

A decorative border with a repeating floral and scrollwork pattern, enclosing the central text.

PART II

The Way

“I am the way . . . no man cometh
unto the Father, but by me.”

Jesus (John 14:6)

The Way of Eternal Life— The Everlasting Gospel

Having now as background the knowledge that may be had of the universe, somewhat of its nature, extent, and grandeur; some knowledge of its inhabitants and the controlling power of harmonized, divine intelligences within it; some knowledge of the origin of man and his nature; likewise, some knowledge of the purpose of God in relation to man's earth life; we are prepared to consider the way to, and the way of, that eternal life.

Sources of authority. We again take occasion to remind the reader that we shall discuss this part of our treatise in the light of all the knowledge that is to be had from all the revelations of God given in all ages, in all dispensations of the gospel, and from among all people who have received any dispensation of the word of God in relation to this subject. That will at least include all that is to be found in the Old Testament and the New; the fragments of the writings from Moses^a as revealed to Joseph Smith, known as the book of Moses; and the fragments from the writings of Abraham, known as book of Abraham; both of which fragments are found in the Pearl of Great Price. Also we shall appeal to the Book of Mormon, which contains the revelations of God to the ancient inhabitants of America; and also the revelations given directly of God to Joseph Smith, the Prophet of this New Dispensation of the gospel, which revelations received by him are collected and published in the Doctrine and Covenants. All these books are accepted

^aRoberts's use of the word "fragments" in connection with the book of Moses should not be construed to refer to an actual written document from which Joseph Smith translated the book, but rather to affirm that Joseph restored, by inspiration, a portion of the ancient writing of Moses. Roberts discusses Joseph Smith's Inspired Version of the book of Genesis in his *Comprehensive History of the Church* 1:238-39.

as scripture by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.¹ All these scriptures will be freely quoted in what we have to say in revelation to the way in which God has designed to bring to pass his purposes with reference to man in his earth life and his eternal life; and all this, without further explanation for using as authoritative reference works, these ancient and modern revelations of God. To the writer, these scriptures are all of equal authority, all of them dependable sources of knowledge. Also we remind the reader again that we shall depend upon the reasonableness, the beauty, the order, the exactness, and the wholeness of God's planned way to bring to pass the immortality and the eternal life of man, to carry conviction of its truth to the mind of the reader, rather than an appeal to any special texts, however apropos to the subject they may be.

Let it be our first concern, then, to present a larger view of this way than is ordinarily entertained, keeping in mind, however, that such revelations as our prophets and seers have received are limited in their application to our earth and its heavens, and that they concern intelligences, spirits, angels, men—the human race—that pertain to our earth and its heavens.

The one and only gospel: This everlasting. Already we have quoted the scripture in the letter of Paul to Titus, giving out the fact that St. Paul lived “In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began” (Titus 1:2). This at once declares the existence of God's plan for the eternal life of man before the world began, so that we may say that God's plan of the way for man's eternal life is older than the earth. This “plan of eternal life,” or way, is referred to in other scriptures as the “everlasting gospel.” St. John so speaks of it, in describing the coming of a new dispensation of that gospel subsequent to his own day, and as coming forth in “the hour of his ⟨God's⟩ judgment.” Therefore in the last days he said:

I saw another angel fly⟨ing⟩ in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach [un]to them that dwell ⟨upon⟩ [on] the earth. . . . Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come. (Rev. 14:6–7)

The only use we make of this quotation here is to show that the gospel is referred to as the “everlasting gospel,” the plan of eternal life which God promised before the world began. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the blood of the Christ is referred to as “the blood of the everlasting

¹For a treatise on these several books, the reader or student may consult Roberts, *Seventy's Course in Theology*, first year.

covenant" (Heb. 13:20). In Revelation, Jesus is spoken of as "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8). Also a war in heaven is spoken of, where "Michael and his angels fought against the dragon (the devil); and the dragon fought and his angels, And prevailed not; neither was their <peace> [place] found any more in heaven" (Rev. 12:7-8).^b Undoubtedly this "war in heaven," was Lucifer's rebellion in the spirit world, before the earth life of man began, and had some relationship to man's earth life and to the purposes of God in regard to that life; all which will have further consideration later on. Enough, perhaps, is set forth here to establish the great antiquity of "the everlasting gospel," God's planned way for man's eternal life.

Let us now get the important fact established that there exists but one way for the bringing to pass of that eternal life plan of God, in other words, but one gospel; and that there has been, and never can be, but ~~one gospel~~, one way. So sure was St. Paul of this, that in writing the church at Galatia, where certain schisms and divisions appeared, that he reproved them by saying sarcastically:

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we [have] preach[ed] unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. (Gal. 1:6-9)

And to the schismatic factions at Corinth he wrote, reproving them for saying, as these factions did say, we are of Paul, we are of Christ; and then came this thundering question, "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" (1 Cor. 1:13). All this makes it clear that there is but one gospel and ever shall be but one, and that, "the everlasting gospel," God's one plan for man's salvation, God's promise of eternal life to be wrought out in all ages by various dispensations of that one gospel plan.

Dispensation: The meaning of. This brings us to the necessity of defining a dispensation. The word in the revelations of God is used in its ordinary meaning of "giving out," as dispensing food to the hungry, clothing to the needy, or dispensing just judgments to violators of the law; giving out. So as to the gospel, giving out knowledge of its truths

^bThe reading, "neither was there peace found" was probably a transcriptional error.

by revelation from God; **revealing it in whole or in subdivisions or part of it**, by bestowing through the administration of angels, or otherwise divine authority upon men, the priesthood, by which man may be authorized to teach and preach in the authority of God, or administer in its ordinances, baptisms[†] for the remission for sins, or the laying on of hands for reception of the Holy Ghost, or consecrate the emblems of the holy sacrament, which represent the crucified body and the shed blood of the Christ for the redemption of man. These are the outgivings comprising knowledge of gospel truth, and outgivings of authority to administer to man the ordinances of that gospel. All the while, however, let it be held in mind, that there is but the one gospel and these dispensations are but acts of God, directly or indirectly giving out knowledge and authority with reference to that one gospel.

Sometimes also a dispensation marks off an epoch in the continuous stream of God's providence towards man; as the Adamic dispensation, meaning by that, all the dispensations of God's truth, which may take place during Adam's life time, or with extension beyond Adam's life, so long as there is unbroken succession as **to** those things instituted during his life time. The Noachian dispensation or the dispensation of God's truth and authority to Noah and succeeding prophets until some developing event required a still further dispensing of some part of the one gospel, as in the matter of the dispensation which called Abraham and set him apart to bring to pass some special purpose of God; the Mosaic dispensation; and the Christian dispensation, comprising that wonderful era made glorious by the personal ministry of the Christ, the offering of the supreme sacrifice which was to redeem and save a world, the very heart of the whole gospel scheme. And beyond that is mentioned another dispensation—a dispensation of the fullness of times spoken of by the apostle Paul in Ephesians, in which it is promised that God will “gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him” (Eph. 1:10); indicating that there will be a dispensation of dispensations, a dispensation of the fullness of all times; and of all dispensations, both in heaven and in earth, a dispensation which will include all that has gone before, and which figuratively may be **represented as the gathering together of all the streams of earth and emptying flowing** them into the ocean, to be held by that ocean in one great union of all the river systems and all the seven seas. So with the dispensation of the

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve objected to the term *baptisms*: “‘Baptisms for the remission of sins.’ We question the plural.” Reporting to President Clawson on October 10, 1929, George Albert Smith explained: “We have but one baptism.”

fullness of times, as all rivers to the ocean trend, so all dispensations come into and are included in this one last and completed dispensation, in which all things both in heaven and in earth shall be gathered together in one, even in Christ. Such the meaning of a dispensation of the gospel; and such the meaning *also* of the dispensation of the fullness of times, the dispensation to which we now have come, and in which we labor for the achievement of God's great purpose in all the labor and travail of our earth and its heavens, and all the human race that have been or shall be associated with our earth and its heavens, and with all the intelligences and the angels and spirits that have or shall belong to it, all entering into this ~~one~~ dispensation^c which unites and completes all dispensations.

The war in heaven. The "war in heaven" described by St. John in his book of Revelation, and briefly referred to above, requires more detailed consideration. I give St. John's account of it in full:

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. (Rev. 12:7-11)

There is liable to be confusion arising from St. John's description of this "war in heaven" on account of connecting it with persecuting earth-powers to which the "Dragon" of "the war in heaven"—the Devil and Satan—gives his power, and wrath, and vindictiveness—in efforts made to destroy the church of God. This dragon, or Satan being the underlying force and inspiration of those earthly powers which persecuted the saints, and chiefly, in John's time, the persecuting Roman Emperors. The "war in heaven," however, in reality took place in heaven before the advent of man on the earth; and it was doubtless on that occasion to which Jesus referred when he said to the triumphantly returning seventy from their mission, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall

^cRoberts was one of the earliest in the latter-day Church to describe what is meant by the term dispensation. For more on this topic, see the introduction to volume one of his *Comprehensive History of the Church*.

from heaven" (Luke 10:18). The whole circumstance of this rebellion, as before stated, took place before man's advent to the earth, and among the preexistent spirits of the spirit world.

One naturally wonders why there should be rebellion and war in heaven, and what it could be all about. Satan—as we shall see—was with his angels overwhelmed; and all were cast out into the earth for seeking to overthrow the plans of God. It is significant that in an earlier verse of the chapter from which we quoted John's account of the "war in heaven," that the great Dragon drew after him "the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth," doubtless meaning the number of those who in the "war in heaven" fought on the Dragon's side (Rev. 12:4).

Again: Why this "war in heaven," and what was it all about? The book of Revelation supplies no definite answer to that question, nor is there any enlightenment in the Old Testament or the New. By revelation in modern days, however, in this New Dispensation of the gospel in which all things are being gathered together in Christ, important additions of knowledge are brought to light concerning this great event. In the fragment, the book of Abraham, it is said that the Lord revealed to Abraham the existence of the intelligences that were organized before the world was. Meaning, doubtless, the intelligences which had been begotten spirits, therefore he beheld in his vision these preexistent spirits destined for habitancy on the earth.

