyes have beheld God; but not my natural, but my spiritual eyes, for my natural eyes could not have beheld; for I should have withered and died in his presence; but his glory was upon me; and I beheld his face, for I was transfigured before him" (Moses 1:11). Likewise, rabbinic texts disclose that as Moses was taken up from the burning bush to a higher place, he knew that as mere flesh and blood he could not endure the divine presence and was gloriously transfigured so that his flesh resembled fire.²⁷ One source describes how "the Lord . . . clothed Moses with the brightness of his glory."²⁸

The Timing of Moses' Theophany. In Moses 1, Moses' theophany precedes the Exodus—the very task Moses was assigned to perform: "Blessed art thou, Moses, for I, the Almighty, have chosen thee, and thou shalt be made stronger than many waters; for they shall obey thy command as if thou wert God" (Moses 1:25). In contrast, Moses' theophany in Jubilees occurs on Mount Sinai after Moses had led the children of Israel out of Egypt.

Even so, ancient Jewish sources speak of multiple ascensions of Moses, including one at the beginning of his career and another during the Exodus. It was no less an authority than Louis Ginzberg, the famous copious compiler of Jewish legends, who pointed out that when medieval sources

25. Menahem M. Kasher, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation: A Millennial Anthology*, 9 vols. (New York: American Biblical Encyclopedia Society, 1953–1979), 7:82, quoting Esther Rabbah 7:9.

26. Kasher, *Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation*, 7:97–99, 130; Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols. (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–1938), 2:305–6, and accompanying notes in 5:416–18.

27. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 2:306, and accompanying notes in 5:416.

28. Cited in J. P. Stehelin, *Rabbinical Literature: or, the Traditions of the Jews Contained in the Talmud and Other Mystical Writings*, 2 vols. (London: J. Robinson, 1748), 1:7.

quote only fragments from Moses' ascension, it is impossible to tell to which ascension they are referring²⁹—showing how easily the different ascension accounts could have become confused or conflated.

A Type of the Messiah. As the divine glory rests upon Moses in the Joseph Smith prologue, Moses is told that he is “in the similitude of [the] Only Begotten” (Moses 1:6). This similarity of Moses to the coming Messiah is echoed in widespread Jewish tradition (reflected also in the New Testament) seeing Moses as a prototype of the Messiah.³⁰ According to the Testament of Levi (ancestor of Moses), the coming Messiah’s “appearance is inexpressibly like that of a prophet [or ‘high prophet’³¹] of the Most High of the posterity of our father Abraham”—apparently referring to Moses.³²

Confrontation of Satan. The Joseph Smith version also recounts Moses’ encounter with Satan, who, upon being spurned by Moses, began to rant and rave, causing Moses “to fear exceedingly; and as he began to fear, he saw the bitterness of hell” (Moses 1:20). Similarly, in rabbinic texts, after Moses receives the Torah he is confronted by Satan.³³ Another tradition remembers that at the burning bush, Moses was granted a vision of hell and the horrific suffering of the wicked,³⁴ who, as Moses saw, “cried bitterly.”³⁵

Vision of All Things. After Satan’s departure in the Joseph Smith prologue, as divine glory once again rested on Moses, he “cast his eyes and beheld the earth, yea, even all of it; and there was not a particle of it

29. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 5:417.

30. Gerhard Kittel, ed., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964–1976), 4:857–73.

31. H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 149. The authors comment that “the coming of Jesus Christ is compared with that of a great prophet, not just a prophet (of the Most High).” Hollander, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 150.

32. Testament of Levi 8:14, translation in Kittel, *Theological Dictionary* 4:859 n. 131. This verse is cited by the author of the article, J. Jeremias, as part of his discussion regarding the similarity of Moses to the Messiah. The versions of the Testament of Levi vary in their readings of this verse, giving rise to different translations; for example, see Testament of Levi 8:15 in R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908), 46.

33. Shabbath 89a, in I. Epstein, ed. *Shabbath: Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*, trans. H. Freedman (London: Soncino, 1972).

34. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 2:309–313 and accompanying notes in 5:418–19 n. 118–19.

35. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 2:310.

which he did not behold, discerning it by the spirit of God” (Moses 1:27). Similarly, in a pseudepigraphical source named Ezekiel the Tragedian, Moses recounts that while on Mount Sinai in the presence of the Almighty, “I gazed upon the whole earth round about; things under it, and high above the skies.”³⁶ Likewise in the Zohar, when God spoke to Moses before the Exodus, Moses beheld properties of matter “which were concealed from all others but revealed to him,” things which “are hidden, and Moses alone perceived them.”³⁷ From ancient times and continuing through the Middle Ages there was a persistent tradition holding that Moses was “the greatest universal genius and master of”—as well as “founder of”—“all the arts and sciences.”³⁸ Sir Isaac Newton traced the idea of atomism—of matter as composed of atoms—to none other than the Hebrew prophet Moses.³⁹

Vision of All Generations. According to the restored prologue, Moses saw not only the earth and its constituent particles, but also “the inhabitants thereof, and there was not a soul which he beheld not; and he discerned them by the spirit of God; and their numbers were great, even numberless as the sand upon the sea shore” (Moses 1:28). So also a rabbinic source tells that even as “God did shew unto Adam every Generation,” meaning “all the Souls, which were to come into the World, . . . so that Adam could perfectly distinguish them,” later “thus it happened on Mount Sinai” with Moses, so that “the Souls, which were not then born into the world, were present on Mount Sinai, in the same form in which they were to appear in the World.”⁴⁰

Worlds without Number. As Moses’ vision in the restored prologue continues to unfold, he sees “many lands; and each land was called earth, and there were inhabitants on the face thereof” (Moses 1:29). The Lord had already told Moses that “I will show thee the workmanship of mine hands; but not all, for my works are without end” (Moses 1:4). Now as the creations multiply before Moses’ eyes, he hears the Lord say: “For my own purpose have I made these things. Here is wisdom and it remaineth

36. Ezekiel the Tragedian 77–78 in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:812.

37. Zohar 23a through 23b in Harry Sperling, Maurice Simon, and Paul P. Levertoff, trans., *The Zohar*, 2d ed., 5 vols. (London: Soncino, 1984), 3:77–78. These passages speak in terms of colors, apparently a portion of the color spectrum that only Moses could see.

38. Raphael Patai, *The Jewish Alchemists: A History and Source Book* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 30–40.

39. John Fauvel and others, eds., *Let Newton Be!* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 194–95.

40. Stehelin, *Rabbinical Literature*, 1:269, quoting Jalkut [Yalkut] Chadash.

in me. . . . And worlds without number have I created; and I also created them for mine own purpose; and by the Son I created them, which is mine Only Begotten” (Moses 1:31, 33).

An intriguing echo of this event appears to have survived in the Zohar, which, in commenting on God’s revelations to Moses before the Exodus, tells of “a hidden region, so transcendent that it passes all understanding, the very source whence the worlds were designed and came into being.” Indeed, the very name by which God revealed himself to Moses implies “fashioning of worlds.”⁴¹ What makes these statements in the Zohar so remarkable is that the doctrine of multiple worlds disappeared from orthodox Judaism, to be revealed anew in the dispensation of the early Christians (who spoke much of it⁴²), only to be lost again in the apostasy that soon followed.⁴³ It was Sir Isaac Newton who, near the end of his lifetime of assiduous study of the structure of the universe and the wisdom of the ancients,⁴⁴ stated that this earth “is but a sort of picture of the Universe,” for “God always created new worlds, always creates new worlds, new systems to multiply the infinitude of his beneficiaries, and extend all happiness beyond all compass and imagination.”⁴⁵ Since Newton’s death in 1727, the remarkable advancements in astronomy for which he opened the way have led a number of leading astronomers to conclude that there must indeed be numerous other worlds supporting intelligent life.⁴⁶

Worlds Yet to Come. In the Joseph Smith prologue, Moses learns not only about existing and past worlds but also about worlds to come. God informs him that “as one earth shall pass away, and the heavens thereof even so shall another come; and there is no end to my works” (Moses 1:38). So also, according to the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, Moses was shown “the worlds which have not yet come.”⁴⁷

41. Zohar 22a in Sperling, Simon, and Levertoff, *The Zohar*, 3:74.

42. Hugh Nibley, *Temple and Cosmos: Beyond This Ignorant Present*, vol. 12 of The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1992), 285–95.

43. Nibley, *Temple and Cosmos*, 293–94; Hugh Nibley, *Old Testament and Related Studies*, vol. 1 of The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1986), 140.

44. Fauvel, *Let Newton Be!* 185–201.

45. Gale E. Christianson, *In the Presence of the Creator: Isaac Newton and His Times* (Norwalk, Conn.: Easton Press, 1989), 574.

46. James S. Trefil, *Space Time Infinity* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985; Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1985), 168–75; Byron Preiss, ed., *The Universe* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1987), 302–14.

47. 2 Baruch 59:9 in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:642.

Contemplating the Divine Creator and His Grand Purpose. The Joseph Smith prologue further tells that as Moses sees the creations stretch out beyond what he could ever have imagined, he asks God: “Tell me, I pray thee, why these things are so, and by what thou madest them.” God responds, “For mine own purpose have I made these things. Here is wisdom and it remaineth in me” (Moses 1:30–31), and that “only an account of this earth, and the inhabitants thereof, give I unto you” (Moses 1:35). Why? Because, as the Lord had explained earlier, “no man can behold all my works, except he behold all my glory; and no man can behold all my glory, and afterwards remain in the flesh on the earth” (Moses 1:5).

Similarly the Zohar, in speaking of God’s revelation to Moses and “the worlds [that] were designed and came into being,” explains that up to a certain “point only is it permissible to contemplate the Godhead, but not beyond, for it is wholly recondite.”⁴⁸ According to one Talmudic passage, upon receiving the Torah from God, Moses asked “that He should show him the ways of the Holy One.”⁴⁹ God’s answer is the same as in the Joseph Smith version; says the Talmud: “God would not grant Moses’ wish to behold all his glory.”⁵⁰ Even if some of the answers were reserved for later, Moses learns, as recounted in the Joseph Smith prologue, the great secret behind all of God’s expansive and eternal creative activity—that his work and glory is “to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man” (Moses 1:39).

Looking Ahead to the Last Days. Accordingly, Moses would be shown the history of only his own earth and would record that history for future generations, even if, as God tells Moses in the Joseph Smith prologue, the day would come when “the children of men shall esteem my words as naught and take many of them from the book which thou shalt write” (Moses 1:41). But those intentional omissions in Moses’ history would eventually be remedied by the Lord of history, who promised Moses that “I will raise up another like unto thee; and they shall be had again among the children of men—among as many as shall believe” (Moses 1:41).

The oldest⁵¹ Jewish source mentioning Moses’ view of hell, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, tells also that God showed Moses “many warnings together with the ways of the Law and the end of time.”⁵² The Syriac

48. Zohar 22a in Sperling, Simon, and Levartoff, *The Zohar*, 3:74.

49. Berakoth 7a, in I. Epstein, ed., *Berakoth: Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*, trans. Maurice Simon (London: Soncino, 1990).

50. Aaron Rothkoff, “Moses: In the Aggadah,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 12:397.

51. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 5:419 n. 118.

52. 2 Baruch 59:4 in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:641–42.

Apocalypse of Baruch was translated into Latin in 1866 and first into English by R. H. Charles in 1896.⁵³ Like nearly all of the other texts and traditions mentioned above, it was unavailable to Joseph Smith, the man whom the Lord raised up to be “like unto” Moses to restore by revelation the passages long ago deleted from the account originally revealed to Moses.

Value of Moses 1 for Latter-day Saints

Moses 1, as revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith, offers a unique contribution to the vast canon of revealed scripture. The entire absence of Moses 1 from the version of Genesis that has come down to us, along with continuing debates about the authorship of the Pentateuch, certainly bear out God’s revelation to Moses that “the children of men shall esteem my words as naught and take many of them from the book which thou shalt write” (Moses 1:41). Of course, as Nibley noted, “those who wish to credit Joseph Smith with a comprehension of comparative literature and ritual far beyond his time and training are free to do so. They may even insist . . . that this is the way any uneducated rustic would tell the story.” But today “we have several very ancient and significant parallels to Moses 1, which lie far beyond the reach of coincidence or daydreaming. The number of details and the order in which they occur make it perfectly clear that we are dealing with specific works of great antiquity that come from a common source.”⁵⁴

As a prologue to the creation account in Genesis, the restored words in Moses 1 serve as an essential introduction to the full book of Genesis, and, indeed, to the entire Bible. This prologue reveals the setting, background, and context for all the words, deeds, and purposes of God. It provides crucial understanding of the nature of God—that human beings were created in the image and likeness of God and that Moses could see God “face to face” and talk with him (Moses 1:2). It discloses the origin of man and God’s love for his children: “Behold, thou art my son” (Moses 1:4). It exposes the reality of Satan and his role in God’s plan (Moses 1:20–22). It also establishes the need for a Savior and Redeemer, who, as Moses learned, is called the “Only Begotten” (Moses 1:6), and introduces the functions of the Holy Ghost (Moses 1:24). All of this leads to an understanding of the work and the glory of God and his grand plan for his children (Moses 1:39), providing eternal purpose and meaning to life.

53. R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, vol. 2: Pseudepigrapha (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 480 note b.

54. Hugh W. Nibley, *Nibley on the Timely and Timeless* (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, 1978), 7.

Without these plain and precious truths revealed in Moses 1, we are hard pressed to understand the drama that begins in Genesis and continues to our day. For as we enter mortality, as Nibley observes, we find ourselves in the position of someone who arrives late to a play and must leave early, and so never sees the beginning or the end, but while there is actually ushered onto the stage to play a brief part.⁵⁵ The restored prologue in Moses 1 tells us what the drama is all about and points the way for us to prepare for that immortality and eternal life which God has prepared for his children.

55. Hugh Nibley, *The World and the Prophets*, vol. 3 of *The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1987), 268–69.

E. Douglas Clark is an attorney and has consulted at numerous United Nations conferences and events in New York and around the world. He received his BA, MBA, and JD degrees from Brigham Young University, where he was managing editor of the law review. His publications include *The Blessings of Abraham: Becoming a Zion People* (American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 2005); “Cedars and Stars: Enduring Symbols of Cosmic Kingship in Abraham’s Encounter with Pharaoh,” in *Astronomy, Papyrus, and Covenant*, ed. John Gee and Brian M. Hauglid, no. 3 in *Studies in the Book of Abraham* (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2005); and *The Grand Design: America from Columbus to Zion* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992).