And among all these there were many of the noble and great ones; And God saw these souls that they were good, and he stood in the midst of them, and he said: These I will make my rulers; for he stood among those that were spirits, and he saw that they were good; and he said unto [me] (Abraham): Abraham, thou art one of them; thou wast chosen before thou wast born. (Abr. 3:22-23)

The great, noble, and good. In addition to the fact of preexistence so clearly stated here, there are two other facts that deserve emphasis, viz., (1) that certain spirits, at least are chosen before they are born, and their earth missions assigned to them; (2) the other fact that is to be emphasized is that the basic reason for the selection of these special spirits for leadership in their projected earth life and missions is that they are "great" souls, that they are "noble" souls, and that they "are good"; and does not this make up the sum of all virtues that enter into leadership? They are great, they are noble, they are good! Under these generalizations may be assembled all the virtues; and these, God decreed, should be his "rulers," more especially chosen, doubtless, as his representatives in the earth as prophets, seers,

teachers, inspired of God. Abraham was one of them, and doubtless a type of the class whom God would use for the unfolding of his truth and his purposes in the earth.

The plan proposed. We resume our quotation from the book of Abraham:

And there stood one among them (the great, noble, and good spirits) that was like unto God, and he said unto those who were with him: We will go down, for there is space there, and we will take of these materials, and we will make an earth whereon these may dwell; And we will prove them herewith, to see if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them; And they who keep their first estate shall be added upon; and they who keep not their first estate shall not have glory in the same kingdom with those who keep their first estate; and they who keep their second estate shall have glory added upon their heads for ever and ever. (Abr. 3:24-26)

It will be seen that the purpose of the creation of the proposed earth is that these spirits which existed before the world was, which the Lord revealed to Abraham, and among whom Abraham was, is that the spirits might be “added upon” if they kept their first estate, which was their preexistent spirit life, and those who did keep their earth life, these will have added upon them glory forever and forever—in other words, will be put in the way of eternal progress. This God’s covenant with these spirits, which established “the hope of eternal life” referred to by St. Paul when he said, that he lived in such hope of eternal life, “which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began” (Titus 1:2).

The Savior chosen. To resume again our quotation:

And the Lord said: Whom shall I send? And one answered like unto the Son of Man: Here am I, send me. And another answered [and said]: Here am I, send me. And the Lord said: I will send the first. And the second was angry, and kept not his first estate; and, at that day, many followed after him. (Abr. 3:27-28)

“Whom shall I send?” Why it was necessary to send any one, does not appear in the book of Abraham, but from other revelations we learn both the significance of the question and the answer to it. First from the book of Moses, where the Lord in revealing unto Moses the things pertaining to our earth and its heaven and concerning his purposes with reference to man’s life on the earth, is given an account of Satan and his rebellion and the “war in heaven” that is illuminating; for early in his career as a prophet, Moses had come in

contact with Lucifer, and had successfully resisted him and his temptations; and then God said:

That Satan, whom thou hast commanded in the name of ⟨my⟩ [mine] Only Begotten, is the same which was ⟨in⟩ [from] the beginning, and he came before me, saying—Behold, here am I, send me, I will be thy son, and I will redeem all mankind, that one soul shall not be lost, and surely I will do it; wherefore give me thine honor. But, behold, my Beloved Son, which was my Beloved and Chosen from the beginning, said unto me—Father, thy will be done, and the glory be thine forever. Wherefore, because that Satan rebelled against me, and sought to destroy the agency of man, which I, the Lord God, had given him, and also, that I should give unto him mine own power; by the power of mine Only Begotten, I caused that he should be cast ⟨out⟩ [down]; And he became Satan, yea, even the devil, the father of all lies, to deceive and to blind men, and to lead them captive at his will, even as many as would not hearken unto my voice. (Moses 4:1–4)

The controversy in heaven, then, and Lucifer's ultimate rebellion concerned the plan, "the way," in which should be carried out the purposes of God with reference to the earth life of man, and what was to be attained through it; that is, the manner in which the hosts of spirits existing before the world was should receive those additions to their spirit life that would put them in the way of being "added upon"; increase of intelligence and power and glory without limitation: how they should be put in the way of eternal progress; and how, in some way, there would be a redemption for them from the complications that might arise in carrying out that scheme of things; and hence, one must needs ~~come~~ **be chosen** as a Redeemer. That bright spirit, a son of the morning, called "Lucifer," because of his high intelligence—"light bearer,"^d proposed to save all men—spirits when incarnate in human bodies—irrespective of what they might do. "Behold," said he, "here am I, send me, I will be thy son, and I will redeem all mankind, that one soul shall not be lost, and surely I will do it; wherefore give me thine honor" (Moses 4:1). Also Lucifer's proposal would strike down the agency of man, and save him on compulsion—not one should be lost.^e "Give me," however, "thy glory," is the spirit in which he spake. And then the Beloved Son, chosen from the beginning—determined upon of God—spake! Listen to him (and contrast his spirit with the

^dThe Latin name Lucifer means "Light Bearer." It is a translation of the Hebrew *beylél*, which connotes "shining one." The phrase *beylél ben shachar*, which first appears in Isaiah 14:12, has been variously translated as "shining one, son of dawn," "morning star," or "Lucifer, son of morning."

^eSee Moses 4:3.

spirit of Lucifer): “Father, thy will be done, and the glory be thine forever” (Moses 4:2). The answer to Lucifer was not obscure. Already it was known that the Father had decreed that those who kept not their first and second estates should not have glory in the same kingdom with those who kept those estates. That was the will of the Father, and therefore the Christ’s answer: “Father, thy will be done; and the glory be thine forever”; and with this he offered himself as the Redeemer. The agency of man in this offer was preserved, and likewise the glory of God.

And this was the One, the preexistent spirit of the Christ, who in earth life shall be known as Jesus of Nazareth, “Immanuel,”—“God with us.” He was chosen to be the Redeemer of men. And because Lucifer and his scheme of salvation for man was rejected, he rebelled against God, the Father, and Jesus Christ, chosen to be the Redeemer. But Lucifer and the hosts which followed him were overwhelmed, and were cast out of heaven, and took up their abode on earth, there to resist and defeat, if possible, the designs of God in bringing to pass the immortality and eternal life of man—as man; as spirits, united with earth elements, that they might have power to receive a fullness of joy, and which, as we have already seen, they could not receive without forming this inseparable connection with material elements.

More light on “the war in heaven.” There still remain other enlightening utterances about this “war in heaven,” and these given by direct revelation from God to the Prophet of the New Dispensation:

And it came to pass that Adam, being tempted of the devil—for, behold, the devil was before Adam, for he rebelled against me, saying, Give me thine honor, which is my power; and also a third part of the hosts of heaven turned he away from me because of their agency (the “third part of the stars of heaven” of St. John’s Revelation (12:4)); And they were thrust down, and thus came the devil and his angels; And, behold, there is a place prepared for them from the beginning, which place is hell. And it must needs be that the devil should tempt the children of men, or they could not be agents unto themselves; for if they never should have bitter they could not know the sweet—Wherefore, it came to pass that the devil tempted Adam, and he partook of the forbidden fruit and transgressed the commandment, wherein he became subject to the will of the devil, because he yielded unto temptation. (D&C 29:36–40)

In this quotation we see repeated some of the former elements entering into the rebellion of Lucifer, with the added item that one-third of the hosts of heaven followed Lucifer, because of their agency,

because they were free, even as spirits, to accept or reject the things proposed of God, subject, of course, to consequences.

One other, and the final quotation on this head, and from the same source of authority—a revelation of God given to the Prophet of the New Dispensation. It occurs in the noted vision given to the Prophet in February 1832, in which is set forth, as nowhere else, both the past and the future of preexistent spirits; of spirits in earth life, and the glory it is possible for them to attain through obedience to the gospel. In that part of the revelation which accounts for Lucifer's rebellion, and the "war in heaven," the Prophet says:

And this we saw also, and bear record, that an angel of God who was in authority in the presence of God, who rebelled against the Only Begotten Son whom the Father loved and who was in the bosom of the Father, was thrust down from the presence of God and the Son, And was called Perdition, for the heavens wept over him—he was Lucifer, a son of the morning. And we beheld, and lo, he is fallen! is fallen, even a son of the morning! And while we were yet in the Spirit, the Lord commanded us that we should write the vision; for we beheld Satan, that old serpent, even the devil, who rebelled against God, and sought to take the kingdom of our God and his Christ—Wherefore, he maketh war with the saints of God, and encompasseth them round about. (D&C 76:25-29)

Then follows the statement as to the condition of those whom he overcomes by his wiles, but upon which, at this point, it is not pertinent to our developing theme to say more.

What God's plan of man's eternal life includes. We now have before us, from divine authoritative sources, the reason of Lucifer's rebellion and the war in heaven. By the development of the reasons for that war, we have come to know the solemn covenant of God with the preexistent spirits of men, the promise to give to them eternal life—life everlasting—immortality; and under circumstances that would make for their eternal progression—to make it possible for those who keep both their first and their second estates to have glory added upon their heads forever and ever; and this through acceptance of and obedience to the one and only gospel. This gospel will include the Fall of Adam, to bring about the broken harmonies in which man must learn his lessons in good and evil, in joy and sorrow, in hope and disappointment, in sickness and in health, in life and death: learning to appreciate the sweet by tasting the bitter, having wisdom with the passing years by the lessons that things in conflict and opposition have to teach. It will include his spiritual death—separation from God; for

man's spiritual life depends upon his sustained union with God; that union broken, spiritual death results.² It will include reunion with God, the rebirth of the spirit into fellowship with God; it will include resurrection from the dead; a reunion of the spirit with such elements of the body as may be necessary for its everlasting garment. All this to get the equipment—the indissoluble union of spirit and element in one sole being, eternal, deathless; with God's highway opening at each soul's feet for the journey of progress up through the heights of being in an endless and inexhaustible universe of progress.

Such the plan of god for the advancement of intelligences. First, through their habitancy of a spirit body; second, habitancy of a human mortal body, by birth into this earth life; third, habitancy of an immortal body, by a greater birth, resurrection from the dead into a deathless life. Such the plan which the wisdom of God has devised for bringing to pass "the immortality and eternal life of man" (Moses 1:39)—the everlasting joy of man.

A supposed purpose of "the world's author" by a philosopher. The late Mr. Wm. James, in his *Pragmatism*,[†] has a very wonderful passage bearing upon the whole thought of this chapter, and so pregnant with

²The statement scarcely needs the support of argument. Spiritual life means relation to and participation in all the higher and better things—the good, the true, the beautiful, the pure, the refined, the noble, the courageous, the unselfish, the merciful; united with truth, justice, knowledge, wisdom, power, intelligence. The heart of all this—the very center and circumference of it, and the life for it, is and must be God; and to so deport ones self that he is thrown out of harmony with all this, severed from fellowship with God by separation from him who is the life of all this volume of higher and better things, this body of soul-quality, this ocean of righteousness—is death indeed—spiritual death; death as real as physical death—the separation of spirit and body. Following is an inspired statement of the spiritual death:

Wherefore, it came to pass that the devil tempted Adam, and he partook of the forbidden fruit and transgressed the commandment, wherein he became subject to the will of the devil, because he yielded unto temptation. Wherefore, I, the Lord God, caused that he should be cast out from the Garden of Eden, from my presence, because of his transgression, wherein he became spiritually dead, which is the first death, even that same death which is the last death, which is spiritual, which shall be pronounced upon the wicked when I shall say: Depart, ye cursed. (D&C 29:40-41; cf. 2 Ne. 9:10-12)

[†]William James (1842-1910) was a devoutly religious philosopher and psychologist. He was the pioneer of physiological psychology and a leader in the philosophical movement of pragmatism.

suggestion relative to our theme, so supported by philosophical thought and analysis of human nature, both strong and weak, that one marvels at so close a parallel of our doctrine, given to the Church of the Latter-day Saints—in *large part*—in the very early years of her existence. The following is the passage from Mr. James:

Suppose that the world's author put the case to you before creation, saying: "I am going to make a world not certain to be saved, a world the perfection of which shall be conditional merely, the condition being that each several agent does its own 'level best.' I offer you the chance of taking part in such a world. Its safety, you see, is unwarranted. It is a real adventure, with real danger, yet it may win through. It is a social scheme of co-operative work genuinely to be done. Will you join the procession? Will you trust yourself and trust the other agents enough to face the risk?"

Should you in all seriousness, if participation in such a world were proposed to you, feel bound to reject it as not safe enough? Would you say that, rather than be part and parcel of so fundamentally pluralistic and irrational a universe, you preferred to relapse into the slumber of nonentity from which you had been momentarily aroused by the tempter's voice?³

Of course if you are normally constituted you would do nothing of the sort. There is a healthy-minded buoyancy in most of us which such a universe would exactly fit. We would therefore accept the offer—"Top! *und Schlag auf Schlag!*" It would be just like the world we practically live in; and loyalty to our old nurse Nature would forbid us to say no. The world proposed would seem 'rational' to us in the most living way.

Most of us, I say, would therefore welcome the proposition to add our *fiat* to the *fiat* of the creator. Yet perhaps some would not; for there are morbid minds in every human collection, and to them the prospect of a universe with only a fighting chance of safety would probably make no appeal. There are moments of discouragement in us all, when we are sick of self and tired of vainly striving. Our own life breaks down, and we fall into the attitude of the prodigal son. We mistrust the chances of things. We want a universe where we can just give up, fall on our father's neck, and be absorbed into the absolute life as a drop of water melts into the river or the sea.

The peace and rest, the security desiderated at such moments is security against the bewildering accidents of so much finite experience. Nirvana means safety from this everlasting round of adventures

³Of course, this proposition of relapsing into "nonentity" is no part of our (*Latter-day Saint*) scheme or thought, since the actual proposition of our revelations was made to intelligences alike uncreated and uncreatable, and alike indestructible; so that while in the exercise of their freedom these intelligences might decline participation in the scheme of things proposed, they could not sink back into nonentities, they would merely remain status quo.

of which the world of sense consists. The hindoo and the buddhist, for this is essentially their attitude, are simply afraid, afraid of more experience, afraid of life.

. . . I find myself willing to take the universe to be really dangerous and adventurous, without therefore backing out and crying 'no play.' I am willing to think that the prodigal-son attitude, open to us as it is in many vicissitudes, is not the right and final attitude towards the whole of life. I am willing that there should be real losses and real losers, and no total preservation of all that is. I can believe in the ideal as an ultimate, not as an origin, and as an extract, not the whole. When the cup is poured off, the dregs are left behind for ever, but the possibility of what is poured off is sweet enough to accept.

As a matter of fact countless human imaginations live in this moralistic and epic kind of a universe, and find its disseminated and strung-along successes sufficient for their rational needs. There is a finely translated epigram in the Greek anthology which admirably expresses this state of mind, this acceptance of loss as unatoned for, even though the lost element might be one's self:

A shipwrecked sailor, buried on this coast,
 Bids you set sail.
 Full many a gallant bark, when we were lost,
 Weathered the gale.

. . . It is then perfectly possible to accept sincerely a drastic kind of a universe from which the element of 'seriousness' is not to be expelled. Whoso does so is, it seems to me, a genuine pragmatist. He is willing to live on a scheme of uncertified possibilities which he trusts; willing to pay with his own person, if need be, for the realization of the ideals which he frames.⁴

A startling parallel. Such [is] the voice of a modern, and, without disparagement of others, we may venture to say, one of our foremost American philosophers. In this statement, as we said in introducing it, Professor James puts the case of the proposed earth existence of man in a close parallel to that set forth in the early revelations to the Church of the Latter-day Saints—so closely a parallel that it is startling. The proposition put to intelligences before the earth was made, in each case; and earth life full of adventure and danger, safety not guaranteed in each case; the counter plan proposed that would guarantee safety rejected; and yet the existence of some "morbid minds" among the spirits—found "in every human collection," to whom "the prospect of a universe with only a fighting chance" made no appeal, and accordingly their rejection of it; in both cases enough heroic souls to accept the adventurous proposition of a scheme of things involving real losses.

⁴James, *Pragmatism*, 290-92, 296-98.

We may thank God that the Christ in the great council prevailed, as also he prevailed in the war of the rebellion in heaven, which followed upon that council's decision. The Christ's spirit stood for freedom of man in that great controversy. He stood for a serious earth life for intelligences, in which, though there would be some losses, many losses in fact, yet also there would be great gain and glory. Gain, however, that could not be obtained but through great strivings; the exercise of all the great virtues, of trust and patience, endurance and courage, wisdom and temperance, together with faith and hope and charity. Thank God, we say, that Jesus the Christ, in the preexistence stood for all those things which make earth life worthwhile, and existence itself endurable—for the moral freedom of man.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: James, *Pluralistic Universe*; Roberts, "History of the 'Mormon' Church"; Smith, *History of the Church* 3:385-92; D&C 29; 76; 84; 88; Moses; Abraham.

The Earth Life of Man Opened

The two creation stories of Genesis. The next task before us is to open the earth life of man. To get him from the preexistent spirit estate in to the commencement of the human race life. This requires a back reference to the creation story as we have it in Genesis. So far as we have considered that story of creation we confined ourselves to the first chapter of Genesis, and that chapter treats creation as a developing unbroken series of events from chaotic material without form and void to the creation of man and woman in the image of God—begotten after their kind.

The first. The creation story in Genesis first chapter is complete, and worthily grand; without flaw or blemish, poetical, and sublime;¹ but when we take up the second chapter of Genesis, we are puzzled by having on our hands seemingly, another account of creation, different in form, and rather puzzling to the Bible theologians as well as to the laymen Bible readers. Such is the difference between the creation account in the first chapter of Genesis and the second, that modern Bible scholarship comes to the conclusion that the story of creation in the second chapter must be altogether from a different source than the account in the first chapter; and holds that there is a serious cleavage that gives reason for the belief that they must have come from separate documents.²

¹The story of this creation in the first chapter of Genesis, should include the first three verses of the second chapter. And the second chapter properly should begin at the present fourth verse of that chapter if the sense and spirit of the creation story is to be regarded. [Genesis 2:3–4 is also where modern textual critics of the Bible divide the two creation accounts. These critics usually ascribe the different accounts to two different authors or redactors of the text. Roberts's explanation for the two accounts is more in harmony with that revealed in the books of Moses and Abraham.]

²Smyth, *How God Inspired the Bible*, 196–97. Also Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 8.

The second. In the second account of the creation, the whole story seems to be reversed from that which is given in the first: “These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth,” says the second account,

when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. (Gen. 2:4-5)

We naturally wonder what has become of the grasses, herbs and trees, spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis? What of the fishes of the sea, the fowls of the air, the beasts of the field? What of man, male and female, of whose creation we read in the first chapter (2) and what of the commandment to “multiply, and replenish the earth?” (Gen. 1:28). Is it not strange that after reading of the creation of man in the first chapter, that we should be told in the second that “there was not a man to till the ground”? (Gen. 2:5).

Proceeding with this second account of the creation, the Bible says:

But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. . . . And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. . . . And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam (the name he had given to the man he had created) to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. (Gen. 2:6-10, 15, 19)

What is especially difficult in this second account of the creation, as before remarked, is that it seems to reverse the order of creation as given in the first chapter. The first account commences with the formation of the earth from chaotic matter; and then records the various steps of progress in succinct and, one would think, natural order up to completion; the last in the order of creation being man. The second account begins with the creation of man, the planting of a garden, as the beginning of vegetable and tree life; and there God places the man

to keep it. Then comes the creation of the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field.

A key to the mystery. There is one significant remark in this second story of the creation in Genesis which may prove to be a key that will unlock the seeming mystery of this difference in the account of the creation without accepting the conclusion adopted by modern criticism, which is that these two creation stories come from different sources, and most likely from distinct documents. This significant remark referred to is:

These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth . . . in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, *And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew:* for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and *there was not a man to till the ground.* But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. . . . And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden. (Gen. 2:4-8; italics added)

Let it be remembered that this passage is in Genesis 2, though the italics in the quotation are mine. This passage standing alone, it is conceded, does not solve the mystery, something more is required; and in our ~~Mosaic fragment of a revelation—The book of Moses—the necessary~~ increase of light is given.