Old Testament Bibliography

Latter-day Saint Publications, 1997–2005

David Rolph Seely, W. Kenneth Hamblin, and Erica Lamb Holland

This is a continuation of the comprehensive bibliography of LDS writings on the Old Testament published in *BYU Studies* 37, no. 2 (1997–98), available at byustudies.byu.edu, under Resources. This bibliography includes publications from 1997 to the end of 2005 as well as a few older publications that were not included in the first bibliography.

Since that bibliography, there has been a Sperry Symposium dedicated to the Old Testament; all of those printed proceedings (*Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns of the Old Testament*) are included in this bibliography. Published in 2005 is the volume *Sperry Symposium Classics*, a collection of papers from previous symposia; since many of those articles were revised for the 2005 volume, they are included here. Also relevant to the Old Testament is a volume published by FARMS entitled *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Of note but not included in this bibliography because of space considerations are the many Old Testament topics discussed in encyclopedic form in *The Book of Mormon Reference Companion*, edited by Dennis Largely, Deseret Book, 2003.

Frequently Cited Sources

Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns of the Old Testament: The Thirtieth Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2001.

Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem. Edited by John W. Welch, David Rolph Seely, and Jo Ann H. Seely. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2004.

Prelude to the Restoration: From Apostasy to the Restored Church: The Thirty-third Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2004.

Sperry Symposium Classics: The Old Testament. Edited by Paul Y. Hoskisson. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005.

When I was a student, before there were computerized concordances, I decided to create a scripture index of the published teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith. I quickly realized that in almost every sentence the Prophet quoted, paraphrased, or alluded to the Bible. The Prophet and the early Saints read and loved the Bible, particularly the Old Testament. In the Old Testament they found the foundations of the restored gospel. The first biblical commentary written by a Latter-day Saint was Oliver Cowdery's short commentary on the book of Zephaniah, which he interpreted as a prophecy of the Restoration. One of the reasons that I made and now have updated this LDS Old Testament bibliography was to acknowledge the love the modern Saints have for the Old Testament as measured by their writings.



Several things of interest have emerged from this ongoing project. Much of LDS scholarship on the Old Testament is intertwined with research on the Book of Mormon, the Pearl of Great Price, and the Joseph Smith Translation—highlighting the blessings we enjoy of these modern scriptures.

LDS scholars have written a great deal on Genesis and Isaiah but far less on other important books in the Bible such as Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and in particular the Psalms—a book which in many ways is the spiritual heart of the Old Testament. Much important work remains. LDS scholarship has begun a great conversation on the Old Testament. My hope is that Latter-day Saint scholars, before beginning to work on an Old Testament topic, will use this bibliography to quickly survey what has been done before to more intelligently and productively enter into this conversation.

Making bibliographies is tedious work, and even in the days of computers it is difficult to locate every entry. I would appreciate any feedback on entries that have been overlooked so that we can further update this comprehensive bibliography. I have always enjoyed the help of good assistants, and I thank Erica Lamb Holland and Ken Hamblin for their work on this project.

Bibliography by Author with Full Citation

- Adams, William James, Jr. "Nephi's Written Language and the Standard Biblical Hebrew of 600 B.C." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 245–58.
- Allred, Philip A. "Moses' Charge to Remember." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 55–73.
- Amistad, Modesto M., Jr. "Wanted: Modern Nehemiahs." *Ensign* 32 (December 2002): 44–46.
- Andreason, Bruce L. "The Mantle of Elijah." *Ensign* 32 (August 2002): 24–26.
- Anderson, Sharon Price. "To Ephraim and Manasseh." *Ensign* 34 (February 2004): 15 (poem).
- Austin, Michael. "Meditations on the Book of Esther." *Sunstone* 118 (April 2001): 73–75 (essay).
- Bailey, Arthur A. "What Modern Revelation Teaches about Adam." *Ensign* 28 (January 1998): 20–27.
- Ball, Terry B. "Isaiah and the Gentiles." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 180–94.
- Ball, Terry B., and Wilford M. Hess. "Agriculture in Lehi's World: Some Textual, Historical, Archaeological, and Botanical Insights." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 149–92.
- Ballard, M. Russell. "The Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign* 28 (October 1998): 6–13.
- Barker, Margaret. "What Did King Josiah Reform?" In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 523–42.
- Barney, Kevin L. "Divine Discourse Directed at a Prophet's Posterity in the Plural: Further Light on Enallage." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 6, no. 2 (1997): 229–34.
- . "Examining Six Key Concepts in Joseph Smith's Understanding of Genesis 1:1." *BYU Studies* 39, no. 3 (2000): 107–24.
- . "Isaiah Interwoven." *FARMS Review of Books* 15, no. 1 (2003): 353–402.
- . "Joseph Smith's Emendation of Hebrew Genesis 1:1." *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 30, no. 4 (Winter 1997): 103–35.
- . "Reflections on the Documentary Hypothesis." *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 57–99.
- Bassett, K. Douglas. *Commentaries on Isaiah in the Book of Mormon*. American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 2003.
- Bennett, Richard E. "The Rising of the Holy Bible to the Restoration." In *Prelude to the Restoration*, 40–58.
- Bird, Randall C. "Moses and the Passover." *Ensign* 32 (February 2002): 31–33.
- Bokovoy, David E. "The Calling of Isaiah." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 128–39.
- . "From Distance to Proximity: A Poetic Function of Enallage in the Hebrew Bible and the Book of Mormon." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 9, no. 1 (2000): 60–63.
- Bokovoy, David E., and John A. Tvedtnes. *Testaments: Links between the Book of Mormon and the Hebrew Bible*. Tooele, Utah: Heritage, 2003.

- Brandt, Edward J. "The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 133–53.
- Brough, Monte J. "Living the Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign* 30 (April 2000): 44–49.
- Brown, Matthew B. *The Gate of Heaven: Insights on the Doctrines and Symbols of the Temple*. American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 1999.
- . "Girded about with a Lambskin." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 6, no. 2 (1997): 124–51.
- Brown, S. Kent. "Jerusalem Connections to Arabia in 600 B.C." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 625–46.
- . "Trust in the Lord: Exodus and Faith." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 154–63.
- Browning, Paul K. "Gathering Scattered Israel: Then and Now." *Ensign* 28 (July 1998): 54–61.
- Bybee, Ariel E. "A Woman's World in Lehi's Jerusalem." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 131–48.
- Call, Terry W. "Facing the Fiery Furnace." *Ensign* 32 (October 2002): 8–10.
- Campbell, Linda M. "Hannah: Devoted Handmaid of the Lord." *Ensign* 28 (March 1998): 46–49.
- Carver, Timothy L. "Enjoying the Old Testament." *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 56–60.
- Chadwick, Jeffrey R. "Lehi's House in Jerusalem and the Land of His Inheritance." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 81–130.
- Christensen, Jess L. "The Choice That Began Mortality." *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 36–38.
- Christensen, Kevin. "The Temple, the Monarchy, and Wisdom: Lehi's World and the Scholarship of Margaret Barker." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 449–22.
- Coleman, Gary J. "The Book of Mormon: A Guide for the Old Testament." *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 45–49.
- Compton, Todd. "'Kingdom of Priests': Priesthood, Temple, and Women in the Old Testament and in the Restoration." *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 36, no. 3 (Fall 2003): 41–59.
- Conkling, Chris. "The Book That Built a Better World." *Ensign* 28 (January 1998): 7–11.
- . "Created in the Image of God, Male and Female." *Ensign* 35 (January 2005): 48–49.
- Crowell, Angela M., and John A. Tvedtnes. "The Nephite and Jewish Practice of Blessing God after Eating One's Fill." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 6, no. 2 (1997): 251–54.
- Crowther, Duane S. *How to Understand the Book of Isaiah*. Bountiful, Utah: Horizon, 1998.
- Dahl, Larry E. "The Abrahamic Test." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 83–99.
- Davidson, Karen Lynn. "Eliza R. Snow, Psalmist of the Latter Days." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 302–14.
- Davis, Garold N. "Book of Mormon Commentary on Isaiah." *Ensign* 28 (September 1998): 54–60.

- Dozeman, Thomas B. "The Authorship of the Pentateuch." *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 32, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 87–112.
- Draper, Richard D. "Enoch: What Modern Scripture Teaches." *Ensign* 28 (January 1998): 28–33.
- . "I Have Even from the Beginning Declared It." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 140–61.
- . "The Prophets of the Exile: Saviors of a People." In *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*, 86–109; rpt. *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 245–65.
- Durkin, Timothy W. "Deuteronomy as a Constitutional Covenant." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 74–88.
- Eastmond, Mark Elbert. "Images of Mercy in the Writings of Isaiah." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 195–209.
- Eyring, Henry B. "Studying and Teaching the Old Testament." *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 30–34.
- Faulring, Scott H., Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews. *Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts*. Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2004.
- Ferrel, David W. "The Lord Is among Us!" *Ensign* 32 (February 2002): 34–36.
- First Presidency of the Church. "Origin of Man." *Ensign* 32 (February 2002): 26–30; rpt. from *Improvement Era* (November 1909): 75–81.
- Flake, Kathleen. "Evil's Origins and Evil's End in the Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis." *Sunstone* 111 (August 1998): 24–29.
- Fontaine, Carole R. "Wisdom Traditions in the Hebrew Bible." *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 101–17.
- Garner, Brian D. "Ezra Unfolds the Scriptures." *Ensign* 32 (December 2002): 47–49.
- Gee, John. "Egyptian Society during the Twenty-sixth Dynasty." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 277–98.
- . "A Seething Pot in the North: International Affairs Leading Up to Lehi's Day." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 543–60.
- Gileadi, Avraham. *The End from the Beginning: The Apocalyptic Vision of Isaiah*. Cave Junction, Ore.: Hebraeus Press, 1997.
- . *Isaiah Decoded: Ascending the Ladder to Heaven*. Escondido, Calif.: Hebraeus Press, 2002.
- . *The Last Days: Types and Shadows from the Bible and the Book of Mormon*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1991.
- Gillum, Gary P. "Obadiah's Vision of Saviors on Mount Zion." In *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*, 122–33; rpt. *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 226–35.
- Gorton, H. Clay. *The Legacy of the Brass Plates of Laban: A Comparison of Biblical and Book of Mormon Isaiah Texts*. Bountiful, Utah: Horizon, 1994.
- Grahl, Paulo R. "Eli and His Sons." *Ensign* 32 (June 2002): 18–20.
- Greaves, Sheldon. "Cosmos, Chaos, and Politics: Biblical Creation Patterns in Secular Contexts." *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 31, no. 3 (Fall 1998): 157–66.
- Green, Arnold H. "Gathering and Election: Israelite Descent and Universalism in Mormon Discourse." *Journal of Mormon History* 25, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 195–228.

- Hallen, Cynthia L. "Rebekah." *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 39–41.
- . "Redeeming the Desolate Woman: The Message of Isaiah 54 and 3 Nephi 22." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 7, no. 1 (1998): 40–47.
- Hamula, James J. "The Quest for Wisdom." *Ensign* 32 (July 2002): 40–42.
- Hardison, Amy Blake. "Being a Covenant People." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 19–34.
- Hardy, Ralph W., Jr. "Naaman and Gehazi: A Contrast in Obedience." *Ensign* 32 (August 2002): 27–29.
- Harris, Victor W. *Creative Ways to Teach the Old Testament, Vol. 1, Genesis–Deuteronomy*. N.p.: By the author, 2000.
- . *Creative Ways to Teach the Old Testament, Vol. 2, Joshua–Malachi*. N.p.: By the author, 2000.
- Hauglid, Brian M. "Temple Imagery in the Psalms." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 262–74.
- Hess, Wilford M. "Recent Notes about Olives in Antiquity." *BYU Studies* 39, no. 4 (2000): 115–26.
- Hinckley, Gordon B. "Overpowering the Goliaths in Our Lives." *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 2–6.
- Hite, Steven J., Julie M. Hite, and R. Tom Melville. *The Old Testament with the Joseph Smith Translation*. Orem, Utah: Veritas Group, 2001.
- Holland, Jeffrey R. "A Handful of Meal and a Little Oil." *Ensign* 26 (May 1996): 29–31.
- Horton, George A., Jr. "An Indispensable Foundation." *Ensign* 32 (March 2002): 38–41.
- Hoskisson, Paul Y. "A Latter-day Saint Reading of Isaiah: The Example of Isaiah 6." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 209–25.
- . "The Witness for Christ in Psalm 22." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 290–301.
- Hoskisson, Paul Y., ed. *Sperry Symposium Classics: The Old Testament*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005.
- Howick, E. Keith. *Challenged by the Old Testament*. Silverton, Idaho: WindRiver, 2004.
- . *Prophets of the Old Testament*. Silverton, Idaho: WindRiver, 2005.
- Hunter, Kendal Brian. *Consider My Servant Job*. Springville, Utah: Cedar Fort, 2004.
- Huntington, Ray L. "Consider Your Ways: The Book of Haggai and the Responsibilities and Blessings of Temple Work." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 236–44.
- . "I Have a Question: Do We Know Where Mount Sinai Is?" *Ensign* 28 (April 1998): 32–33.
- Jackson, Kent P. *The Book of Moses and the Joseph Smith Translation Manuscripts*. Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2005.
- . "I Have a Question: Why Is the Witness of Christ and His Mission Much Clearer in the Book of Mormon Than in the Old Testament?" *Ensign* 29 (September 1999): 66.