After giving an account of the creation, much as it stands in the first chapter of Genesis, the revelation in this ~~fragment~~ **book** proceeds, **in its second [sic] chapter, to say:**

And now, behold, I say unto you, [that] these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth, when they were created, in the day that I, the Lord God, made the heaven and the earth, And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew. For I, the Lord God, created all things, of which I have spoken, spiritually, before they were naturally upon the face of the earth. For I, the Lord God, had not caused it to rain upon the face of the earth. And I, the Lord God, had created all the children of men; and not yet a man to till the ground; for in heaven created I them; and there was not yet *flesh* upon the earth, neither in the water, neither in the air; But I, the Lord God, spake, and there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground. And I, the Lord God, formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul, the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also; nevertheless, all things were before created; but spiritually were they created and made according to my word. (Moses 3:4-7; italics added)

Spiritual and temporal creations. Still another word from modern revelation is given upon this subject of the two creations, the spiritual and the physical, called in the revelation, however, the “spiritual and the temporal”; and now the passage:

And as the words have gone forth out of my mouth even so shall they be fulfilled, that the first shall be last, and that the last shall be first in all things whatsoever I have created by the word of my power, which is the power of my Spirit. For by the power of my Spirit created I them; yea, all things both spiritual and temporal—First^(ly) spiritual, secondly temporal, which is the beginning of my work; and again, first temporal, and secondly spiritual, which is the last of my work—Speaking unto you that you may naturally understand; but unto myself my works have no end, neither beginning. (D&C 29:30-33)

Progressive movement in spiritual and temporal creations.

An important thought arises out of this statement in addition to the confirmation of the word from the book of Moses passage, that things were created spiritually before they were created temporally (i.e. physically). We are given the idea of a process, a movement in creation, which suggests from lower to higher, and from higher to still higher: first from an imperfect spiritual state, to a union with the temporal—the birth of man into earth life. Thence from the imperfect temporal (imperfect because the life is mortal) to the higher spiritual status—spirit being indissolubly united to its physical counter-part, the physical body, by the resurrection from the dead—raised to spiritual life—to the “immortality” God designed for man from the beginning through this process—from spiritual-temporal; to temporal-spiritual; the completion or perfection of God’s work.

The place of man in the second creation story—~~in Genesis~~. It appears from the second creation story that man is the first creation instead of the last; that he is not only the first man, but the “first flesh” upon the earth also;[†] and then comes the act of creation of woman, the

[†]Raising one of its main objections to *The Truth, the Way, the Life*, the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve wrote the following observations to Elder Roberts: “The place of man in the order of creation is questioned, as it is taught in this chapter. The expression, ‘the first flesh upon the earth also,’ is not interpreted by members of the committee as you have expressed it here. We feel that the arguments as given contradict the accounts given in all our scriptures, and more especially in the temple ceremonies. As we understand it the term, ‘first flesh also,’ does not have reference to Adam as being the first living creature of the creation on the earth, but that he, through the ‘fall’ became the first ‘flesh,’ or mortal soul. The term ‘flesh’ in reference to mortal existence is of common usage. We find it so used

planting of the garden, the placing of man in it, the creation of animal life, the fish of the sea, and fowls of the air. The question is, how can these things be; and how can the second story be made to harmonize with the first? In the second creation story man seems to get his earth-heritage in a barren state, as if some besom of destruction had swept the earth; and it must be newly fitted up as a proper abode for him from desert barrenness to a fruitful habitat.

The second creation story an incident in the earth's creative phases. This "second creation story" may be regarded as one of a developing series of phases through which the planet earth is passing in its course towards a final celestial state of being. For example: had our revelations pertaining to the earth begun with Noah instead of Adam, and at the close of the cataclysm of the flood, when all animal life had been destroyed, except that which was especially preserved in the ark with Noah, we could clearly understand the procession of

in the scriptures. Adam having partaken of the fruit became mortal and subject to death, which was not the condition until that time. We are taught in the Temple as well as in the scriptures that man was the last creation placed upon the earth, before death was introduced. Adam was the first to partake of the change and to become subject to the flesh. This is the view expressed by President Joseph F. Smith and President Anthon H. Lund. Following are examples bearing out this thought: 'They shall wander in the flesh, and perish' (1 Ne. 19:14). 'And now, if I do err, even did they err of old; not that I would excuse myself because of other men, but because of the weakness which is in me, according to the flesh, I would excuse myself' (1 Ne. 19:6). 'And it is a rare thing that the king requireth, and there is none other that can shew it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh' (Dan. 2:11). 'That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God' (1 Pet. 4:2). 'No man has seen God at any time in the flesh, except quickened by the Spirit of God' (D&C 67:11)."

In a handwritten comment, Roberts noted the following: **Objections to be overcome in chs 30 and 35 in T.W.L. before approval by Committee: that work represents (1) Pre-Adamic occupancy of the Earth. Our revelations localized to this Earth & its heavens: I further localize those revelations to an Adamic Dispensation ~~when which may be in~~ but an Epoch ~~in what may~~ be a long series of Epochs on the ~~the nature~~ the Earth the nature of which are unknown but suitable doubtless to the Pre-Adamic conditions. Doubtless also this Adamic Dispensation may have some specific purpose in itself to be worked out and different from those that have preceded it. (2) Adam came to the Earth a translated being; hence subject to death; hence not as a man Immortal. 1914 - 1832 = 82**

Reporting to President Rudger Clawson on October 10, 1929, George Albert Smith explained: "This entire chapter is questioned by the brethren. It pertains to man's place in the creation. It is not in harmony with the revelations, especially the ceremonies of the Temple, which were given by the Prophet by revelation."

events leading out from Noah and his family into a world development under the commandment which God gave to Noah and his sons, when he said to them: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish (refill) the earth" (Gen. 9:1); and then reviewing with the family of Noah the covenant of mastery over all things in the earth, even as he had covenanted with Adam.

May it not be that some such condition as this which we have supposed in the case of Noah, really happened in regard to the "beginning" of things with Adam? And that what is recorded in the second creation story is merely an account of the preparation of the earth for the occupancy of it by Adam; and the account also of his advent upon the earth with Eve his wife? That is to say, previous to the advent of Adam upon the earth, some destructive cataclysm, a universal glacial period or an excessive heat period left the earth empty and desolate, and it *became* the mission of Adam to "replenish" the earth with inhabitants.^a

That there were pre-Adamite races in the earth; and that man's habitation of it is of greater antiquity than the period which begins with Adam, is quite generally accepted by the scientific world, and for them, admits of no doubt;³ but if the account of things through the Bible revelations begins with Adam, as merely the opening of a dispensation of God's providence with the human race on the earth, **since that time**, then matters take on a form much more understandable, and makes possible the solving of many problems.

Reality of spiritual creation. In using the phraseology of "spiritual creation," and "temporal" and "natural" creation in the foregoing quotations and comments upon them, their use must not be thought to imply that the spiritual creation was not a real creation. It was doubtless as tangible and actual as the creation on which we walk; but in the process of creation it appears that there are two parts, first a spiritual creation and second a temporal or natural one, what in our modern phraseology would be called the physical creation.

Though we may not **fully** understand the nature of this spiritual creation, yet to learn that the first account of the creation in the Bible, is of a spiritual creation, and the second of a natural one, gives some relief from the apparent contradiction from the fact that it removes all appearance of inconsistency or contradiction between the two accounts. For since they are descriptions of two different things instead of a conflicting

^aThe Hebrew word *male* translated as "replenish" in the KJV simply means "to fill" and does not demand an interpretation of "refill" or "replenish."

³This subject is considered somewhat at length in the chapter following this.

account of one thing, there is nothing in the law of consistency requiring the account in the first chapter of Genesis—the account of spiritual creation—**but what** could be safely accepted as the announcement of the general plan of the creation of worlds not only of our own planet but of all worlds; and in it will be found ample scope for the belief that the earth came into existence, as our scientists generally insist, by the accretion of nebulous matter; that it took millions of years for the concentration and solidification of that matter, granting as long periods as geologists may demand for the formation of earth's crust followed by the changes which were wrought during the six great periods named in Genesis; beginning with the production of light, the dividing of the water, the appearing of land, then vegetation, animals, man.⁴

The temporal or physical creation of our planet, however, and of all planets, would doubtless correspond to the spiritual creation of it. The spiritual creation standing in the same relationship to the natural or physical creation, as the well devised plan of the architect—the mind creation of his building—does to the material erection of a building, so that the account given of the spiritual creation of our earth may as well be regarded as the account of the natural or physical creation of it.

But this conclusion would leave all the difficulties between the two accounts of the creation in the Bible untouched unless we accept the second creation story as describing an incident, and one of many, that ~~have~~ **has** happened in the long history of our planet; and in this case regard the second creation story of Genesis as the account of preparing the earth for the advent of Adam, and Eve, his wife, on their mission to bring forth the human race upon earth as already suggested.

As this theory of creation affects man. Let us contemplate the foregoing conception of creation as it affects man:

First—according to what has already been set forth—there is the self-existent, intelligent entity^b—and intelligence is not created or made, be it remembered, neither indeed can it be. This entity is begotten

⁴The order of creation in the second account of creation in Genesis, it will be remembered, is somewhat reversed: 1. man; 2. vegetation; 3. animals; 4. woman; **instead of from lower forms of life to higher—from simple to more complex as given in Gen. 1.**

^bRoberts was one of the first to teach that the term *intelligence*, as used in D&C 93:29, refers to individual intelligent entities which with progression become spirits. The Church has no official position on the nature of pre-spirit intelligence. In contrast to Roberts's ideas, there are many who feel that the term *intelligence* does not refer to entities, but rather to intelligent matter in general from which individual spirits are begotten.

spirit—an intelligent entity united to a spirit-body, in some way begotten of God, and by some method of self-sundering, near or remote—but sufficiently direct and near to impart something of the divine nature to the spirit which is to become man, and near enough to establish fatherhood of God to it.

This fulfills the “firstly spiritual” of the revelation. This spiritual personage is begotten a man, in earth life and fulfills the “secondly temporal” of the revelation.

This man, so created or begotten, exists on the earth for a time to learn the lessons which earth life amid broken harmonies has to teach; and in that earth life appears the beginning of the second creative movement as the “again firstly temporal” of the revelation.

After a time the man dies; then again after a time, the man undergoes what might with some justification be called a greater birth. He undergoes resurrection from the dead, the spirit and body which were separated at death, and by death, are reunited by the resurrection from death; the spirit and the body become truly “soul” (also “sole”) spirit and body inseparably connected—deathless. This second creative movement fulfills the requirement of the “secondly spiritual,” which is the last of God’s work—that is, the last of God’s creative acts with reference to man as a “soul,” the indissoluble union of a spirit with earth elements. God has attained his purpose in bringing about the immortality of man.