- . “Joseph Smith’s Cooperstown Bible: The Historical Context of the Bible Used in the Joseph Smith Translation.” *BYU Studies* 40, no. 1 (2001): 41–70.
- . *Lost Tribes and Last Days: What Modern Revelation Tells Us about the Old Testament*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005.
- . *The Restored Gospel and the Book of Genesis*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2001.
- Jeffery, Duane E. “Noah’s Flood: Modern Scholarship and Mormon Traditions.” *Sunstone* 134 (October 2004): 27–45.
- Jenson, Glen O. “Look and Live.” *Ensign* 32 (March 2002): 32–24.
- Jorgensen, B. W. “Scriptural Chastity Lessons: Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife; Corianton and Harlot Isabel.” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 32, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 7–34.
- Judd, Frank F., Jr. “Melchizedek: Seeking after the Zion of Enoch.” In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 69–82.
- King, Michael L. “Isaiah’s Vision of God’s Plan to Fulfill His Covenant.” In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 162–79.
- Knowles, Todd A. “Elijah Nurtures Faith.” *Ensign* 32 (July 2002): 43–45.
- Kotter, Wade. “Review of *LDS Perspectives on the Dead Sea Scrolls* by Donald W. Parry and Dana M. Pike.” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 32, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 159–60.
- Lane, Jennifer C. “The Lord Will Redeem His People: Adoptive Covenant and Redemption in the Old Testament.” In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 298–310.
- Largely, Dennis, ed. *The Book of Mormon Reference Companion*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2003.
- LeBaron, E. Dale. “Elijah’s Mission: His Keys, Powers, and Blessings from the Old Testament to the Latter Days.” In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 283–97.
- Lee, Peggy Furniss. “A King for Israel.” *Ensign* 32 (June 2002): 21–23.
- Ludlow, Victor L. *Unlocking Isaiah in the Book of Mormon*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2003.
- Lybbert, Merlin R. “The Powerful Potential of Scripture Stories.” *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 35.
- Madsen, Ann N. “‘His Hand Is Stretched Out Still’: The Lord’s Eternal Covenant of Mercy.” In *Revelation, Reason, and Faith: Essays in Honor of Truman G. Madsen*, edited by Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, and Stephen D. Ricks, 703–22. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2002.
- . “‘What Meaneth the Words That Are Written?’ Abinadi Interprets Isaiah.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 10, no. 1 (2001): 4–14.
- Madsen, David H. “Jacob and Esau.” *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 42–44.
- Madsen, John M. “A Precious and Powerful Witness of Jesus Christ.” In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 1–18; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 18–34.
- Marsh, W. Jeffrey. “Training from the Old Testament: Moroni’s Lessons for a Prophet.” *Ensign* 28 (August 1998): 10–17.
- Matthews, Robert J. “The Old Testament: A Voice from the Past and a Witness for the Lord Jesus Christ.” In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 35–47.

- Matthews, Robert J. "The Role of the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible in the Restoration of Doctrine." In *The Disciple as Witness: Essays on Latter-day Saint History and Doctrine in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, edited by Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges, 327–54. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000.
- Mauss, Armand L. "In Search of Ephraim: Traditional Mormon Conceptions of Lineage and Race." *Journal of Mormon History* 25, no. 1 (1999): 131–73.
- Menlove, Frances Lee. "A Listening Heart: Reflections on 1 Kings 3:5–9." *Sunstone* 124 (October 2002): 20–21.
- Meservy, Keith H. "Lord = Jehovah." *Ensign* 32 (June 2002): 29.
- Millet, Robert L. "The Ancient Covenant Restored." *Ensign* 28 (March 1998): 36–45.
- . "The Eternal Gospel." *Ensign* 26 (July 1996): 48–56.
- . "Prophets and Priesthood in the Old Testament." In *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*, 196–215; rpt. *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 48–68.
- Morgan, Christopher J. "The Sin of Achan." *Ensign* 32 (April 2002): 43–45.
- Muhlestein, Kerry. "Believing in the Atoning Power of Christ." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 89–100.
- Muldowney, Charles A. "Hezekiah's Tunnel Vision." *Ensign* 32 (September 2002): 30–33.
- Nelson, Russell M. "The Creation." *Ensign* 30 (May 2000): 84–86.
- . "The Exodus Repeated." *Ensign* 29 (July 1999): 6–13.
- . "Remnants Gathered, Covenants Fulfilled." In *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*, 1–21; rpt. *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 1–17.
- . "Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods." *Ensign* 26 (May 1996): 14–16.
- Newell, Lloyd D., and Robert L. Millet. *A Lamp unto My Feet: Daily Reflections on the Old Testament*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005.
- Nibley, Hugh W. "Great Are the Words of Isaiah." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 177–95.
- Ogden, D. Kelly. "Jerusalem." *Ensign* 33 (April 2003): 12–21.
- "Old Testament Times at a Glance." *Ensign* 32 (January 2002): 50–55.
- Olmstead, Thomas F. "The Savior's Use of the Old Testament." *Ensign* 32 (July 2002): 46–51.
- Parker, Todd B., and Robert Norman. "Moses: Witness of Jesus Christ." *Ensign* 28 (April 1998): 24–31.
- Parry, Donald W. "The Flood and the Tower of Babel." *Ensign* 28 (January 1998): 35–41.
- . *Harmonizing Isaiah: Combining Ancient Sources*. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2001.
- . "Messiah Becomes the New King: Notes on Isaiah 9:3–7." In *The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, edited by Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges, 305–21. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000.
- . "Symbolic Action as Prophecy in the Old Testament." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 337–55.

- . *Visualizing Isaiah*. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2001.
- Parry, Donald W., Jay A. Parry, and Tina M. Peterson. *Understanding Isaiah*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1998.
- Petersen, Scott R. *Where Have All the Prophets Gone? Revelation and Rebellion in the Old Testament and the Christian World*. Ogden, Utah: Latter-day Harvest, 2004.
- Peterson, Daniel C. “‘Ye Are Gods’: Psalm 82 and John 10 as Witnesses to the Divine Nature of Humankind.” In *The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, edited by Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges, 471–594. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000.
- Peterson, Kim M. “Psalms of the Heart, Prayers unto God.” In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 250–61.
- Pike, Dana M. “‘The Great and Dreadful Day of the Lord’: The Anatomy of an Expression.” *BYU Studies* 41, no. 2 (2002): 149–60.
- . “Israelite Inscriptions from the Time of Jeremiah and Lehi.” In *Glimpses of Lehi’s Jerusalem*, 193–244.
- . “Recovering the World of the Bible.” In *Prelude to the Restoration*, 159–84.
- Pinegar, Ed J., and Richard J. Allen. *Choose Ye This Day: Daily Inspiration from the Old Testament*. American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 2005.
- . *Latter-day Commentary on the Old Testament*. American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 2001.
- . *Teachings and Commentaries on the Old Testament*. American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 2005.
- Pratt, John P. “I Have a Question: When Was Judah’s 70-Year Captivity?” *Ensign* 28 (October 1998): 64–65.
- Price, Lynn F. *Every Person in the Old Testament*. Bountiful, Utah: Horizon, 2002.
- Price, Robert M. “Prophecy and Palimpsest.” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 35, no. 3 (Fall 2002): 67–82.
- Rasband, Ester. “The Third Commandment.” *Ensign* 29 (April 1999): 13–15.
- Read, Lenet Hadley. “The Golden Plates and the Feast of Trumpets.” *Ensign* 30 (January 2000): 25–29.
- Reeve, Rex C., Jr. “A Latter-day Testament of Biblical Truth.” *Ensign* 31 (January 2001): 24–29.
- Reynolds, Noel B. “The Israelite Background of Moses Typology in the Book of Mormon.” *BYU Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 4–23.
- . “Lehi as Moses.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 9, no. 2 (2000): 26–35.
- Richardson, Matthew O. “The King’s Law: A Framework of Leadership.” In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 101–13.
- Ricks, Stephen D. “Adam’s Fall in the Book of Mormon, Second Temple Judaism, and Early Christianity.” In *The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, edited by Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges, 595–605. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000.

- Ricks, Stephen D. "Ancient Views of Creation and the Doctrine of Creation *ex Nihilo*." In *Revelation, Reason, and Faith: Essays in Honor of Truman G. Madsen*, edited by Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, and Stephen D. Ricks, 319–38. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2002.
- . "The Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign* 28 (June 1998): 25–29.
- Ridges, David J. *The Old Testament Made Easier, Part 1*. Springville, Utah: Cedar Fort, 2005.
- . *Isaiah Made Easier: In the Bible and Book of Mormon*. Springville, Utah: Bonneville Books, 2002.
- Romney, Joseph B. "Noah, the Great Preacher of Righteousness." *Ensign* 28 (February 1998): 22–28.
- Rona, Daniel. *Old Testament Supplemental Study Material*. Salt Lake City: Ensign Foundation, 2001.
- Satterfield, Bruce. "The Divine Justification for the Babylonian Destruction of Jerusalem." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 561–94.
- Schade, Aaron P. "The Kingdom of Judah: Politics, Prophets, and Scribes in the Late Preexilic Period." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 299–336.
- Schutze, Manfred H. "The Sword of the Lord and of Gideon." *Ensign* 32 (April 2002): 46–49.
- Seely, David Rolph. "Exploring the Isaiah Code: Ascending the Seven Steps on the Stairway to Heaven." Review of *Isaiah Decoded: Ascending the Ladder to Heaven*, by Avraham Gileadi. *FARMS Review of Books* 16, no. 2 (2004): 381–94.
- . "Genesis 15 in Light of the Restoration." In *Revelation, Reason, and Faith: Essays in Honor of Truman G. Madsen*, edited by Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, and Stephen D. Ricks, 339–64. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2002.
- . "The Restoration as Covenant Renewal." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 311–36.
- . "Sacred History, Covenants, and the Messiah: The Religious Background of the World of Lehi." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 381–420.
- . "Words 'Fitly Spoken': Tyndale's English Translation of the Bible." In *Prelude to the Restoration*, 212–27.
- Seely, David Rolph, and Fred E. Woods. "How Could Jerusalem, 'That Great City,' Be Destroyed?" In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 595–610.
- Seely, David Rolph, and Jo Ann H. Seely. "Josephus's Portrayal of Jeremiah: A Portrait and a Self-Portrait." In *The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, edited by Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges, 339–58. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000.
- . "Lehi and Jeremiah: Prophets, Priests, and Patriarchs." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 8, no. 2 (1999): 24–35. Rev. ed. in *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 357–80.
- Seely, David Rolph, and Robert D. Hunt. "Dramatis Personae: The World of Lehi." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 41–64.

- Seely, Jo Ann H. "Bringing Them Out of the Land of Jerusalem.' A Photo Essay." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 65–80.
- Sherry, Thomas Edward. "Attitudes, Practices, and Positions toward Joseph Smith's Translation of the Bible: A Historical Analysis of Publications, 1847–1987." EdD diss. Brigham Young University, 1988.
- Simon, Jerald F. "Researching Isaiah Passages in the Book of Mormon." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 210–23.
- Skinner, Andrew C. "Finding Jesus Christ in the Old Testament." *Ensign* 32 (June 2002): 24–28.
- . "The Inextricable Link between Temple, Covenant, and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism." In *Covenant and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism*, edited by Raphael Jospe, Truman G. Madsen, and Seth Ward, 71–90. Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, 2001.
- . "The Influence of the Hebrew Scriptures on the Founders and Founding of the American Republic." In *Lectures on Religion and the Founding of the American Republic*, 39–48. Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 2003.
- . "Jacob in the Presence of God." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 117–32.
- . "Jacob: Keeper of Covenants." *Ensign* 28 (March 1998): 51–56.
- . "Joseph Smith Vindicated Again: Enoch, Moses 7:48, and Apocryphal Sources." In *Revelation, Reason, and Faith: Essays in Honor of Truman G. Madsen*, edited by Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, and Stephen D. Ricks, 365–82. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2002.
- . *Prophets, Priests, and Kings: Old Testament Figures Who Symbolize Christ*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005.
- . "Serpent Symbols and Salvation in the Ancient Near East and the Book of Mormon." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 10, no. 2 (2001): 42–55.
- Skinner, Andrew C., and W. Jeffrey Marsh. *Scriptural Parables of the Latter Days*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2002.
- Strathearn, Gaye. "Jesus' Use of Deuteronomy in the Temptations." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 114–27.
- . "I Have a Question: Who Were the Maccabees and How Did They Influence Jewish History?" *Ensign* 28 (December 1998): 49.
- . "The Wife/Sister Experience: Pharaoh's Introduction to Jehovah." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 100–116.
- Swift, Charles. "The Power of Symbol." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 224–39.
- Tanner, John S. "Hast Thou Considered My Servant Job?" In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 266–82.
- Tefan, Jean A. "Jeremiah: As Potter's Clay." *Ensign* 32 (October 2002): 11–13.
- Thomas, M. Catherine. "The Provocation in the Wilderness and the Rejection of Grace." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*, 164–76.
- Thompson, Jeffrey P., and John W. Welch. "The Rechabites: A Model Group in Lehi's World." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 611–24.
- Thompson, John S. "Lehi and Egypt." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 159–276.
- Tvedtnes, John A. "Ancient Israelite Psalters." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 240–49.

- Tvedtnes, John A. "Early Christian and Jewish Rituals Related to Temple Practices." In *First Annual Mormon Apologetics Symposium: Proceedings*. Ben Lomond, Calif.: Foundation for Apologetic Information and Research, 1999.
- . "The Higher and Lesser Laws." In *Revelation, Reason, and Faith: Essays in Honor of Truman G. Madsen*, edited by Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, and Stephen D. Ricks, 383–406. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2002.
- . "Temple Prayer in Ancient Times." In *The Temple in Time and Eternity*, edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks, 79–98. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1999.
- Tvedtnes, John A., Brian M. Hauglid, and John Gee. *Traditions about the Early Life of Abraham*. Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2001.
- Uceda, Juan. "Jonah and the Second Chance." *Ensign* 32 (September 2002): 26–29.
- Underwood, Grant. "The Prophet Joseph Smith's Use of the Old Testament." *Ensign* 32 (August 2002): 30–35.
- Valletta, Thomas R. *The Old Testament for Latter-day Saint Families*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005.
- . "The True Bread of Life." *Ensign* 29 (March 1999): 7–14.
- Van Dyke, Blair G. "Profiles of a Covenant People." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 35–54.
- Wayment, Thomas A. "Jesus' Use of Psalms in Matthew." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*, 275–89.
- Welch, John W. "The Calling of Lehi as a Prophet in the World of Jerusalem." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 421–48.
- . "The Trial of Jeremiah: A Legal Legacy from Lehi's Jerusalem." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 337–56.
- Welch, John W., and Robert D. Hunt. "Culturegram: Jerusalem 600 B.C." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, 1–40.
- Welch, John W., David Rolph Seely, and Jo Ann H. Seely, eds. *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Wilcox, S. Michael. "The Abrahamic Covenant." *Ensign* (January 1998): 42–48.
- . "The 12 Spies." *Ensign* 32 (March 2002): 35–37.
- Wilcox, S. Michael, John Telford, and others. *On Holy Ground: Images of Old Testament Lands*. American Fork, Utah: Covenant Communications, 2001.
- Wilson, Keith J. "From Gutenberg to Grandin: Tracing the Development of the Printing Press." In *Prelude to the Restoration*, 269–85.
- Woodford, Robert J. "'In the Beginning': A Latter-day Perspective." *Ensign* 28 (January 1998): 12–19.
- Wright, Dennis A. "'None Were Greater': A Restoration View of Melchizedek." *Ensign* 28 (February 1998): 30–35.