This as our principle is applied to man, clearly sets forth this double action movement in creation, in bringing to pass the completed creation of man, and just how that created movement takes place from “spiritual” to “temporal”; and then from “temporal” to “spiritual”; which, however, is seen to be both temporal and spiritual united, or the union of what we usually call material element with spirit, which when perfectly and indissolubly united, is the highest attainment in creation.

Of lesser forms than human life. How the creation of lesser forms of life are affected by creation first spiritually and then temporally, is not so definitely indicated in the revelations of God; and we are under the necessity of confessing that we do not know of anything that is directly and fully revealed concerning the matter, and so must needs let it pass without an attempted exposition; accepting it, however, on the word of God, as being true, that “all things” are created spiritually before they are created temporally, or take on a material body.

Regarding references for this chapter, Roberts explained: “The subject matter of this chapter stands so apart that it is difficult to find authorities to which the student may be directed for corroborative material. It is therefore urged that special attention be paid to the scriptures and other works cited in the body of the text.”

31

An Adamic Dispensation

Further localization of revelation. We have already seen that the revelations of God given through Moses pertain to our earth and the heavens with which it is connected, and have noted the effect of that localization of revelations to our earth and its heavens. Now it is proposed to consider a still further localization of our revelations to an Adamic Dispensation in the world's history. We begin then with Adam, and the procession of events from his time; which, with reference to the whole period of the earth's existence, may be set down as comparatively recent, and even very recent times, within historic time in fact, if we accept the Bible account of the commencement of things *as historic*. This would admit of a very long period of time beyond the advent of Adam, to the absolute beginning of the physical existences of the earth, during which time pre-Adamite races, less developed than he, may have existed.[†] They may have lived and died through various long ages through

For this chapter, the recommended readings include “the standard works on anthropology.”

[†]On this chapter, the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve wrote as follows: “This entire chapter deals with the question of ‘pre-Adamites.’ This doctrine is not taught by the Church; it is not sustained in the scriptures. It can only be treated as an hypothesis, and the result will be uncertain, confusing, for after all is said it is speculation leading to endless controversy. We are aware that one of the brethren (Orson Hyde) in an early day advocated this teaching, however we feel that the brethren of the general authorities cannot be too careful, and should not present as doctrine that which is not sustained in the standards of the Church. It appears to us that all which has been revealed is contrary to this teaching, especially that given in the Temple.” Roberts handwrote the following response: **? Not so presented. Was approved also by Pres. Young. R wh[ich] see m[anu]s[crypt].** Reporting to President Clawson on October 10, 1929, George Albert Smith stated: “This entire chapter is out of harmony with the teachings of the authorities of the Church. The doctrine of pre-Adamites has never been accepted by the Church and is viewed by the brethren as being in conflict with the revelations of the Lord. This is so with the Temple ceremonies. References in other chapters to these two thoughts—the place of man in creation and pre-Adamites, should be eliminated.”

which the earth passed, of which we have no information supplied by revelation concerning them; but who have provided all the fossil and other evidences of man's existence in the earth discovered by the researches of science, and which so disturb the Bible account of things when an attempt is made to stretch the Bible account to cover all the **possible human life** events that have happened in all periods of time since the physical or temporal existence of the earth began.

The antiquity of man in the earth. ~~The science view.~~ Let us briefly consider some of the evidences ~~Science gives~~ of man's greater antiquity in the earth than the Bible account warrants. Of course we shall not be able to go deeply into the subject, and can only present the conclusions at which scientific investigators have arrived.

(a) *The **once** "orthodox Christian" view of creation.* In the first place, let us present the once orthodox conception of the date of creation as fixed by an interpretation of the Mosaic account of creation. The most definite statement on this head, and one that is very frequently referred to in controversial writings on the subject, is the interpretation of the Mosaic account by Dr. John Lightfoot, said to be a profound biblical scholar. He was vice chancellor of Cambridge University in 1654. As a result of careful searching of scripture, Dr. Lightfoot was led to declare that "heaven and earth, center and circumference, were made in the same instant of time, and clouds full of water and man was created by the Trinity on the 26th of October, 4004 B.C., at 9 o'clock in the morning."

Of course, this represents the definiteness of extreme methods of interpretation followed by Bible students of Dr. Lightfoot's days. It is now recognized that even the accepted dates of creation and other Bible events by the chronologers, Ussher, Hales, and the Jewish reckoning, are to be regarded approximately only. Since the computations made by those chronologers, the researches of Oriental scholars are bringing forth other evidence bearing upon the subject. While these researches are confirming the historical character of Abraham, and other Hebrew patriarchs as quite definite, in their extensive excavations on the sites of ancient cities, they are tracing back a more remote period for the history of Near Eastern peoples. The Babylonian tablets discovered in these researches give the world a message out of the past which antedates that of Christ up to about 5,500 to 6,000 years instead of 4,004;^a adding more than a thousand years to the Bible

^aThe Babylonian tablets to which Roberts refers are probably the earliest Sumerian inscriptions, now dated at about 2500 B.C. Using archaeological, stratigraphic, and carbon-14 dating, archaeologists now think that this civilization began about 4500 B.C.

account of creation, as interpreted by Dr. Lightfoot and others of the orthodox school.¹

Origin of the earth as viewed by science.^b In contrast to this (supposed) Bible view of creation, I place in contrast the scientific view. This begins with part of the generally accepted nebulae hypothesis; that is that our solar system, to extend the brief statement no further, was brought into existence by some great sun, many millions of year ago, passing so near to our sun that it whipped from the gravitational grip of the sun large masses of the sun's substances and set them whirling separately into space.²

In time these whirling, fiery masses took their respective places in orbits around the sun according to the minor planets of our system.

In reference to our own planet, to again limit our consideration to that which more nearly concerns our inquiry, in time—and how long is unknown³—the fiery mass that was finally to constitute our earth began condensing until the mass was covered over by a thin rocky

¹Lull, "Antiquity of Man," 1-2.

^bRoberts added this section to the final typescript by inserting four typed pages, numbered 3/2-3/5.

²New planets are very rare. They come into being as the result of the close approach of two stars, and stars are so sparsely scattered in space that it is an inconceivably rare event for one to pass near to a neighbour, yet exact mathematical analysis shews that planets cannot be born except when two stars pass within about three diameters of one another. As we know how the stars are scattered in space, we can estimate fairly closely how often two stars will approach within this distance of one another. The calculation shews that even after a star lived its life of millions of millions of years, the chance is still about a hundred thousand to one against its being a sun surrounded by planets. (Jeans, *The Universe Around Us*, 320-21). [Roberts's description of the Nebulae Hypothesis is somewhat different from the traditional theory proposed by Pierre Simon de Laplace, which did not require a collision or close passing of stars, but rather a condensing of the sun's atmosphere into rings that eventually coalesced into planets. Neither Roberts's nor Laplace's version of the Nebular Hypothesis enjoys wide acceptance today.]

³The lapses of time of recent geological estimates concerning the age of the earth and life upon it is stated by Sir James Jeans in his recent work (1929) *The Universe Around Us*, 13, is given in tabulated form as follows:

Age of the earth.....	About 2,000,000,000 of years
Age of life on the earth	300,000,000 of years
Age of man on the earth	300,000 of years

More recent estimates of these ages are as follows:

Age of the earth.....	4,700,000,000
Age of life on the earth	2,000,000,000 (advent of blue green algae)
Age of man on the earth	200,000 (<i>Homo sapiens neanderthalensis</i>)

coating; this thickened sufficiently to confine the heat beneath the encrustation, while the hydrogen and oxygen united to form vapors about it. These became condensed and, descending on all sides of the earth, completely enveloped it with water, something as a universal ocean would do. Also in time an atmosphere gathered about it.

Ages upon ages passed, and the Laurentian, the Cambrian, and the Silurian rocks were gradually formed under the water. Then, intermittently, came great upheavals of the earth's crust, the foldings of it into mountain chains, carrying with them even to the summits of mountains remains of marine animal life which had lived at the bottom of seas.⁴ Then land upheavals rising above the water divided them and formed separate oceans and seas; meantime gradual subsidences of some parts of the earth's crust and the elevation of other parts gave form to the land areas, to continents and islands. Low forms of plant life appeared—mosses, ferns, grasses, flowering plants, shrubbery and trees began to appear. The dense vapors which had shrouded the earth

The age of man on earth varies depending on how one defines man. Modern science places the advent of modern man, *Homo sapiens*, about 34,000 years ago.

As an indication of the great age of the earth's crust, the following note from J. W. Draper's *Conflict Between Religion and Science*, gives substantial, and irresistible evidence of its immense age:

The coal-bearing strata in Wales, by their gradual submergence, have attained a thickness of 12,000 feet; in Nova Scotia of 14,570 feet. So slow and so steady was this submergence, that erect trees stand one above another on successive levels; seventeen such repetitions may be counted in a thickness of 4,515 ft. The age of the trees is proved by their size, some being 4 ft. in diameter. Round them, as they gradually went down with the subsiding soil, calamites grew, at one level after another. In the Sydney coal-field fifty-nine fossil forests occur in superposition. (Draper, *Conflict Between Religion and Science*, 190-1). [Draft 3 reads "calamities" for "calamites."]

⁴"Marine shells, found on mountain-tops far in the interior of continents, were regarded by theological writers as an indisputable illustration of the Deluge [in the days of Noah]," says Draper.

But when, as geological studies became more exact, it was proved that in the crust of the earth vast fresh-water formations are repeatedly interrelated with vast marine ones, like the leaves of a book, it became evident that no single cataclysm was sufficient to account for such results; that the same region, through gradual variations of its level and changes in its topographical surroundings, had sometimes been dry land, sometimes covered with fresh and sometimes with sea water. It became evident also that, for the completion of these changes, tens of thousands of years were required. (Draper, *Conflict between Religion and Science*, 191)

in these ages began to disappear, and the sun shone on the earth's surface to quicken and enlarge life in sea, earth, and air; these thrived in all their varied forms, and ultimately man came and began his wonderful career.

This is not a chapter on geology, even in outline, much less a work on that subject; so that I am not concerned in tracing, even in tabulated form, the several periods and strata of the earth's formation from first to last; I only wish to mention enough of these to make intelligible the scientific conceptions of the antiquity of man in the earth; so I pass by the primary and secondary parts of geological formations in the text books and other words on the subject. But in the Tertiary and Quaternary periods we have the epochs where the emergence of man, or near man, occurs; and therefore these are in the geological period of immense import, and to our own subject. These geological periods include what are called the Eocene and Oligocene times or epochs in which arise the higher mammals of the ancient species; the Miocene and Pliocene times in which man emerges; and finally, preceding recent times, is the Pleistocene epoch, which is identical with the last great Ice Age. These epochs in geological formations correspond with the following periods of time.