Bibliography by Old Testament Book

Genesis

- Bailey, Arthur A. "What Modern Revelation Teaches about Adam." *Ensign*.
- Barney, Kevin L. "Examining Six Key Concepts in Joseph Smith's Understanding of Genesis 1:1." *BYU Studies*.
- . "Joseph Smith's Emendation of Hebrew Genesis 1:1." *Dialogue*.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. "The Authorship of the Pentateuch." *Dialogue*.
- Flake, Kathleen. "Evil's Origins and Evil's End in the Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis." *Sunstone*.
- Hallen, Cynthia L. "Rebekah." *Ensign*.
- Jackson, Kent P. *The Restored Gospel and the Book of Genesis*.
- Jeffery, Duane E. "Noah's Flood: Modern Scholarship and Mormon Traditions." *Sunstone*.
- Jorgensen, B. W. "Scriptural Chastity Lessons: Joseph and Potiphar's Wife; Corianton and Harlot Isabel." *Dialogue*.
- Madsen, David H. "Jacob and Esau." *Ensign*.
- Mauss, Armand L. "In Search of Ephraim: Traditional Mormon Conceptions of Lineage and Race." *Journal of Mormon History*.
- Nelson, Russell M. "The Creation." *Ensign*.
- Parry, Donald W. "The Flood and the Tower of Babel." *Ensign*.
- Ricks, Stephen D. "Ancient Views of Creation and the Doctrine of Creation *ex Nihilo*." *Revelation, Reason, and Faith*.
- Romney, Joseph B. "Noah, the Great Preacher of Righteousness." *Ensign*.
- Seely, David Rolph. "Genesis 15 in Light of the Restoration." *Revelation, Reason, and Faith*.
- Skinner, Andrew C. "Jacob in the Presence of God." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- . "Jacob: Keeper of Covenants." *Ensign*.
- Strathearn, Gaye. "The Wife/Sister Experience: Pharaoh's Introduction to Jehovah." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Tvedtnes, John A., Brian Hauglid, and John Gee. *Traditions about the Early Life of Abraham*.
- Woodford, Robert J. "In the Beginning: A Latter-day Perspective." *Ensign*.
- Wright, Dennis A. "None Were Greater: A Restoration View of Melchizedek." *Ensign*.

Exodus

- Bird, Randall C. "Moses and the Passover." *Ensign*.
- Brown, S. Kent. "Trust in the Lord: Exodus and Faith." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Ferrel, David W. "The Lord Is among Us!" *Ensign*.
- Huntington, Ray L. "I Have a Question: Do We Know Where Mount Sinai Is?" *Ensign*.

Nelson, Russell M. "The Exodus Repeated." *Ensign*.

Thomas, M. Catherine. "The Provocation in the Wilderness and the Rejection of Grace." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Valletta, Thomas R. "The True Bread of Life." *Ensign*.

Leviticus

Ricks, Stephen D. "The Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign*.

Numbers

Jenson, Glen O. "Look and Live." *Ensign*.

Wilcox, S. Michael. "The 12 Spies." *Ensign*.

Deuteronomy

Allred, Philip A. "Moses' Charge to Remember." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Ballard, M. Russell. "The Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign*.

Durkin, Timothy W. "Deuteronomy as a Constitutional Covenant." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Richardson, Matthew O. "The King's Law: A Framework of Leadership." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Strathearn, Gaye. "Jesus' Use of Deuteronomy in the Temptations." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Joshua

Morgan, Christopher J. "The Sin of Achan." *Ensign*.

Judges

Schutze, Manfred H. "The Sword of the Lord and of Gideon." *Ensign*.

1 & 2 Samuel

Campbell, Linda M. "Hannah: Devoted Handmaid of the Lord." *Ensign*.

Grahl, Paulo R. "Eli and His Sons." *Ensign*.

Hinckley, Gordon B. "Overpowering the Goliaths in Our Lives." *Ensign*.

Lee, Peggy Furniss. "A King for Israel." *Ensign*.

1 & 2 Kings / 1 & 2 Chronicles

Barker, Margaret. "What Did King Josiah Reform?" *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Hamula, James J. "The Quest for Wisdom." *Ensign*.

Hardy, Ralph W., Jr. "Naaman and Gehazi: A Contrast in Obedience." *Ensign*.

Holland, Jeffrey R. "A Handful of Meal and a Little Oil." *Ensign*.

Knowles, Todd A. "Elijah Nurtures Faith." *Ensign*.

- LeBaron, E. Dale. "Elijah's Mission: His Keys, Powers, and Blessings from the Old Testament to the Latter Days." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Menlove, Frances Lee. "A Listening Heart: Reflections on 1 Kings 3:5–9." *Sunstone*.
- Muldowney, Charles A. "Hezekiah's Tunnel Vision." *Ensign*.

Ezra/Nehemiah

- Amistad, Modesto M., Jr. "Wanted: Modern Nehemiahs." *Ensign*.
- Garner, Brian D. "Ezra Unfolds the Scriptures." *Ensign*.

Esther

- Austin, Michael. "Meditations on the Book of Esther." *Sunstone*.

Job

- Hunter, Kendal Brian. *Consider My Servant Job*.
- Tanner, John S. "Hast Thou Considered My Servant Job?" *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Psalms/Proverbs/Ecclesiastes/Song of Solomon

- Davidson, Karen Lynn. "Eliza R. Snow, Psalmist of the Latter Days." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Hauglid, Brian M. "Temple Imagery in the Psalms." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Hoskisson, Paul Y. "The Witness for Christ in Psalm 22." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Madsen, John M. "A Precious and Powerful Witness of Jesus Christ." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Peterson, Daniel C. "'Ye Are Gods': Psalm 82 and John 10 as Witnesses to the Divine Nature of Humankind." *Disciple as Scholar*.
- Peterson, Kim M. "Psalms of the Heart, Prayers unto God." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Tvedtnes, John A. "Ancient Israelite Psalters." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Wayment, Thomas A. "Jesus' Use of Psalms in Matthew." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Isaiah

- Andreason, Bruce L. "The Mantle of Elijah." *Ensign*.
- Ball, Terry B. "Isaiah and the Gentiles." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- . "Isaiah and the Great Arraignment." *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*, 46–60; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Barney, Kevin L. "Isaiah Interwoven." *FARMS Review of Books*.
- Bassett, K. Douglas. *Commentaries on Isaiah in the Book of Mormon*.

- Bokovoy, David E. "The Calling of Isaiah." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Crowther, Duane S. *How to Understand the Book of Isaiah*.
- Davis, Garold N. "Book of Mormon Commentary on Isaiah." *Ensign*.
- Eastmond, Mark Elbert. "Images of Mercy in the Writings of Isaiah." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Gileadi, Avraham. *The End from the Beginning: The Apocalyptic Vision of Isaiah*.
———. *Isaiah Decoded: Ascending the Ladder to Heaven*.
- Gorton, H. Clay. *The Legacy of the Brass Plates of Laban: A Comparison of Biblical and Book of Mormon Isaiah Texts*.
- Hallen, Cynthia L. "Redeeming the Desolate Woman: The Message of Isaiah 54 and 3 Nephi 22." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Hoskisson, Paul Y. "A Latter-day Saint Reading of Isaiah: The Example of Isaiah 6." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- King, Michael L. "Isaiah's Vision of God's Plan to Fulfill His Covenant." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Ludlow, Victor L. *Unlocking Isaiah in the Book of Mormon*.
- Madsen, Ann M. "'What Meaneth the Words That Are Written?' Abinadi Interprets Isaiah." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Nibley, Hugh W. "Great Are the Words of Isaiah." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Parry, Donald W. *Harmonizing Isaiah: Combining Ancient Sources*.
———. "Messiah Becomes the New King: Notes on Isaiah 9:3–7." *Disciple as Scholar*.
———. *Visualizing Isaiah*.
- Parry, Donald W., Jay A. Parry, and Tina M. Peterson. *Understanding Isaiah*.
- Ridges, David J. *Isaiah Made Easier in the Bible and Book of Mormon*.
- Seely, David Rolph. "Exploring the Isaiah Code: Ascending the Seven Steps on the Stairway to Heaven." Review of *Isaiah Decoded*. *FARMS Review of Books*.
- Simon, Jerald F. "Researching Isaiah Passages in the Book of Mormon." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Jeremiah/Lamentations

- Draper, Richard D. "The Prophets of the Exile: Saviors of a People." *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Pike, Dana M. "Israelite Inscriptions from the Time of Jeremiah and Lehi." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Seely, David Rolph, and Jo Ann H. Seely. "Josephus's Portrayal of Jeremiah: A Portrait and a Self-Portrait." *Disciple as Scholar*.
- . "Lehi and Jeremiah: Prophets, Priests, and Patriarchs." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Tefan, Jean A. "Jeremiah: As Potter's Clay." *Ensign*.
- Welch, John W. "The Trial of Jeremiah: A Legal Legacy from Lehi's Jerusalem." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Ezekiel

Draper, Richard D. "The Prophets of the Exile: Saviors of a People." *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Daniel

Call, Terry W. "Facing the Fiery Furnace." *Ensign*.

Draper, Richard D. "The Prophets of the Exile: Saviors of a People." *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Twelve Minor Prophets

Gillum, Gary P. "Obadiah's Vision of Saviors on Mount Zion." *Voices of Old Testament Prophets*; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Huntington, Ray L. "Consider Your Ways: The Book of Haggai and the Responsibilities and Blessings of Temple Work." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Pike, Dana M. "'The Great and Dreadful Day of the Lord': The Anatomy of an Expression." *BYU Studies*.

Uceda, Juan. "Jonah and the Second Chance." *Ensign*.

Bibliography by Select Subject Categories

Abraham and Sarah [see also *Covenant*]

Dahl, Larry E. "The Abrahamic Test." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Tvedtnes, John A., Brian Hauglid, and John Gee. *Traditions about the Early Life of Abraham*.

Wright, Dennis A. "None Were Greater: A Restoration View of Melchizedek." *Ensign*.

Adam and Eve [see also *Creation, Fall*]

Bailey, Arthur A. "What Modern Revelation Teaches about Adam." *Ensign*.

Adversity

Flake, Kathleen. "Evil's Origins and Evil's End in the Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis." *Sunstone*.

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (including intertestamental books and Dead Sea Scrolls)

Kotter, Wade. "Review of *LDS Perspectives on the Dead Sea Scrolls* by Donald W. Parry and Dana M. Pike." *Dialogue*.

Skinner, Andrew C. "Joseph Smith Vindicated Again: Enoch, Moses 7:48, and Apocryphal Sources." *Revelation, Reason, and Faith*.

Bible: Joseph Smith Translation

Faulring, Scott H., Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews. *Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts*.

Flake, Kathleen. "Evil's Origins and Evil's End in the Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis." *Sunstone*.

Hite, Steven J., Julie M. Hite, and R. Tom Melville. *The Old Testament with the Joseph Smith Translation*.

Jackson, Kent P. *The Book of Moses and the Joseph Smith Translation Manuscripts*.

———. "Joseph Smith's Cooperstown Bible: The Historical Context of the Bible Used in the Joseph Smith Translation." *BYU Studies*.

Matthews, Robert J. "The Role of the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible in the Restoration of Doctrine." *Disciple as Witness*.

Sherry, Thomas Edward. "Attitudes, Practices, and Positions toward Joseph Smith's Translation of the Bible: A Historical Analysis of Publications, 1847–1987." EdD diss.

Bible: King James Version

Jackson, Kent P. "Joseph Smith's Cooperstown Bible: The Historical Context of the Bible Used in the Joseph Smith Translation." *BYU Studies*.

Bible: LDS Interpretation

Fontaine, Carole R. "Wisdom Traditions in the Hebrew Bible." *Dialogue*.

Bible: Origin, Formation, and Translation

Barney, Kevin L. "Reflections on the Documentary Hypothesis." *Dialogue*.

Price, Robert M. "Prophecy and Palimpsest." *Dialogue*.

Seely, David Rolph. "Words 'Fitly Spoken': Tyndale's English Translation of the Bible." *Prelude to the Restoration*.

Wilson, Keith J. "From Gutenberg to Grandin: Tracing the Development of the Printing Press." *Prelude to the Restoration*.

Biblical Criticism

Price, Robert M. "Prophecy and Palimpsest." *Dialogue*.

Book of Mormon and the Old Testament

Adams, William James, Jr. "Nephi's Written Language and the Standard Biblical Hebrew of 600 B.C." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Bokovoy, David E., and John A. Tvedtnes. *Testaments: Links between the Book of Mormon and the Hebrew Bible*.

Chadwick, Jeffrey R. "Lehi's House in Jerusalem and the Land of His Inheritance." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

- Christensen, Kevin. "The Temple, the Monarchy, and Wisdom: Lehi's World and the Scholarship of Margaret Barker." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Coleman, Gary J. "The Book of Mormon: A Guide for the Old Testament." *Ensign*.
- Davis, Garold N. "Book of Mormon Commentary on Isaiah." *Ensign*.
- Gee, John. "A Seething Pot in the North: International Affairs Leading Up to Lehi's Day." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Gileadi, Avraham. *The Last Days: Types and Shadows from the Bible and the Book of Mormon*.
- Gorton, H. Clay. *The Legacy of the Brass Plates of Laban: A Comparison of Biblical and Book of Mormon Isaiah Texts*.
- Hallen, Cynthia L. "Redeeming the Desolate Woman: The Message of Isaiah 54 and 3 Nephi 22." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Horton, George A., Jr. "An Indispensable Foundation." *Ensign*.
- Jackson, Kent P. "I Have a Question: Why Is the Witness of Christ and His Mission Much Clearer in the Book of Mormon Than in the Old Testament?" *Ensign*.
- Ludlow, Victor L. *Unlocking Isaiah in the Book of Mormon*.
- Madsen, Ann M. "'What Meaneth the Words That Are Written?' Abinadi Interprets Isaiah." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Marsh, W. Jeffrey. "Training from the Old Testament: Moroni's Lessons for a Prophet." *Ensign*.
- Read, Lenet Hadley. "The Golden Plates and the Feast of Trumpets." *Ensign*.
- Seely, David Rolph, and Robert D. Hunt. "Dramatis Personae: The World of Lehi." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Seely, Jo Ann H. "Bringing Them Out of the Land of Jerusalem.' A Photo Essay." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Simon, Jerald F. "Researching Isaiah Passages in the Book of Mormon." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Thompson, John S. "Lehi and Egypt." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Covenant

- Allred, Philip A. "Moses' Charge to Remember." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Durkin, Timothy W. "Deuteronomy as a Constitutional Covenant." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Hardison, Amy Blake. "Being a Covenant People." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- King, Michael L. "Isaiah's Vision of God's Plan to Fulfill His Covenant." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Lane, Jennifer C. "The Lord Will Redeem His People: Adoptive Covenant and Redemption in the Old Testament." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Madsen, Ann N. "'His Hand Is Stretched Out Still': The Lord's Eternal Covenant of Mercy." *Revelation, Reason, and Faith*.
- Millet, Robert L. "The Ancient Covenant Restored." *Ensign*.
- . "The Eternal Gospel." *Ensign*.