The Miocene, within the Tertiary period, to 900,000 years ago;

Pliocene, within the Quaternary period, to 500,000 years ago;

Pleistocene or last great Ice Age in which ancient artcrafts of man with his remains are found and ranging from 400,000 years down to twenty or thirty thousand years ago, which marked the retreat of the great glaciers from the present northern temperate zones. So that within the Tertiary and Quaternary geological periods, within which it is claimed that fossil remains of man and his artcrafts and weapons are found, there is room for a very great antiquity for man, and certainly a pre-Adamite period of human existences.^c

(b) *The science view on the antiquity of man in the earth.* Meantime science submits its deductions on the subject of the antiquity of man in the earth. These come from a number of sources, among them through the fixing of time by the discovery made through the artcrafts which man has used in various periods of time. For instance, there is the age of iron and steel, our own age, in which man uses these

^cRoberts gives no reference for the periods, epochs, dates, and events he cites here. Most of his information is not in harmony with current scientific thought. For example, currently the beginning of the Miocene epoch is placed at 22-26 million years ago, while the beginnings of Pliocene and Pleistocene are placed at 5-7 and 1.8-2.5 million years ago respectively. Man (*Homo sapiens*) is thought to have emerged during the Pleistocene.

materials in manufactures and building. This was preceded by the age of bronze, and that by the stone age. This last named age is divided into three periods: first the Neolithic or "new stone age." This was preceded by the Paleolithic, or the "older stone age"; and this again by the Eolithic. This third period is supposed to be the very oldest period in which man began the use of anything like implements in his ways of life. There is some doubt if the so-called "stone implements" of this age were "purposeful manufactures" at all. Some hold that such implements as were used were merely nature-shaped stones, as were more convenient than others for various uses; and it was these rude nature-shaped implements that suggested the purposeful manufactures of the Paleolithic or old stone age. The crude implement manufactures of this period merged into the more artistically prepared and the greater variety of implements of the new stone age, or Neolithic period. The antiquity of man in the earth is attested first by the undoubted existence and use of these implements, and the slow development of their form and multiplied uses, coupled with calculations based on the glacial periods that are known to have overwhelmed portions of the earth's surface and under which drifts these artifacts of early man have been found, **and** to scientists justify the conclusion that man has lived upon the earth very many thousands of years longer than the interpretations given of the Mosaic account of creation by the orthodox chronologers. The conclusion based upon these **even limited** facts carry back the antiquity of man from 25,000 to 30,000 years in his occupancy of the earth, and hence tend to establish the probability of pre-Adamite races [in] the earth.^d

The rock record.^c How do we know when the various classes of animals and plants were established on the earth **asks the author of the *Outline of Science***. "How do we know the order of their appearance and the succession of their advances?" The answer is: by reading the rock record. In the course of time the crust of the earth has been elevated into continents and depressed into ocean troughs, and the surface of the land has been buckled up into mountain ranges and folded in gentler hills and valleys. The high places of the land have been weathered by air and water in many forms, and the results of the

^dThe dates Roberts cites here for the occupancy of man on earth are much more recent than those he cited earlier in the text. Whether this is due to a change in his opinion or a difference in how his sources are defining "man" is uncertain.

^cThis paragraph was originally a footnote; Roberts left the instruction: "Printer: make into body of text. Not note." "The rock record" is a phrase taken from Thomson, *Outline of Science* 1:88.

weathering have been borne away by rivers and seas, to be laid down again elsewhere as deposits which eventually formed sandstones, mudstones, and similar sedimentary rocks. . . . When the sediments were accumulating age after age, it naturally came about that remains of the plants and animals living at the time were buried, and these formed the fossils by the aid of which it is possible to read the story of the past. By careful piecing together of evidence, the geologist is able to determine the order in which the different sedimentary rocks were laid down, and thus to say, for instance, that the Devonian period was the time of the origin of amphibians. In other cases the geologist utilizes the fossils in his attempt to work out the order of the strata when these have been much disarranged. For the simpler fossil forms of any type must be older than those that are more complex. There is no vicious circle here, for the general succession of strata is clear, and it is quite certain that there were fishes before there were amphibians (from amphibia, one of the classes of vertebrates, a marsh frog is of the type); and amphibians before there were reptiles, and reptiles before there were birds and mammals. In certain cases, e.g., of fossil horses and elephants, the actual historical succession has been clearly worked out.⁵

Running parallel with this line of evidence and confirming it is the evidence that comes from the discovery of human remains in various old earth strata which represent geological formations of hundreds of thousands of years ago. It is held that human remains have been found in the Pliocene strata of the earth's surface, preceding the Pleistocene strata ~~of the earth's surface~~, and corresponding with the earlier glacial periods, and immediately preceding the present surface formation. The Pliocene strata corresponds to terms ~~of~~ years to about 500,000 years ago; and it follows that if human remains are found in that strata then man lived upon the earth that long ago.^{6,f}

I give the following abbreviated account of these various discoveries of human remains in these strata with the corresponding time period in years:

Alleged Evidence of man's antiquity in the earth. (a) *The Java Man.* The finds in relation to this so-called man consist of a small top

⁵Thomson, *Outline of Science* 1:88.

⁶Thomson, *Outline of Science* 1:92, 162–63, and illustrated plates.

^fIn referring to human remains from the Pliocene epoch, Roberts cannot mean members of the species *Homo sapiens*, but rather what current anthropologists would call pre-hominids, such as *Ramapithecus*, or possibly early hominids like *Australopithecus* or *Homo habilis*.

of the skull (skull cap), a thigh bone, and two back teeth. There is some dispute among authorities as to whether these remains are really of man or some pre-human ape-man; others hold that they are relics of a primitive man, but off the main line of "the ascent of man." Sir Arthur Keith holds this creature was "a being, human in nature; human in gait; human in all its parts, save its brain." In scientific phraseology they call him *Pithecanthropus*. He is supposed to have been about 5'7" in height, somewhat less than the average height of man today. The skull cap indicates low-cut forehead, beetling brows and a brain capacity of about two-thirds of the modern man. The remains were found by Dr. E. Dubois, a Dutch army surgeon at Trinell, central Java, 1894. The Java man is supposed to have lived from four hundred thousand to five hundred thousand years ago.⁸

(b) *The Heidelberg Man*. The remains of this fossil are a lower jawbone, and its teeth. It was discovered in Heidelberg in 1907 by Dr. Schoetensack. With the relic were bones of various mammals long since extinct in Europe, such as the elephant, rhinoceros, bison, and lion. There were also some crude flint implements with these finds. "But the teeth are human teeth," says Professor Thomson, author of the *Outline of Science*; "but" he adds, "the relic is of a primitive type, off the main line of human ascent." The reconstructed man from this jawbone receives the scientific name of *Homo-Heidelbergensis*. The age of this fossil is claimed to be three hundred thousand years.⁹

(c) *The Neanderthal Man*.¹ The fossils of this man were recovered from the Neanderthal ravine near Dusseldorf, Germany, 1856. According to some authorities the Neanderthal man was living in Europe a quarter of a million years ago. He was the "cave man" of that period. It is claimed he used fire, buried his dead reverently, and furnished them with an outfit for a long journey. [He] had a big brain, great beetling ape-like eyebrows. Professor Huxley was of the opinion that "the Neanderthal man represents a distinct species off the main line of ascent."¹

(d) *The Piltdown Man, or "Dawn Man."* The remains of this man consist of two pieces of skull bone, a small piece of jawbone, and a canine tooth. Found in Sussex, England, 1912. It is thought by some that

⁸Java Man is currently classified as a member of the species *Homo erectus*, now dated in the Middle Pleistocene, at about 500,000 years ago.

⁹Heidelberg Man is currently classified as a member of the species *Homo erectus*, dated in the Middle Pleistocene.

¹Roberts consistently wrote "Meanderthal Man."

¹Neanderthal Man is currently classified as *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*, a species now dated from the Upper Pleistocene.

the two little bits—jawbone and canine tooth—may not belong to the skull at all. The conclusion is that the skull indicates a large brain, a high forehead without the beetling eyebrows. The time period of these fossil remains date from one hundred thousand to five hundred thousand years ago.^k

(e) *The Cro-Magnon Man*. This is the cave man, or race we hear so much about, existing between the third and fourth ice ages of the earth, extending back from thirty to fifty thousand years ago. The evidence for the existence of such a race is much more satisfactory than the fossil remains of the other periods, and it is held by scientists quite generally, that this man approaches more nearly the modern man than any of the other supposed races.⁷

[*A Catholic cardinal's comment on this class of evidence.*¹ On the remains of the Piltdown, or Dawn Man, we have a recent interesting comment made by Cardinal O'Connell, American Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church. The remains of the Dawn Man are in the American Museum of Natural History, New York, in the hall of the "Age of Man." "In that hall," said the Cardinal, "the popular feature arranged by Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn is an exhibition of what might be justly termed the grotesque gullibility of so-called scientists. There is the Piltdown Man; two bits of skull-bone, a very small piece of jaw-bone, and a canine tooth. All these bones were found in different places in a sandpit of Sussex, and at long intervals."

"Now for the scientific process out of these scraps of bone which you could conceal in the hollow of your hand, by pure, unproven assumption, is constructed an ape-man and labeled Ecanthropus, or the 'Dawn Man,' out of the pure imagination, and false assumption, not backed by a single spark of evidence, science produces a purely fake skeleton and bids the world to come to the Natural History Museum for educational instruction!"⁸

The author's comment. Of course, there seems to be telling affect in the sarcastic comment of the Roman Cardinal on these bits of **alleged** fossil human remains; but notwithstanding these sarcasms,

^kIn the 1950s, the bones that were called Piltdown Man were revealed to be planted fakes. This fraud had deceived even the best of the scientific community for a number of decades.

⁷Thomson, *Outline of Science* 1:155-80; and Lull, "Antiquity of Man," 31-35. [Cro-magnon is now considered to belong to the same species as modern man, *Homo sapiens*.]

¹Roberts marked the next three paragraphs "out," "page out."