- Nelson, Russell M. "Remnants Gathered, Covenants Fulfilled." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Seely, David Rolph. "The Restoration as Covenant Renewal." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- . "Sacred History, Covenants, and the Messiah: The Religious Background of the World of Lehi." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Skinner, Andrew C. "The Inextricable Link between Temple, Covenant, and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism." *Covenant and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism*.
- Van Dyke, Blair G. "Profiles of a Covenant People." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Wilcox, S. Michael. "The Abrahamic Covenant." *Ensign*.

Creation

- "Created in the Image of God, Male and Female." *Ensign*.
- First Presidency of the Church. "Origin of Man." *Ensign*.
- Greaves, Sheldon. "Cosmos, Chaos, and Politics: Biblical Creation Patterns in Secular Contexts." *Dialogue*.
- Nelson, Russell M. "The Creation." *Ensign*.
- Ricks, Stephen D. "Ancient Views of Creation and the Doctrine of Creation *ex Nihilo*." *Revelation, Reason, and Faith*.
- Woodford, Robert J. "In the Beginning: A Latter-day Perspective." *Ensign*.

Customs, Culture, and Ritual

- Bybee, Ariel E. "A Woman's World in Lehi's Jerusalem." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Read, Lenet Hadley. "The Golden Plates and the Feast of Trumpets." *Ensign*.
- Tvedtnes, John A., and Angela M. Crowell. "The Nephite and Jewish Practice of Blessing God after Eating One's Fill." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.

Elijah

- Knowles, Todd A. "Elijah Nurtures Faith." *Ensign*.
- LeBaron, E. Dale. "Elijah's Mission: His Keys, Powers, and Blessings from the Old Testament to the Latter Days." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Enoch

- Draper, Richard D. "Enoch: What Modern Scripture Teaches." *Ensign*.

Ephraim

- Mauss, Armand L. "In Search of Ephraim: Traditional Mormon Conceptions of Lineage and Race." *Journal of Mormon History*.

Faith

- Brown, S. Kent. "Trust in the Lord: Exodus and Faith." In *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
 Call, Terry W. "Facing the Fiery Furnace." *Ensign*.

Fall

- Christensen, Jess L. "The Choice That Began Mortality." *Ensign*.

Flood

- Jeffery, Duane E. "Noah's Flood: Modern Scholarship and Mormon Traditions." *Sunstone*.
 Parry, Donald W. "The Flood and the Tower of Babel." *Ensign*.

Flora and Fauna

- Ball, Terry B., and Wilford M. Hess. "Agriculture in Lehi's World: Some Textual, Historical, Archaeological, and Botanical Insights." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
 Hess, Wilford M. "Recent Notes about Olives in Antiquity." *BYU Studies*.

Genealogy and Lineage

- Mauss, Armand L. "In Search of Ephraim: Traditional Mormon Conceptions of Lineage and Race." *Journal of Mormon History*.

Geography

- Brown, S. Kent. "Jerusalem Connections to Arabia in 600 B.C." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
 Chadwick, Jeffrey R. "Lehi's House in Jerusalem and the Land of His Inheritance." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
 Huntington, Ray L. "I Have a Question: Do We Know Where Mount Sinai Is?" *Ensign*.
 Ogden, D. Kelly. "Jerusalem." *Ensign*.

History

- Brown, S. Kent. "Jerusalem Connections to Arabia in 600 B.C." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
 Bybee, Ariel E. "A Woman's World in Lehi's Jerusalem." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
 Chadwick, Jeffrey R. "Lehi's House in Jerusalem and the Land of His Inheritance." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
 Conkling, Chris. "The Book That Built a Better World." *Ensign*.
 Gee, John. "Egyptian Society during the Twenty-sixth Dynasty." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

- Gee, John. "A Seething Pot in the North: International Affairs Leading Up to Lehi's Day." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Pike, Dana M. "Recovering the World of the Bible." *Prelude to the Restoration*.
- Pratt, John P. "I Have a Question: When Was Judah's 70-Year Captivity?" *Ensign*.
- Satterfield, Bruce. "The Divine Justification for the Babylonian Destruction of Jerusalem." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Schade, Aaron P. "The Kingdom of Judah: Politics, Prophets, and Scribes in the Late Preexilic Period." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Seely, David Rolph. "Sacred History, Covenants, and the Messiah: The Religious Background of the World of Lehi." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Seely, David Rolph, and Fred E. Woods. "How Could Jerusalem, 'That Great City,' Be Destroyed?" *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Strathearn, Gaye. "I Have a Question: Who Were the Maccabees and How Did They Influence Jewish History?" *Ensign*.
- Thompson, Jeffrey P., and John W. Welch. "The Rechabites: A Model Group in Lehi's World." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Israel, Scattering and Gathering

- Browning, Paul K. "Gathering Scattered Israel: Then and Now." *Ensign*.
- Chadwick, Jeffrey R. "Lehi's House in Jerusalem and the Land of His Inheritance." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Green, Arnold H. "Gathering and Election: Israelite Descent and Universalism in Mormon Discourse." *Journal of Mormon History*.
- Nelson, Russell M. "The Exodus Repeated." *Ensign*.
- . "Remnants Gathered, Covenants Fulfilled." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Jerusalem

- Chadwick, Jeffrey R. "Lehi's House in Jerusalem and the Land of His Inheritance." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Ogden, D. Kelly. "Jerusalem." *Ensign*.
- Satterfield, Bruce. "The Divine Justification for the Babylonian Destruction of Jerusalem." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Seely, David Rolph, and Fred E. Woods. "How Could Jerusalem, 'That Great City,' Be Destroyed?" *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Seely, Jo Ann H. "'Bringing Them Out of the Land of Jerusalem.' A Photo Essay." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Welch, John W. "The Calling of Lehi as a Prophet in the World of Jerusalem." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Welch, John W., and Robert D. Hunt. "Culturegram: Jerusalem 600 B.C." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Welch, John W., David Rolph Seely, and Jo Ann H. Seely, eds. *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Wilcox, S. Michael, John Telford, and others. *On Holy Ground: Images of Old Testament Lands*.

Jesus Christ, the God of the Old and New Testament

- Hoskisson, Paul Y. "The Witness for Christ in Psalm 22." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Jackson, Kent P. "I Have a Question: Why Is the Witness of Christ and His Mission Much Clearer in the Book of Mormon Than in the Old Testament?" *Ensign*.
- Lane, Jennifer C. "The Lord Will Redeem His People: Adoptive Covenant and Redemption in the Old Testament." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Madsen, John M. "A Precious and Powerful Witness of Jesus Christ." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Matthews, Robert J. "The Old Testament: A Voice from the Past and a Witness for the Lord Jesus Christ." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Meservy, Keith H. "Lord = Jehovah." *Ensign*.
- Olmstead, Thomas F. "The Savior's Use of the Old Testament." *Ensign*.
- Skinner, Andrew C. "Finding Jesus Christ in the Old Testament." *Ensign*.
- . *Prophets, Priests, and Kings: Old Testament Figures Who Symbolize Christ*.

Joseph and Asenath

- Jorgensen, B. W. "Scriptural Chastity Lessons: Joseph and Potiphar's Wife; Corianton and Harlot Isabel." *Dialogue*.
- Nelson, Russell M. "The Exodus Repeated." *Ensign*.

Justification

- Eastmond, Mark Elbert. "Images of Mercy in the Writings of Isaiah." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Law of Moses

- Brandt, Edward J. "The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Madsen, John M. "A Precious and Powerful Witness of Jesus Christ." In *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*; rpt. in *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Muhlestein, Kerry. "Believing in the Atoning Power of Christ." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Ricks, Stephen D. "The Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign*.
- Tvedtnes, John A. "The Higher and Lesser Laws." *Revelation, Reason, and Faith*.

Literary Aspects

- Adams, William James, Jr. "Nephi's Written Language and the Standard Biblical Hebrew of 600 B.C." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.
- Barney, Kevin L. "Divine Discourse Directed at a Prophet's Posterity in the Plural: Further Light on Enallage." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.

Bokovoy, David E. "From Distance to Proximity: A Poetic Function of *Enallage* in the Hebrew Bible and the Book of Mormon." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.

Pike, Dana M. "'The Great and Dreadful Day of the Lord': The Anatomy of an Expression." *BYU Studies*.

———. "Israelite Inscriptions from the Time of Jeremiah and Lehi." In *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Melchizedek

Judd, Frank F., Jr. "Melchizedek: Seeking after the Zion of Enoch." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Moses

Allred, Philip A. "Moses' Charge to Remember." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Bird, Randall C. "Moses and the Passover." *Ensign*.

Jackson, Kent P. *The Book of Moses and the Joseph Smith Translation Manuscripts*.

Jenson, Glen O. "Look and Live." *Ensign*.

Nelson, Russell M. "The Exodus Repeated." *Ensign*.

Parker, Todd B., and Robert Norman. "Moses: Witness of Jesus Christ." *Ensign*.

Reynolds, Noel B. "The Israelite Background of Moses Typology in the Book of Mormon." *BYU Studies*.

———. "Lehi as Moses." *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.

Music

Davidson, Karen Lynn. "Eliza R. Snow, Psalmist of the Latter Days." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Peterson, Kim M. "Psalms of the Heart, Prayers unto God." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

New Testament and the Old Testament

Brandt, Edward J. "The Law of Moses and the Law of Christ." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

Olmstead, Thomas F. "The Savior's Use of the Old Testament." *Ensign*.

Skinner, Andrew C. "Finding Jesus Christ in the Old Testament." *Ensign*.

———. *Prophets, Priests, and Kings: Old Testament Figures Who Symbolize Christ*.

Strathearn, Gaye. "Jesus' Use of Deuteronomy in the Temptations." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Wayment, Thomas A. "Jesus' Use of Psalms in Matthew." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Old Testament: Overviews and Manuals

Hoskisson, Paul Y., ed. *Sperry Symposium Classics: The Old Testament*.
Howick, E. Keith. *Challenged by the Old Testament*.

Olive Oil

Hess, Wilford M. "Recent Notes about Olives in Antiquity." *BYU Studies*.

Priesthood

Compton, Todd. "Kingdom of Priests: Priesthood, Temple, and Women in the Old Testament and in the Restoration." *Dialogue*.
Judd, Frank F., Jr. "Melchizedek: Seeking after the Zion of Enoch." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
Wright, Dennis A. "None Were Greater: A Restoration View of Melchizedek." *Ensign*.

Prophets and Prophecy

Andreason, Bruce L. "The Mantle of Elijah." *Ensign*.
Draper, Richard D. "I Have Even from the Beginning Declared It." *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
Gileadi, Avraham. *The Last Days: Types and Shadows from the Bible and the Book of Mormon*.
Howick, E. Keith. *Prophets of the Old Testament*.
Jackson, Kent P. *Lost Tribes and Last Days: What Modern Revelation Tells Us about the Old Testament*.
Marsh, W. Jeffrey. "Training from the Old Testament: Moroni's Lessons for a Prophet." *Ensign*.
Millet, Robert L. "Prophets and Priesthood in the Old Testament." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
Parry, Donald W. "Symbolic Action as Prophecy in the Old Testament." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
Petersen, Scott R. *Where Have All the Prophets Gone? Revelation and Rebellion in the Old Testament and the Christian World*.
Skinner, Andrew C., and W. Jeffrey Marsh. *Scriptural Parables of the Latter Days*.
Welch, John W. "The Calling of Lehi as a Prophet in the World of Jerusalem." *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*.

Restoration and Joseph Smith

Bennett, Richard E. "The Rising of the Holy Bible to the Restoration." *Prelude to the Restoration*.
Jackson, Kent P. *The Restored Gospel and the Book of Genesis*.
Matthews, Robert J. "The Role of the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible in the Restoration of Doctrine." *The Disciple as Witness*.

- Pike, Dana M. "Recovering the World of the Bible." *Prelude to the Restoration*.
- Reeve, Rex C., Jr. "A Latter-day Testament of Biblical Truth." *Ensign*.
- Seely, David Rolph. "Genesis 15 in Light of the Restoration." *Revelation, Reason, and Faith*.
- . "The Restoration as Covenant Renewal." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Underwood, Grant. "The Prophet Joseph Smith's Use of the Old Testament." *Ensign*.

Sacrifice

- Ballard, M. Russell. "The Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign*.
- Brough, Monte J. "Living the Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign*.
- Ricks, Stephen D. "The Law of Sacrifice." *Ensign*.

Science and Religion

- Jeffery, Duane E. "Noah's Flood: Modern Scholarship and Mormon Traditions." *Sunstone*.

Scripture Study

- Carver, Timothy L. "Enjoying the Old Testament." *Ensign*.
- Coleman, Gary J. "The Book of Mormon: A Guide for the Old Testament." *Ensign*.
- Eyring, Henry B. "Studying and Teaching the Old Testament." *Ensign*.
- Lybbert, Merlin R. "The Powerful Potential of Scripture Stories." *Ensign*.
- Matthews, Robert J. "The Old Testament: A Voice from the Past and a Witness for the Lord Jesus Christ." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Newell, Lloyd D., and Robert L. Millet. *A Lamp unto My Feet: Daily Reflections on the Old Testament*.
- "Old Testament Times at a Glance." *Ensign*.
- Pinegar, Ed J., and Richard J. Allen. *Choose Ye This Day: Daily Inspiration from the Old Testament*.
- . *Latter-day Commentary on the Old Testament*.
- . *Teachings and Commentaries on the Old Testament*.
- Price, Lynn F. *Every Person in the Old Testament: An Alphabetical Reference and Synopsis*.
- Ridges, David J. *The Old Testament Made Easier, Part 1*.
- . *Isaiah Made Easier in the Bible and Book of Mormon*.
- Rona, Daniel. *Old Testament Supplemental Study Material*.
- Valletta, Thomas R. *The Old Testament for Latter-day Saint Families*.