⁸From synopsis of speech of Cardinal O'Connell, New York World, February 1, 1926 [quote not found].

comparative structural anatomy has to its credit some very wonderful achievements, and one must not attempt to settle the whole controversy on one item of evidence. All the fossil discoveries must be considered, not only those from the Pliocene and Pleistocene strata of the earth's crust, but with them **there** must be accounted ~~for~~ the human remains found in the various glacial periods of scores and hundreds of thousands of years ago, together with the written historical evidences, which are pushing back the line of man's antiquity in the earth far beyond the 4004 years B.C. of the supposed Bible account of creation. The stone ages of man alone gives greater antiquity to man than the Bible account of creation, and establish, one may feel very safe in saying, evidences of pre-Adamite races in the earth, and justifies the assumption we are about to test out, that so far as the revelations of God to the human race is concerned, they relate to the advent of man to the earth in very recent times to begin a dispensation of human life for the attainment of some special purpose with reference to the earth life of man—of **the man as we know him, in the** Adamic dispensation merely.]]

If it shall be urged that this conception of things with reference to the earth and its inhabitants only pushes back the problem of human origin to an earlier date, and by no means settles the question of human origins, we shall concede that such is the case, and answer that it is not our purpose to deal with these pre-Adamite conditions and questions, but only to account for man's origin as we know man now, and with special reference to the purpose of God in this present Adamic dispensation, leaving the disposal of the beginning and the end of pre-Adamite races to still further revealed knowledge from God, or to future knowledge ascertained by the researches of man.^m

^mDraft 1 of this chapter 31 ended here. The material that follows was added later and is evidently what Roberts referred to in his letter to James E. Talmage, March 18, 1932:

I am sending you the chapter from "The Truth, The Way, and The Life" agreed upon in our conversation. I am sending it to you in the same form it passed into the hands of the Committee of the Twelve, but since its return I have added a few pages more of evidence in relation to the Antiquity of Man that was contained in the chapter as they read it. The spirit and facts of the chapter, however, are in no way changed, but the evidence has been a little increased.

I shall appreciate it, if after you have read it you will return same. I do not wish to have it copied by anyone.

Further consideration of the word “replenish.” Attention has already been called (in the preceding chapter) to the use of the word “replenish” in connection with the commandment to Adam to be fruitful and “replenish” the earth. The derivation of the word “replenish” comes from the Latin *replenir*; *re-*, again; and *plenus*—full (Standard Dictionary); hence in all the leading dictionaries the primary meaning of “replenish” is given “to fill again as something that has been emptied.”ⁿ In the intransitive sense the primary meaning is also “to fill again and to recover former fullness.” It should be noted however, that there are secondary definitions which render the word “to finish, perfect”; “to fill by occupying,” etc. And these do not necessarily include the meaning “to regain a state of former development,” but if the Bible use of the word be considered as used in the case of Noah and his sons (as already suggested) to whom God said, as well as to Adam, “multiply, and replenish the earth” (Gen. 9:1), we shall find “to fill again” or “refill” most nearly the mission given to Noah and his sons, *viz*: to again fill the earth with inhabitants; and this same word used in the commission to Adam, “to replenish the earth” in the event of some cataclysm having swept away pre-Adamite races, may have the same significance as when **the word was** said to Noah.

In this connection it is interesting to note that one of the original apostles of the New Dispensation, a contemporary of the Prophet Joseph Smith, and President Brigham Young, ventured to advance the doctrine of a pre-Adamite race and the above interpretation of “replenish.” Also his doctrine was publicly approved by President Brigham Young when the discourse was delivered. This was at the General Conference of the Church on the 6th of October, 1854, at which Orson Hyde, the apostle referred to, had been appointed to deliver a special lecture from which I quote the following:

I will go back to the beginning, and notice the commandment that was given to our first parents in the garden of Eden. The Lord said unto them, “multiply and replenish the earth.” I will digress here for a moment from the thread of the subject, and bring an idea that may perhaps have a bearing upon it.

The earth, you will remember, was void and empty (having in mind the description of the earth in Genesis 2), until our first parents began at the garden of Eden. What does the term replenish mean? This word is derived from the Latin; “*re*” and “*plenus*”; “*re*” denotes repetition, iteration; and “*plenus*” signifies full, complete; then the meaning of the word replenish is, to refill, recomplete. If I were to go into a merchant’s store, and find he had got a new stock of goods,

ⁿOn the Hebrew from which “replenish” is translated, see page 294 above.

I should say—"you have *replenished* your stock, that is, filled up your establishment, for it looks as it did before." "Now go forth," says the Lord, "and replenish the earth"; for it was covered with gloomy clouds of darkness, excluded from the light of heaven, and darkness brooded upon the face of the deep. *The world was peopled before the days of Adam, as much so as it was before the days of Noah. It was said that Noah became the father of a new world*, but it was the same old world still, and will continue to be, though it may pass through many changes.

When God said, Go forth and replenish the earth; it was to replenish the inhabitants of the human species, and make it as it was before.⁹

At the close of Elder Hyde's discourse, President Brigham Young arose and said:

*I do not wish to eradicate any items from the lecture Elder Hyde has given us this evening, but simply to give you my views, in a few words, on the portion touching Bishops and Deacons [on the matter of their being married men]. . . . We have had a splendid address from brother Hyde, for which I am grateful. . . . I say to the congregation, treasure up in your hearts what you have heard to-night, and at other times.*¹⁰

Evidences of man's antiquity in the earth. Of course we can not here go into extensive treatment of the subject outlined, the volume of evidence; and the extent of the argument are too great for that in these chapters; but it is possible to give citations and conclusions of those who have treated the subject at length.

Sir James Lyell.^o Among those who recognized in the discoveries that were being made midway of the nineteenth century that man was not only contemporary with long extinct animals of past geological epochs, but that he had already developed, ~~at that time~~, *in those epochs* into a stage of culture above pure savagery—was Sir James Lyell M.A., F.R.S., the celebrated and all but father of the science of modern geology. In his earlier works on geology Sir James long opposed the idea of the great antiquity of man in the earth, but in 1863 he published the first edition of his *Geological Evidence of the Antiquity of Man*; "and the fact," remarks Andrew D. White, author of the two volumes of *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, 1896, "that he had so long opposed the new ideas gave force to the

⁹*Journal of Discourses* 2:79; italics added.

¹⁰*Journal of Discourses* 2:88, 90; italics added.

^oThe man Roberts refers to as Sir "James" Lyell is actually Sir "Charles" Lyell (1797-1875).

clear and conclusive argument which led him to renounce his early scientific beliefs.”¹¹ Continuing, our author, White, says:

Research among the evidences of man’s existence in the early Quaternary, and possibly in the Tertiary period (hundreds of thousands of years ago),^p was now pressed forward along the whole line. . . . These investigations went on vigorously in all parts of France and spread rapidly to other countries. The explorations which Dupont began in 1864, in the caves of Belgium, gave to the museum at Brussels eighty thousand flint implements, forty thousand bones of animals of the Quaternary period, and a number of human skulls and bones found mingled with these remains. From Germany, Italy, Spain, America, India and Egypt, similar results were reported.¹²

Andrew D. White.^q White devotes three chapters of his great work to this subject under the title “From Genesis to Geology,” “The Antiquity of Man, Egyptology and Assyriology”; and “The Antiquity of Man and Prehistoric Archaeology.”¹³ In his concluding pages of chapter 7, he says:

Human bones had been found under such circumstances as early as 1835 at Cannstadt near Stuttgart, and in 1856 in the Neanderthal near Düsseldorf; but in more recent searches they had been discovered in a multitude of places, especially in Germany, France, Belgium, England, the Caucasus, Africa, and North and South America. Comparison of these bones showed that even in that remote Quaternary period (several hundred thousand years ago), there were great differences of race, and here again came in an argument for the yet earlier existence of man on the earth; for long previous periods must have been required to develop such racial differences. Considerations of this kind gave a new impulse to the belief that man’s existence might even date back into the Tertiary period (a half a million years ago).^r The evidence for this earlier origin of man was ably summed up, not only by its brilliant advocate, Mortillet, but by a former opponent, one of the most conservative of modern anthropologists, Quatrefages; and the conclusion arrived at by both was, that man did really exist in the Tertiary period. The acceptance of this conclusion was also seen in

¹¹See White, *Warfare of Science with Theology* 1:275. In a footnote on this page White cites the works of eleven writers on various phases of this subject, research workers and scientists all, who support the theory of man’s great antiquity in the earth.

^pQuaternary is our most recent period, now thought to have begun about 1.8 to 2.5 million years ago.

¹²See White, *Warfare of Science with Theology* 1:275–76.

^qAndrew D. White (1832–1918), the founder of Cornell University, was a professor of history and English literature.

¹³These chapters are in vol. 1, chs. 5–7, where he cites many authorities. In his last pages of chapter 7, he cites more than a score of scientific works on the subject.

^rThe tertiary is now thought to have begun about 65 million years ago.

the more recent work of Alfred Russel Wallace, who, though very cautious and conservative, placed the origin of man not only in the Tertiary period; but in an earlier stage of it than most had dared assign—even in the Miocene.

. . . Of attempts to make an exact chronological statement throwing light on the length of the various prehistoric periods, the most notable have been those by M. Morlot, on the accumulated strata of the Lake of Geneva; by Gilliéron, on the silt of Lake Neuchâtel; by Horner, in the delta deposits of Egypt; and by Riddle, in the delta of the Mississippi. . . . The period of man's past life upon our planet, which has been fixed by the universal church (he refers *here* to the Roman Catholic Church), "always, everywhere, and by all," is thus perfectly proved to be insignificant compared with those vast geological epochs during which man is now known to have existed.¹⁴

Dr. John W. Draper: In his work on *Conflict Between Religion and Science*, 1875, John W. Draper, M.D. LL.D., author of the *Intellectual Development of Europe*, also has an important **and** exhaustive chapter on "The Age of the Earth and the Antiquity of Man." In his closing pages of that chapter he says:

So far as investigations have gone, they indisputably refer the existence of man to a date remote from us by many hundreds of thousands of years. . . .