Symbolism

- Parry, Donald W. "Symbolic Action as Prophecy in the Old Testament." *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

- Skinner, Andrew C. *Prophets, Priests, and Kings: Old Testament Figures Who Symbolize Christ*.
- . “Serpent Symbols and Salvation in the Ancient Near East and the Book of Mormon.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Swift, Charles. “The Power of Symbol.” *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Symposia and Collections of Essays

- Covenant and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism*, edited by Raphael Jospe, Truman G. Madsen, and Seth Ward.
- Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns of the Old Testament: The Thirtieth Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium*.
- The Disciple as Scholar: Essays on Scripture and the Ancient World in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, edited by Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges.
- The Disciple as Witness: Essays on Latter-day Saint History and Doctrine in Honor of Richard Lloyd Anderson*, edited by Stephen D. Ricks, Donald W. Parry, and Andrew H. Hedges.
- Glimpses of Lehi’s Jerusalem*, edited by John W. Welch, David Rolph Seely, and Jo Ann H. Seely.
- Prelude to the Restoration: From Apostasy to the Restored Church: The Thirty-third Annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium*.
- Revelation, Reason, and Faith: Essays in Honor of Truman G. Madsen*, edited by Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, and Stephen D. Ricks.
- Sperry Symposium Classics: The Old Testament*, edited by Paul Y. Hoskisson.
- The Temple in Time and Eternity*, edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks.

Teaching the Old Testament

- Eyring, Henry B. “Studying and Teaching the Old Testament.” *Ensign*.
- Harris, Victor W. *Creative Ways to Teach the Old Testament, Vol. 1, Genesis–Deuteronomy*.
- . *Creative Ways to Teach the Old Testament, Vol. 2, Joshua–Malachi*.
- Matthews, Robert J. “The Old Testament: A Voice from the Past and a Witness for the Lord Jesus Christ.” *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- “Old Testament Times at a Glance.” *Ensign*.
- Pinegar, Ed J., and Richard J. Allen. *Latter-day Commentary on the Old Testament*.
- . *Teachings and Commentaries on the Old Testament*.
- Price, Lynn F. *Every Person in the Old Testament: An Alphabetical Reference and Synopsis*.
- Ridger, David J. *Isaiah Made Easier in the Bible and Book of Mormon*.
- . *The Old Testament Made Easier, Part 1*.
- Rona, Daniel. *Old Testament Supplemental Study Material*.

Temple and Tabernacle

- Brown, Matthew B. *The Gate of Heaven: Insights on the Doctrines and Symbols of the Temple*.
- . “Girded about with a Lambskin.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Christensen, Kevin. “The Temple, the Monarchy, and Wisdom: Lehi’s World and the Scholarship of Margaret Barker.” *Glimpses of Lehi’s Jerusalem*.
- Compton, Todd. “Kingdom of Priests: Priesthood, Temple, and Women in the Old Testament and in the Restoration.” *Dialogue*.
- Hauglid, Brian M. “Temple Imagery in the Psalms.” *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.
- Huntington, Ray L. “Consider Your Ways: The Book of Haggai and the Responsibilities and Blessings of Temple Work.” *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Skinner, Andrew C. “The Inextricable Link between Temple, Covenant, and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism.” *Covenant and Chosenness in Judaism and Mormonism*.
- Tvedtnes, John A. “Early Christian and Jewish Rituals Related to Temple Practices.” *First Annual Mormon Apologetics Symposium: Proceedings*.
- . “Temple Prayer in Ancient Times.” *The Temple in Time and Eternity*.

Ten Commandments

- Conkling, Chris. “The Book That Built a Better World.” *Ensign*.
- Nelson, Russell M. “Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods.” *Ensign*.
- Rasband, Ester. “The Third Commandment.” *Ensign*.

Types and Symbols

- Parry, Donald W. “Symbolic Action as Prophecy in the Old Testament.” *Sperry Symposium Classics*.
- Reynolds, Noel B. “The Israelite Background of Moses Typology in the Book of Mormon.” *BYU Studies*.
- . “Lehi as Moses.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Skinner, Andrew C. *Prophets, Priests, and Kings: Old Testament Figures Who Symbolize Christ*.
- . “Serpent Symbols and Salvation in the Ancient Near East and the Book of Mormon.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.
- Swift, Charles. “The Power of Symbol.” *Covenants, Prophecies, and Hymns*.

Women in the Old Testament

- Bybee, Ariel E. “A Woman’s World in Lehi’s Jerusalem.” *Glimpses of Lehi’s Jerusalem*.
- Campbell, Linda M. “Hannah: Devoted Handmaid of the Lord.” *Ensign*.
- Compton, Todd. “Kingdom of Priests: Priesthood, Temple, and Women in the Old Testament and in the Restoration.” *Dialogue*.
- Hallen, Cynthia L. “Rebekah.” *Ensign*.

- . “Redeeming the Desolate Woman: The Message of Isaiah 54 and 3 Nephi 22.” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*.

Zion

- Judd, Frank F., Jr. “Melchizedek: Seeking after the Zion of Enoch.” *Sperry Symposium Classics*.

David Rolph Seely (david_seely@byu.edu) is Professor of Ancient Scripture at Brigham Young University. He received his BA in Greek and his MA in Classics from BYU. He received his PhD in ancient and biblical studies at the University of Michigan. His research and writing interests include the Old and New Testaments, the Book of Mormon, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. He recently co-edited with John Welch and Jo Ann H. Seely the book *Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem*, and he was part of the international team of scholars that translated and published the Dead Sea Scrolls, working with Professor Moshe Weinfeld of Hebrew University on the *Barkhi Nafshi* texts.

W. Kenneth Hamblin is a BYU undergraduate in Middle East studies–Arabic with a minor in history. He appreciates the opportunity to have worked with David Seely on numerous projects. Ken thanks his father, William J. Hamblin, for inspiring him to study the ancient Middle East. As a teen Ken spent a year at the BYU Jerusalem Center while his father taught there. Ken is recently married.

Erica Lamb Holland is an undergraduate at BYU majoring in political science and minoring in English. She loved working with David Seely and is thankful for the opportunity this research gave her to learn more about the Old Testament. She is married to Brad Holland.

Gregory A. Prince and William Robert Wright.
David O. McKay and the Rise of Modern Mormonism.
 Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2005

Reviewed by James B. Allen

During the administration of President David O. McKay (1951–70), The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was transformed in many ways, not the least of which was its becoming a worldwide church. *David O. McKay and the Rise of Modern Mormonism* is a candid, insightful, and highly important topical study of those years. For some Church members, the book may be uncomfortably candid, for in addition to discussing President McKay’s remarkable strengths and accomplishments, the authors do not hesitate to deal with controversial issues or to discuss his and other Church leaders’ vulnerabilities. Neither do they shy away from the disagreements that sometimes arose among Church leaders. Throughout, however, Prince and Wright show deep reverence for President McKay and make very positive assessments of his leadership.

The strength of this book comes, in part, from its sources. As the authors point out, “There has never been a prophet of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints about whom so much information is available” (ix). Most significant was the multivolume set of diaries kept by Clare Middlemiss, President McKay’s private secretary for thirty-five years, who painstakingly compiled first-person dictations, extracts from minutes of meetings, letters, newspaper clippings, various memoranda, photocopies of Elder Alvin R. Dyer’s daily record from 1967 on, and other significant materials. Middlemiss gave them to Robert Wright before her death, with the expectation that they would lead to significant publications about President McKay. The authors also drew from the 215 scrapbook volumes compiled by Middlemiss, which are housed in the Church Archives, and profited from many other rich primary sources. In addition, the

authors conducted over two hundred important interviews and scoured all the significant secondary studies dealing with the McKay administration.

The authors clearly honor President McKay as a man and revere him as a prophet. They describe his “noble character,” his concern for missionary work, and his intense distaste for bureaucracy. “To those accustomed to a bureaucratic management style,” they write, “McKay’s approach was a source of continual frustration” (21). They also emphasize McKay’s deep spirituality, his personal emphasis on prayer and meditation, and the way he received revelation. Though he sometimes experienced “the more dramatic forms of revelation” (39), his mainstay was the “whispering of the spirit” that came when he was alone and not under pressure. He thus spent many hours alone in the temple, often early in the morning and often on Sundays, studying and meditating. It was then, he explained to the General Authorities in a 1956 temple meeting, that “impressions come as clearly as if he were to hear a voice, and those impressions are right” (39). He also reminded them, “If we so live that our minds are free from worry, our consciences are clear, and our feelings are right toward one another, the operation of the Spirit of the Lord upon our spirit is as real as when we pick up the telephone; but when they come we must be brave enough to take the suggested action” (39). On another occasion he told a reporter that he had never seen the Savior but that he had “heard his voice—many times—and that he had felt His presence” (38).

As the book uncovers the challenges, problems, and controversies facing President McKay, it also reveals his values. The authors underscore his encouragement of intellectual inquiry, his emphasis on free agency, his tolerance of disparate views within the Church, and his refusal to embarrass anyone publicly. In private conversation and correspondence, for example, he made it clear that Elder Joseph Fielding Smith’s strongly anti-evolutionary *Man, His Origin and Destiny* was not Church doctrine but, because of his refusal to publicly contradict another General Authority, he was unable to take the book out of print or keep many Church members from considering it official. A similar story is told with reference to Elder Bruce R. McConkie’s *Mormon Doctrine*. At the same time, when other General Authorities wanted to discipline Juanita Brooks for her writing about John D. Lee and excommunicate Sterling M. McMurrin for his unorthodox views, President McKay intervened in their behalf.

One of the most contentious public issues during these years was civil rights. The authors describe an administration in which most of President McKay’s “inner circle” was opposed to civil rights legislation, with Hugh B. Brown, a member of the First Presidency, the notable exception.

To the consternation of many people, President McKay tried to sidestep the issue, and no official Church statement was forthcoming. In October 1963, however, he instructed President Brown to read a statement supporting civil rights as part of his own general conference address, and many people considered that statement as official. The controversy did not abate in Utah, however, partly because of Elder Ezra Taft Benson's continuing effort to link the civil rights movement with Communism.

In the minds of some people, attitudes toward civil rights were not unrelated to the LDS ban on blacks holding the priesthood. The authors provide an important discussion of President McKay's concern about the ban and his little-known efforts at least to soften it if he could not completely remove it. They note a few ways that he intervened to extend priesthood blessings when he could, such as lifting the requirement in South Africa that a man must trace his genealogy out of that country before he could receive the priesthood. Surrounded by those who, with the exception of Hugh B. Brown, insisted on keeping the ban, he was nevertheless "repeatedly pleading with the Lord for a complete reversal" (105). He would not change the policy without a revelation, which never came, but the authors rightly maintain that "it is no stretch to assert that David O. McKay built the foundation upon which the revelation to Spencer W. Kimball rests" (105).

A chapter on education catalogs the remarkable growth of Brigham Young University, largely the result of President McKay's confidence in the controversial and sometimes overly tenacious BYU President Ernest L. Wilkinson. The authors also discuss the ever-present matter of academic freedom. Though religious orthodoxy was certainly within the purview of the university president, they say, political orthodoxy was another matter—especially when Wilkinson attempted unsuccessfully to discipline, or even release, certain faculty members for their views. (One minor clarification: Richard D. Poll is referred to as a professor of political science when, in fact, he was a professor of history. The confusion may come from the fact that Poll was a professor of history and political science before the two disciplines were given their own departments, after which Poll was solely a professor of history.)

The authors also discuss the Church College of Hawaii, Ricks College, and the unsuccessful attempt by Wilkinson to establish an extensive junior college program. All this provides some interesting insight into two different sides of President McKay: his deep devotion to broad, liberal education, but also, especially in connection with Wilkinson's plans to relocate Ricks College, his sometimes uncomfortable indecisiveness. One

weakness in this chapter, however, is that too little attention is paid to the dramatic expansion of the seminary and institute programs. Of particular importance were early-morning seminaries, which began the year before David O. McKay became Church President but expanded dramatically during his administration. It is not insignificant that from 1951 to 1970 seminary enrollment jumped from 29,812 to 132,053 and institute enrollment increased from 3,862 to 44,005.¹

The discussion of the building program is an example of the authors' frank yet even-handed approach to sensitive issues. With Henry D. Moyle, a member of the First Presidency, overseeing the program and Wendell Mendenhall as head of the building committee, the program boomed during President McKay's early years. Due to a variety of problems, however, including possible financial irregularities, Mendenhall was ultimately released, but the authors remind readers that judging the excesses of those years too harshly may be unfair. Both Moyle and Mendenhall had a vision of "lifting the image of the church throughout the world, of instilling in members a pride in their church that they did not have when meetings occurred in rented facilities that included nightclubs and bars, and of using handsome buildings to assist missionary efforts" (225). In that respect, they largely succeeded.

The missionary program, likewise, was beset with controversy and marred by some excesses, partly because of President Moyle's support of certain mission presidents whose overly enthusiastic prodding led to such abuses as the so-called baseball baptisms. Prince and Wright discuss these things openly, but also emphasize the long-term positive results of the entire period, such as the formation of new stakes and the raising up of local leadership. They also show empathy for the men whose reputations were marred by some of the excesses, reminding readers that they "acted out of genuine concern for the church to which they belonged and to which they devoted their lives" (253).

For some readers, the most disquieting discussion may be in chapter 12, "Confrontation with Communism." Here Elder Ezra Taft Benson looms large as the most extreme and outspoken anti-Communist among Church leaders. President McKay also despised Communism, and thus encouraged Elder Benson. In the eyes of others, however, the apostle became too extremist, especially in his open support of the John Birch Society. The inside story of the tension within Church leadership and the unsuccessful efforts of President McKay to check Elder Benson's excesses, but still make clear his own opposition to Communism, is dealt with in fascinating detail. On one occasion, after Elder Benson gave an especially inflammatory

address at BYU, President McKay authorized President Hugh B. Brown to give a strong rebuttal speech at the same school. In the end, however, just where President McKay stood on how to fight Communism was unclear for, the authors say, “both Latter-day Saints who endorsed the extreme views of the John Birch Society and those who opposed them found reason to believe the prophet was on their side” (279).

On other political issues, President McKay made every effort to demonstrate public neutrality, though he did not hesitate to take a stand if he thought moral issues were involved. The authors draw attention, for example, to his controversial support of right-to-work laws and his opposition to liquor-by-the-drink in Utah. They also tell of the surprising friendship that grew between him and U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson. One result of that friendship was Johnson’s clearing the way for LDS men to be appointed as military chaplains even though they did not have the requisite three years of formal theological training.

Many other important topics are discussed chapter by chapter. One is President McKay’s ecumenical outreach and deep respect for people of other faiths. A chapter on radio and television broadcasting details the Church’s failed effort to establish a short-wave radio network but also the beginnings of its successful programming through Bonneville International. Another examines the fitful start of the correlation program and its mixed results, frustrated in part by the long-entrenched bureaucracies of the auxiliary organizations. There is also a fine overview of President McKay’s desire to take the blessings of the temple to all members of the Church as well as his willingness to introduce certain changes in the temple ceremony that would “subordinate the physical aspects of the ceremony to the symbolic” (278).

When asked by a reporter what the most outstanding accomplishment of his administration was, President McKay replied, “The making of the Church a world-wide organization” (358). The authors agree and present a fine overview of how he accomplished that feat. Reversing the traditional “gathering” policy, improving the Church’s image abroad, placing emphasis on training local leaders, and recognizing great cultural differences among the peoples of the world were among the achievements that led toward internationalism not just in numbers but also in spirit.

David O. McKay and the Rise of Modern Mormonism is a must read for anyone interested in the history of the Church in the twentieth century. In their willingness to frankly discuss all the controversies the authors may offend some sensibilities, but in the end every reader should be impressed

with their clear appreciation for President McKay as both a prophet and a remarkable exemplar.

James B. Allen (who can be reached via byustudies@byu.edu) is Professor of History Emeritus and a former Senior Research Fellow at the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History, both at Brigham Young University.

1. William E. Berrett, *A Miracle in Weekday Religious Education* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Printing Center, 1988), 245.

Gary Topping. *Utah Historians and the Reconstruction of Western History*.

Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003

Reviewed by Brian Q. Cannon

In this engaging and creative study, Gary Topping, associate professor of history at Salt Lake Community College, examines the historical work and legacy of five scholars who wrote about Utah and Mormon history: Fawn Brodie, Bernard DeVoto, Juanita Brooks, Dale Morgan, and Wallace Stegner. The five never constituted a cohesive group. Brodie, Brooks, and Morgan grew up in Mormon households whereas DeVoto and Stegner did not. Only Brooks retained her religious faith past her youth. Morgan alone interacted closely with each of the others. They resembled one another in their lack of university degrees in history, their tireless research, and their engaging literary style.

While Topping surveys these Utahns' scholarship broadly, his incisive analysis of their interpretations of Mormon history will be of particular interest to readers of this journal. DeVoto grew up in Ogden as the son of an apostate Catholic and a lapsed Mormon. Theology held no more appeal for DeVoto than it did for his parents. DeVoto bid good riddance to Utah in 1915 when he departed for Harvard. As an expatriate he lampooned Utah and Mormonism in a series of articles published in *American Mercury* in the 1920s, characterizing Ogden as a "scurvy little Mormon-Gentile dump" (48) and Mormonism as "equal parts of smugness, ignorance, and superstition" (53). DeVoto later expressed admiration for Mormon pioneering and solidarity in his classic *Year of Decision 1846*, and in 1943 he apologized publicly for his "ignorant, brash, prejudiced, malicious, and what is worst of all, irresponsible" criticism of Utah and the Mormons (87). But he retained his contempt for Mormon doctrine, which he labeled "simply preposterous" (87), and for Joseph Smith, whom he regarded as paranoid and incapable of effective leadership. Topping does not accept Joseph Smith's theology any more than DeVoto did, but he censures DeVoto for his one-sided interpretation. He finds DeVoto's unflattering portrait of the founding prophet, along with his portrait of many other historical figures,

to be a “caricature” (89) and an “interpretive distortion” (101) that underestimates Smith’s capacity for organization and leadership.

Dale Morgan was a native of Salt Lake City who “quietly apostatized” as a teenager (125). His finest work was his biography of mountain man/explorer Jedediah Smith, but he also wrote on Mormon themes. His first major historical publication was a study of the theocratic ghost government of Deseret that operated unofficially alongside the territorial government of Utah in the mid-nineteenth century. Although Morgan planned to write a multivolume history of Mormonism, he managed to complete only seven chapters that traced the first twenty-five years of Joseph Smith’s life. Those chapters, with their “completely naturalistic” (144) interpretation of the Book of Mormon, were posthumously edited and published in 1986. Morgan believed that his interpretation of Joseph Smith flowed from the facts, but Topping points out that Morgan’s selection and interpretation of the facts were largely shaped by his bias against supernatural explanations.

Topping moves next to a consideration of the work of Juanita Brooks, the Nevada native whose study of the Mountain Meadows Massacre earned her the praise of historians and the scorn of neighbors and some Church leaders. Praising Brooks for the example of integrity that she set in writing Mormon history, Topping nevertheless finds her explanation of the causes of the massacre to be insufficient. In contending that southern Utahns fell victim to hysteria and provocation, Brooks overlooked the possibility that “fundamental personal or cultural flaws” (219) such as violent tendencies or teachings motivated them, he says. Topping argues persuasively that Brooks’s loyalty to Mormonism shaped her interpretation of the massacre just as much as Morgan’s distrust of the supernatural shaped his account of Joseph Smith.

Wallace Stegner, who grew up in Salt Lake City and was educated at the University of Utah, wrote often and insightfully about Utah and Mormons in works including *Mormon Country*, *Joe Hill*, *The Big Rock Candy Mountain*, *Recapitulation*, and *The Gathering of Zion*. Topping praises Stegner for his evenhanded and “fair” if somewhat nostalgic characterization of Utah in *Mormon Country*, which was admired by Mormons and non-Mormons alike. Topping justly criticizes Stegner’s history of the Mormon migration to Utah, *The Gathering of Zion*, for attributing too much of Mormon organization to Brigham Young’s influence, enriching his narrative with imagined detail and distorting the personalities of some characters.

The final writer whom Topping discusses is Fawn Brodie, whose prominent Mormon relatives included David O. McKay and BYU President

George Brimhall. Topping praises Brodie for “magnificent[ly]” linking Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon to Smith’s cultural environment, but he criticizes her for failing in the original edition of *No Man Knows My History* to provide a convincing motive for the founding prophet’s alleged deception.

Aside from the fact that they were contemporaries with ties to Utah who wrote on Mormon topics, what links these writers? Topping convincingly argues that “the creative tension with their native culture . . . ignited and propelled [these writers’] careers” (4). All of them were reacting against the “heavy-handed pro-Mormon interpretations prominent in most Utah histories of their day” (8). Topping attributes the shortcomings of these five writers partly to insufficient training in history and partly to “the Mormon worldview” (323).

Unquestionably, greater training in historical methods would have encouraged Brooks and Morgan to ask larger questions and set their work within a broader historiographical context. It might have also made Stegner, DeVoto, and Brodie more sensitive to nuances and complexity in their evidence. The impact of the Mormon worldview upon these writers collectively is more questionable, though. First of all, what is the Mormon worldview? According to Topping it is a perspective in which “irony is essentially alien” (40) and “the truth is always on the surface” (323). By denying original sin, it also tends toward an “optimistic conception of human nature” (208). These are generalizations that oversimplify the complexity and variety in Mormon scripture and discourse as well as the differences among Latter-day Saints in outlook.

The influence of Mormon cosmology upon these writers is most plausible in the case of Brooks, who retained her faith in Mormonism as an adult. Topping convincingly argues that Mormonism shaped Brooks’s interpretations. Its impact upon Brodie and Morgan, both of whom abandoned their faith as teenagers, is asserted but not demonstrated. Both tried to explain the Mormon past in their research and writing, but Mormonism’s enduring impact upon their mature perceptions of motive, human nature, truth, and irony is questionable. Both reacted against their flawed and partial understanding of a faith and an institution that they had summarily rejected in their adolescence. Stegner and DeVoto became fairly well acquainted with Mormon culture during their adolescence; their interpretations of Mormon history reflected their perceptions as outside observers of institutional Mormonism but their rejection of the supernatural prevented them from taking Mormonism seriously.

Although Topping overstates Mormonism’s impact upon most of these writers, his book nevertheless brims with trenchant observations

regarding each author's methodology, biases, assumptions, and conclusions. Topping probes into differences between fiction and history, considers the relative significance of environmental and psychological factors as causal agents, and discusses the difficulty of emphasizing strands in the evidence without distortion. He shows these writers' tendency to project their own concerns onto those they studied and the ways that bias influenced their selection and interpretation of evidence. All of this makes for an illuminating reading experience.

Brian Q. Cannon (brian_cannon@byu.edu) is Associate Professor of History at Brigham Young University. He received his PhD in American history from the University of Wisconsin–Madison. He serves on the *BYU Studies* editorial board.

Edward J. Larson. *Evolution:
The Remarkable History of a Scientific Theory.*

New York: The Modern Library, 2004

Trent D. Stephens and D. Jeffrey Meldrum
with Forrest B. Peterson. *Evolution and Mormonism:
A Quest for Understanding.*

Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2001

Reviewed by William E. Evenson

The unifying biological concept of evolution, and particularly its implications for human origins, is of widespread interest among members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints because questions of human biology and origins make contact with our sense of who we are and our relationships to one another, to other species, and to God. These two books provide a valuable foundation for exploring evolution: What is this scientific framework, within which all of modern biology is now viewed? How did it develop, and what are its relationships to other or supporting bodies of scientific knowledge and facts? What is the official position of the LDS Church with respect to these ideas? What of unofficial views of LDS leaders? Can evolution be reconciled with faith in a satisfying way?

Larson's book, *Evolution*, written by a prize-winning scholar with extensive publications in evolution-related intellectual and social history, gives valuable historical perspective for addressing these questions. This Modern Library edition, compact as is usual for this series, covers more than two hundred years of history in 286 pages of main text. It is a treasure of historical information, giving an excellent overview of the development of the ideas of evolution and natural selection and pointing the reader to sources for further information where desired. This book, like Larson's previous books, is gracefully written. It maintains scholarly integrity while flowing smoothly from Cuvier's pioneering precursor work in the late eighteenth century up to present-day issues. Larson does

excellent work in clearly connecting important developments in this history to their earlier roots. Furthermore, he is especially strong in weaving in personal histories and interesting biographical details of the scientists who figure in his history. Besides its readability, Larson's book can be recommended for its evenhandedness. The book is not a brief for or against evolution or any variant theory.

The idea of evolution had been gaining popularity since the Enlightenment. But the science was limited until the seminal work of Georges Cuvier in comparative anatomy in the late 1700s. Larson begins the story there. Cuvier set the stage for Darwin's ideas by recognizing the validity of fossils, the extinctions of species that the fossils suggested, and the possibility of reconstructing past natural history from geological evidence. Nevertheless, Cuvier, like most of us, was sufficiently a product of his time to have retained a strong commitment to the theory of "special creation," and he produced scientific arguments that were strong for his time in support of that theory. In fact, he introduced the idea of "irreducible functional complexity" to argue for special creation, an idea that has returned in modern "intelligent design" arguments, but ironically requiring strikingly different biological examples today because many of the cases cited by Cuvier have been understood and resolved through the progress of evolutionary science in the last two centuries.

From Cuvier, the story proceeds through the discovery of dinosaur fossils by William Buckland in the late 1810s, and then Gideon Mantell in 1821, to the early development of geology as a full-fledged science. Most of the early English geologists were committed Christians who naturally viewed their science through the lens of their understanding of the Bible. Another French scientist and colleague of Cuvier (though bitter intellectual opponent), Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, advocated continuous change of species and, seeking a mechanism for this, proposed the inheritance of acquired characteristics, a concept destined to recur in connection with scientific puzzles that turned up over the next century and more. Charles Lyell championed the now-dominant geological paradigm of uniformitarianism, the idea that the same natural processes have operated in the past as are observed today, a concept that proved crucial to providing Darwin sufficient time for evolution to operate.

The history continues with the voyage of the *Beagle* and Darwin's awakening to uniformitarianism and succession relationships among species. Darwin gradually came to view creationism as unscientific, a central argument used today against teaching "creation science" or its variants, including intelligent design, in science classes. The contributions of Alfred

Russel Wallace are discussed, both in connection with the initial public proposal of the mechanism of natural selection and his later science. Larson also looks carefully at the philosophical-rhetorical aspects of the growing influence of the ideas of evolution and natural selection. T. H. Huxley and Asa Gray were two staunch defenders who came from nearly opposite religious positions. By the early 1900s evolution was widely accepted in science, but the mechanism—how it worked—was still unclear, and natural selection was consequently much less accepted. The mechanism question would not be resolved until the rediscovery of Mendelian genetics and the eventual synthesis of population genetics with evolution by natural selection. Convincing discoveries of evolutionary relationships among fossils, gradually filling in so-called missing links in several lines (for example, birds, horses and, eventually, humans), were persuasive for scientists in the early 1900s.

Larson discusses the terrible misapplication of the idea of evolution by natural selection in the eugenics movement, then goes on to examine the anti-evolution crusades in America in the 1920s, culminating in the 1925 *Scopes* trial. He reviews the development of the modern synthesis of genetics and natural selection. I found it interesting that by the 1950s, Darwin's finches from the Galapagos had become the "prime evidence for the modern synthesis" (241). Yet, ironically, "Darwin never actually mentioned them in *Origin of Species*" (241–42). Larson closes the book with a review of modern cultural developments (chapter 11), including the rise of creation science and, more recently, intelligent design, followed by a review of recent scientific developments (chapter 12), such as the impact of the discovery of the chemical structure of DNA and the introduction of sociobiology. The discovery of the chemistry of DNA has allowed the amazingly fruitful exploration of molecular mechanisms of evolution. Sociobiology is still controversial but has led to very interesting research whose future impact will be fascinating to follow.

Larson's *Evolution* does not go into the biology in great detail, being content with brief sketches or allusions where necessary. Rather, it focuses on evolution as an idea and its impact on both science and the larger intellectual community. It is both reliable and successful as a study of the history of a remarkable idea.

If the Larson book supplies the necessary historical background for investigating the meaning and philosophical impact of the unifying biological concept of evolution, *Evolution and Mormonism*, by Stephens and Meldrum, is the best source known to me that is currently available to begin the study of the relationship of LDS doctrine to this important

concept. It provides a strong foundation of both religion and science to approach these issues. There are several reasons why I say this is the best current source: First, it is not insignificant that Stephens and Meldrum are both faithful and committed Latter-day Saints as well as respected scientists (biology professors at Idaho State University). The authors move in this work toward a synthesis of science and religion that is consistent with both LDS doctrine and recent science, and thereby construct a more productive synthesis than heretofore. Second, it is designed for LDS readers seeking an introduction that reviews relevant LDS doctrine as well as the basic science. Such an introduction is otherwise only available in bits and pieces, primarily in articles. Starting with this book, LDS readers can prepare themselves to pursue particular issues in more depth in other works. Third, this book is more ambitious than other currently available treatments of this subject; it goes beyond what anyone else has done, especially in remaining faithful to the scientific data. There are other, perhaps better, introductions to evolutionary science, but none better that also expound and take seriously the LDS doctrinal issues.

The authors find no conflict between their faith and science, and they attempt in this book to show why other Mormons need find no such conflict. They do this by considering interpretations of the scriptures and of scientific data and concepts that are consistent with one another. Of course, theirs is not the only possible way to view either the scriptures or the science. And such a path necessarily involves speculation. Nevertheless, in my view their effort is reasonably successful, particularly in forthrightly addressing the two major questions that are commonly seen as separating LDS beliefs from an evolutionary worldview:

(1) If evolution is an entirely random process, as many evolutionary biologists say, how then can there be order in the universe? How could God have been in control of the process if the outcome was unpredictable? How could we have been created in God's image as the result of a random evolutionary process? (2) If Adam and Eve came into being as the result of evolutionary processes, how then could they have been immortal? If they were not immortal, how do we explain the Fall? If there was no Fall, what was the mission of Jesus? If there was no Fall and Atonement, is there then no Christianity? (xvii)

The thoughtful foreword by BYU professor Duane E. Jeffery nicely puts this work into perspective with the intellectual currents in the Church in the twentieth century. An appendix provides two important First Presidency statements on evolution and the origin of man (1909 and 1925) and an unsigned "Priesthood Quorums' Table" editorial instruction on the origin of man from the official Church magazine (1910).

The authors requested “an official declaration of doctrine” (7) from the First Presidency prior to writing this book. The response consisted essentially of the 1909 First Presidency statement “The Origin of Man” as reprinted in the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*. I have personally seen ample evidence that Church leaders at various levels have not yet reached consensus on the means and methods employed in the creation of life on earth, although there is no lack of agreement concerning God’s overall plan and purpose. Thus, Church practice since these authors’ inquiry has been to respond to similar questions about evolution with brief, rather noncommittal statements, emphasizing by implication that the Church has no official position on organic evolution as a process for the development of life on earth.

Further insight is obtained by comparing the 1909 and 1925 First Presidency statements. Stephens and Meldrum point out that the 1925 statement “removed what had been construed by some as implicit anti-evolution sentiments in the 1909 statement” (44). Additional context is interesting: the 1925 statement was requested of the First Presidency by a major U.S. news organization that was collecting the positions of churches in America on organic evolution due to the interest in the *Scopes* trial. President Heber J. Grant and his counselors provided an edited version of the 1909 statement rather than sending the full 1909 statement itself as the official Church position.

Large sections of the book explore statements by LDS leaders, both official and unofficial. The authors approach the widely varying views generously. As the BYU Board of Trustees, consisting of General Authorities and officers of the Church, said in their 1992 cover letter to the BYU Evolution Packet, “Formal statements by the First Presidency are the definitive source of official Church positions.”¹ The official statements on evolution are those contained in that packet: 1909 First Presidency statement, 1910 First Presidency Christmas Message affirming the consistency of LDS doctrine with “true science,” 1925 First Presidency statement, and 1992 *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* article on “Evolution” containing a 1931 First Presidency instruction to General Authorities. With the exception of the 1910 Christmas Message, these official statements are reviewed in chapter 4. In addition, numerous unofficial views are reproduced. It becomes clear in this chapter that no single view of evolution has been held by Church leaders.

As the authors consider the scientific status of evolution, they point out that “over 90 percent of the evidence that we have available to test the theory of evolution today did not exist in 1960” (17). Furthermore, at

this stage of scientific knowledge, “the data overwhelmingly indicate that humans are not unique but are related to other animals. In fact, this similarity is so close that, at the cellular level and below, humans are largely indistinguishable from other mammals. There is no scientific evidence supporting the notion that humans are physically unique” (30). In dealing with the science of evolution they explore such questions as the following: What are the central claims of Darwin’s theory? What is the theory as it stands now, with our knowledge of DNA, for example? What is the evidence for evolution from molecular and cell biology? from fossils? What is the place of man in the natural world?

Stephens and Meldrum give in chapter 11 their personal interpretation of the creation story in Genesis, providing a point-by-point, verse-by-verse analysis. This chapter would have benefited from reference to B. H. Roberts’s analysis of these same issues in his book *The Truth, the Way, the Life* (which was not published until 1994). Unfortunately, it does not become clear until the last paragraph of the chapter why the authors judge this detailed argument/exegesis to be so important: there they clarify how their interpretation of Genesis allows a reconciliation of the scientific evidence with the role that Adam and Eve play in the scriptural account. There is an interesting attempt to reach a consistent understanding of science and the Genesis story because of their carefully detailed comparison of the scientific evidence and the scriptural text.

How can man be made “in God’s image” if evolution proceeds by random events? This question has been troublesome for religious persons seeking to deal seriously with evolution, and it is the subject of chapter 12. The basic answer given in this book is that natural laws provide constraints on evolutionary processes; only certain pathways are possible. The weakest part of this book from a scientific point of view is the impression given in this chapter that such constraints are already significantly understood and that the work of Stephens and his students on this topic is widely accepted. This is indeed an interesting line of work, but it is still not widely viewed as a major determinant of evolutionary development. Stephens may be correct, and he has not shied from vigorous defense of these ideas (nor should he), but it is unfortunate that a book of this kind for a general audience neglects to distinguish what is established and accepted in the scientific community from what is in its infancy and subject to varying interpretations. It would be unfortunate if readers are caught out should the science finally go in a different direction.

My major criticisms of this book are twofold: (1) the speculative science discussed in the previous paragraph, and (2) the idiosyncratic and

speculative interpretation of scripture to which the authors sometimes resort (see chapter 11, for example). Neither of these concerns is particularly damning since both issues can be understood in context, and judgment can be reserved. I would also love to see a book from this faithful point of view that deals with recent discoveries in neuroscience and the implications (if any) for the relationship of body and spirit. But that is clearly beyond the scope of the present treatise.

What has occurred in the nearly four years since *Evolution and Mormonism* was published that might change how we view these issues? The scientific evidence has only strengthened. Progress has been made with some of the challenges, such as the evolutionary history of whales and evolutionary pathways to bacterial flagella. Fossils of a remarkable new small species of human have been discovered (*Homo floresiensis*), leading to interesting reassessments of the branches of human evolution, but changing nothing fundamental in the relationships outlined in this book. The LDS doctrinal position remains undefined. In my opinion, this is wise. Humans cannot predict the course of science or where future insights will lead. Only clear revelation to the Church leadership would give direction that does not run the risk of requiring future major reinterpretation with accompanying embarrassment. Apparently, such revelation has not yet been received.

So what is the current state of evolutionary science? What of purported “holes” in the theory? In considering evolution as a unifying biological concept, I do not believe there are any major gaps in the data or in our understanding of it that might suggest the theory is inadequate or in crisis. The overarching concept accommodates both the well-understood data of science and the not-so-well-understood; there are no strong contradictions. So where is research being done? Are all questions already answered? Of course not. There are many issues still being explored: how particular organs may have evolved, under what environmental or competitive pressures, and on what evolutionary time scale, for example. On the evolutionary pathways for the development of particular groups of species, I commend readers to the book by Kenneth R. Miller, *Finding Darwin’s God: A Scientist’s Search for Common Ground Between God and Evolution*, in which a committed, believing Catholic and cell biologist examines the compatibility of evolution with his religious faith. Of course, there are gaps in our current knowledge (for example, what is the origin of Alzheimer’s disease, and how do we understand its evolution?), but the history of science is a history of filling such gaps. If we hope to find the place for God’s action in the world in such gaps, we play a dangerous game:

Where is God, then, when science finally explains the gap? What have we have chosen to rest our faith on?

LDS students of this profoundly significant subject would do well to read both of these books. I suggest that the Larson book is the place to start. Then *Evolution and Mormonism* will help put the unifying concept into perspective within our religious teachings. The thoughtful LDS learner will subsequently be able to approach additional questions in this area with well-informed views.

William E. Evenson (evenson@byu.edu) is Associate Dean and Professor of Physics at Utah Valley State College and Professor Emeritus of Brigham Young University. Dr. Evenson is a Fellow of the American Physics Society. He earned a PhD in theoretical physics at Iowa State University and a BS in physics at BYU. He is the author of "Evolution," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, ed. Daniel H. Ludlow, 4 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1992), 2:478; "LDS Doctrine and the Theory of Evolution," in *Can Science Be Faith Promoting?* by Sterling B. Talmage, ed. Stan Larson; and "Science: The Universe, Creation, and Evolution," in *The Truth, the Way, the Life*, by B. H. Roberts, ed. John W. Welch, 2d ed. (Provo, Utah: BYU Studies, 1996). Dr. Evenson served on the BYU Studies advisory board for many years.

1. BYU Evolution Packet (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1992), 3.

Dallas Willard. *The Divine Conspiracy:
Rediscovering Our Hidden Life in God.*

New York: HarperCollins, 1997

Reviewed by Godfrey J. Ellis

Many fascinating Christian books are currently available, and it is difficult to know which ones merit attention. Occasionally, one book comes along that is truly important, not only because of what it says *to* Latter-day Saints, but also because of what it says *for* Latter-day Saints. It is as if the author is an “agent on the inside”—making points that no LDS author could as credibly make. Such a book is Dallas Willard’s *The Divine Conspiracy*. Although this book has been on the shelf for almost ten years now, it has retained its value to Latter-day Saints and deserves wider notice than it has received so far.

In its foreword, Richard Foster calls the work a “masterpiece and a wonder,” and compares it to Michelangelo’s Sistine Chapel ceiling (ix). While these are superlatives run amok, it is true that *The Divine Conspiracy* is a jewel. Latter-day Saints should warmly welcome its viewpoints on popular culture, scholarship, and spirituality. The titles alone of its ten chapters should catch the eye of every Latter-day Saint; for example, “Entering the Eternal Kind of Life Now,” “What Jesus Knew: Our God-Bathed World,” “Who Is Really Well Off?—The Beatitudes,” “On Being a Disciple, or Student, of Jesus,” “A Curriculum for Christlikeness,” and “The Restoration of All Things.” Its sparkling doctrinal points are strikingly underscored, not just by what is being said but also by who is saying it. Although Latter-day Saints will probably disagree with some terms, concepts, and conclusions in *The Divine Conspiracy*, those logical differences are overshadowed by the value of the author’s positive and passionate convictions.

An example of Willard’s convictions is seen in his treatment of the Sermon on the Mount. He claims that Christian scholars seem baffled by the text and laments, “We are scattered, wandering, and have no clear and comprehensive message for life because our most important text is an enigma” (132). Then he discovers, to his astonishment, that the teachings represent “one [unified] discourse—purposely organized” (132, 133) and

not just random sayings that “unknown ‘editors’ had thrown together as one might throw marbles into a sack” (132). His enthusiasm about his new discovery virtually jumps off the page as he hopes “to gain a fresh hearing for Jesus” (xiii). But, in fact, LDS scholars have already seen this harmony, and much more. For example, John Welch has masterfully unfolded the unity of the discourse(s), especially in a temple context.¹

The Divine Conspiracy conveys a great share of excitement with an abundance of catchy, turn-of-phrase sparkle. One jolt concerns the so-called Christian left. Many Latter-day Saints are vulnerably unaware that a Christian left exists. Willard shows that a growing percentage of “mainstream” Christians hold decidedly liberal political and social perspectives. The simple dichotomy of Christian right versus secular left disappeared years ago. Willard then describes, criticizes, and dismantles the Christian left, arguing that the emphasis on political and social action has resulted in a total loss of understanding of Christ. By downplaying worship in favor of social activism, they destroy any sense in which God and Jesus are persons, “alive and accessible” (53). On their present course, Willard fears, the Christian left may soon break away from Christ entirely. While I fear that short-visioned Latter-day Saints might say, “Let ‘em go!” the loss of any believers in Jesus Christ diminishes us all at a time when people of faith are under attack as never before. No man is an island, as John Donne noted long ago, and Christians need strength and unity in the face of the secular forces currently ravaging our society. Christianity cannot afford to lose the Christian left.

Willard also takes on the Christian far right, rejecting their extreme view that salvation comes simply by declaring that Jesus is Lord—in other words, through grace alone. Sounding decidedly outside the mainstream, Willard claims that believing in faith without any effort or behavior change is tantamount to believing that one has been “let off the divine hook” (42). The focus on the distant afterlife, over the immediate here-and-now, is an effective dismissal of the very object of their professed faith. Willard calls this situation “consumer Christianity” (342) and claims that those believers have an almost total lack of understanding of what a new birth in Christ really means. They may have “faith in faith but will have little faith in God” (91). They “self-identify as Christians while having hardly a whiff of Christlikeness about them” (42). The end result is that those on the far right, who “profess Christian commitment, consistently show little or no behavioral and psychological difference from those who do not” (43).

Instead of a Christian left or a Christian right, Willard proposes Christian discipleship. A sizeable portion of Willard’s audience, of course, sees salvation as an irrevocable gift of pure grace utterly independent of

merit or works. Sensitive to such readers, Willard avoids the word *works*, as he subtly pushes for a moderation of the “just-believe-and-you’re-saved” position. A “magical moment of mental assent” (43) is not enough to produce disciples, and discipleship is mandatory for the life change that results in salvation. In contrast, Willard tells his readers that they must work out their own salvation in a *joint project* with God. As did C. S. Lewis, Willard communicates powerful insights to LDS readers. Neal A. Maxwell once said of Lewis, “While it is not doctrine for which I look to Lewis, I find his *depiction* of discipleship especially articulate and helpful.”²

One of Willard’s most powerful points comes as he discusses the attainment of true discipleship based on a pure change of heart. Once that happens, simple discipleship flows out of our new identity. Willard drives his point home with a piercing analogy. Was it difficult for Christ to forgive from the cross? No. “What would have been hard for him,” Willard suggests, “would have been to curse his enemies and spew forth vileness and evil upon everyone” (183). That was not in his nature. Willard underscores his point by charging readers actually to become “as [Christ] was, permeated with love” (183).

Members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints will want to read Dallas Willard for the same reasons they have wanted to read C. S. Lewis—because it is so warmly validating to hear a non-LDS voice preach LDS doctrine and because new, outside insights often spotlight old, inside truths. This book preaches correct doctrines to mainstream Christians in a way that would be impossible for an LDS author to do. In teaching great principles to all Christians, including Latter-day Saints, this book can bring readers closer to Christ. No higher recommendation than that can be given.

Godfrey J. Ellis (who can be reached via byustudies@byu.edu) is Professor of Psychology at Saint Martin’s University. He earned a BA and an MA at Brigham Young University and a PhD in Family Sociology and Social Psychology at Washington State University.

1. John W. Welch, *The Sermon at the Temple and the Sermon on the Mount* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1990); and John W. Welch, *Illuminating the Sermon at the Temple and the Sermon on the Mount* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1999).

2. Neal A. Maxwell, “C. S. Lewis: Insights on Discipleship,” in C. S. Lewis: *The Man and His Message*, ed. Andrew C. Skinner and Robert L. Millet (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1999), 9.