We are thus carried back immeasurably beyond the six thousand of Patristic chronology. It is difficult to assign a shorter date for the last glaciation (~~period~~) of Europe than a quarter of a million of years, and human existence antedates that. But not only is it this grand fact that confronts us, we have to admit also a primitive animalized state, and a slow, a gradual development.¹⁵

Dr. Richard Swann Lull. A more recent authority, Richard Swann Lull, Professor of Vertebrate Paleontology, Yale University, 1921–22, in a Lecture Symposium published by the Yale University Press (1923), says

¹⁴White, *Warfare of Science with Theology* 1:281–83. As to the evidence of man in the Tertiary period, see works already cited, especially Quatrefages, Cartailhac, and Mortillet. For an admirable summary, see Laing, *Human Origins*, chapter 8. See also, for a summing up of the evidence in favour of man in the Tertiary period, Quatrefages, *Histoire Generale des Races Humaines*, in the *Bibliothèque Ethnologique*, Paris, 1887, chapter 4. As to the earlier view, see Vogt, *Lectures on Man*; refutation of Sir J. W. Dawson's attempt to make the old and new Stone periods coincide, see H. W. Haynes, in chapter 6, of the *History of America*, edited by Justin Winsor. For development of various important points in the relation of anthropology to the human occupancy of our planet, see Topinard, *Anthropology*, London, 1890, chapter 9. **Omit reading of [these works].**

¹⁵Draper, *Conflict between Religion and Science*, 199.

in his discussion about the Piltdown or Dawn Man and the geological structure in which he was found that

the British authorities, Lewis Abbott and J. Reid Moir, both refer the older gravels to the Pliocene, but the more widely accepted belief is that the Piltdown Man is Lower Pleistocene, of Second or Third Interglacial time, so that in terms of years his age (i.e. of the Piltdown Man) is from 200, 000 to 300,000 years.

In the concluding paragraphs of Professor Lull's lecture he says,

All of our evidence points to central Asia as the birthplace of mankind, and to the Miocene (period), 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 years ago the time of his origin. . . .

The antiquity of man has thus been made known by *direct* evidence in the form of human relics, the greatest age of which can hardly be less than half a million years. *Corroborative* evidence lies in the great variation, not alone between the several species of prehistoric man, but also among the many races of *Homo sapiens* himself, of which Gregory recognizes twenty-six, with a number of sub-races. And that the major divisions are very old is attested by ancient murals and other documents of the Egyptians and other oriental peoples.¹⁶

Later Utterances: Sir Arthur Keith. Still later utterances by scientists of prominence in current periodicals abundantly sustain these authorities I have been quoting. For instance in the Magazine Section of the *New York Times*, for October 12, 1930, Sir Arthur Keith, the eminent anthropologist and world distinguished scholar, describes what he considers to be "one of the greatest triumphs that has ever been accomplished by patient, exact archeological inquiry," in the discovery that about 20,000 years ago in Europe a race of white, non-primitive Cro-Magnon man—displaced an earlier and inferior type, the Neanderthal man; and then at length discusses the question, "Whence did Cro-Magnon man come?" And this at some length. I may only quote briefly:

We have grown up with the belief that Europe has always been the home of white men: we never knew until recently that what has happened in North America and Australia during recent times—the replacement of one race by another—also occurred in the continent of Europe some 20,000 years ago, according to our present mode of reasoning prehistoric time. . . . At the present day the white man is replacing the Aborigines of Australia. What is our evidence for asserting that some 20,000 years earlier a similar replacement occurred in Europe—a primitive type of white man, men of the Cro-Magnon type, migrating into Europe, colonizing it and ultimately taking complete

¹⁶Lull, "Antiquity of Man," 22, 38; italics in original.

possession of the continent? . . . We infer the date of the colonization from its relationship to the last Ice Age. We know that Neanderthal Man lived in Europe before the last Ice Age set in; we have found his fossil remains and his culture under its oldest deposits. Then there came an interlude—a temperate interval—in the Ice Age. It was in this interlude that the Cro-Magnon appeared in Europe and in which the Neanderthals either died out or were exterminated. So far we have found no evidence of cross-breeding, but it may have occurred. Then after the temperate interlude which saw the arrival of the Cro-Magnons, arctic conditions returned and continued until the dawn of the modern climate of Europe. By painstaking investigations the geologists of Scandinavia have been able to calculate approximately the number of centuries which have elapsed since arctic conditions came to an end in Europe. Their estimate is 12,000 years. . . . We estimate that at least 8,000 years must be added to the 12,000 to give the date of the glacial interlude which saw the first arrival of the forerunners of the modern inhabitants of Europe. The date of their arrival may very well be much earlier; it cannot be later.

He then presents the claims made by those who regard the migration of the Cro-Magnon people as coming from Africa. The advocates of this idea, Sir Arthur claims, can produce irrefutable evidence that the Sahara—the whole of North Africa—was then inhabited by man, for in deposits which have been laid down by those ancient rivers and streams, man's stone implements have been found.

English geologists, (Messrs. Sandford and Arkell), working for the government of Egypt, have proved (1929) that in the lower valley of the Nile there are deposits which contain the same succession of stone implements as occur in the valleys of the Seine and of the Thames. In the valleys of tributary streams issuing from the Libyan Desert, the same deposits are found with the same succession of implements.

In these early times the basin of the Fayum, which lies to the southwest of Cairo, was filled by the water of the Nile. In the beaches of this old lake Messrs. Sandford and Arkell found evidence that the desiccation of North Africa and of the Sahara began to set in during the period of Aurignacian culture—the period at which Cro-Magnon people appear in Europe (20,000 years ago). In Tunis and Algiers, French archaeologists have discovered and examined many of the workshops of Aurignacian man.

On the strength of this evidence the Pro-African school of anthropologists assume that it was the flaming sword of drought which compelled the Cro-Magnon people to emigrate from the Sahara and seek a new home in Europe.

Sir Arthur Keith himself, however, finds the Asiatic origin of the Cro-Magnon race most convincing, which he argues at length, but assigns about the same period of time for the Cro-Magnon advent into Europe.

What I have been seeking to show is that they (i.e. these Cro-Magnon migrations) are but repetitions of migratory movements which are as old as the evolution of human races. The Australians of today are but repeating what their ancestors did in Europe 20,000 years ago.

And after lengthy argument he says:

The seizure of Europe by pioneer bands of white settlers was a slow process; it probably extended over several thousands of years; there were migrations. The European pioneers made a clean sweep in their new country; the original natives, Neanderthal men, disappeared from Europe just as completely as the native race did from Tasmania in the nineteenth century.¹⁷

Sir James Jeans. In the November 23, number of *The Times* (1930), is another exhaustive argument on the age of the earth in which it is stated by Wm L. Laurence, who discusses the question, that

Sir James Jeans, dealing with this same subject in *The Universe Around Us*, published in 1929, gives the age of the earth as 2,000,000,000 years; the age of life on the earth as 300,000,000 years; and the age of man on earth as 300,000 years. The first of these figures would seem to have been corroborated now by the latest findings of Professor Kovarik.¹⁸

Sir Arthur Keith again: Evidence in South Africa. In the *Times*, Magazine Section of November 23, Sir Arthur Keith again made an important contribution to the subject of man's antiquity on the earth. This time under the title of "Supermen—of the Dim Past and Future." This article was based upon recent discoveries in South Africa led by one J. B. Botha, a farmer at Boskop in the Transvaal. Many discoveries of the remains of ancient man went on until finally representatives of the British Association for the Advancement of Science visited South Africa in 1929. "Another important addition was made to our knowledge of these large-brained inhabitants of South Africa," says Sir Arthur Keith.

Local archaeologists had been busy searching caves and river deposits in Cape Colony, the Transvaal and Rhodesia for traces of ancient man and were able to demonstrate to their visitors that there was strange parallelism between ancient South Africa and ancient Europe. In both of these widely separated parts of the world men had lived and had shaped stone tools for hundreds of thousands of years—ever since the beginning of the last geological age—the pleistocene period of the earth's history.

¹⁷*New York Times*, Magazine Section, October 12, 1930.

¹⁸*New York Times*, November 23, 1930.

In South Africa, as in Europe, one method of shaping stone tools, after having been in fashion for a long time, was succeeded by another method of “culture.” The strange thing was that although the South African stone cultures were never at any time identical with the European, yet there were many resemblances not only between individual cultures but in the sequence with which these cultures followed one another. Cave art flourished both in Europe and in South Africa. South Africa was even more rich than Europe in its rock and cave paintings. The British visitors were also surprised to learn that the rock paintings and rock engravings which were known to be the oldest were also the finest from an artistic point of view. As time went on, the hand of the South African artist lost its cunning.

Sir Arthur Keith also gives an account of the recent discoveries of a fossilized skeleton of a man at what is called Skildegat cave of which he gives the following account:

The floor of the cave was nearly 100 feet wide; they ran sections across it and had, by the Autumn of 1929, dug down to a depth of fourteen feet, passing through five distinct strata, every one of them rich in traces of humanity—hearths, implements, and burials. Above the fifth stratum and at a depth of nine feet they came across an ancient grave containing a complete skeleton. The bones were fossilized: the strata over the skeleton were intact. Now the stone tools of the stratum in which the skeleton lay were all of a kind which have been named “Still Bay”—because it was in a deposit at Still Bay, 200 miles to the east of Fish Hoek, that this culture was first discovered. A beautiful stone lance-head of the Still Bay type lay under the skeleton; all the evidence pointed to the fact that the Still Bay culture was the handiwork of the kind of man found in the Skildegat cave. It was the first time a human skeleton had been found in South Africa amid the tools which in life the man had fabricated and used.

Now the Still Bay culture of South Africa has its parallel in Europe; it is known as the Solutrean, and prevailed toward the end of the last ice age—having an antiquity of at least 15,000 years. There is every reason to suppose that the Still Bay culture of South Africa is just as ancient as the Solutrean of Europe. The skeleton found in the Skildegat cave is that of a man who inhabited South Africa some 15,000 years ago, or perhaps more. The man whose skeleton Messrs. Peers discovered has been named the Fish Hoek Man.¹⁹

H. S. Harrison, President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. In the *New York Times* of November 30, 1930, there is an article by H. S. Harrison, President of the Anthropological Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in which he says:

¹⁹*New York Times*, Magazine Section, November 23, 1930.

There is less inclination than there was to regard all known fossil human or humanoid forms as being ancestral types to modern man, and they are now welcomed as distant collaterals, rather than as forefathers. Neanderthal man of the Mousterian epoch, Heidelberg man of a rather earlier period, and the still more remote men or ape-men of Piltdown in England, of Java, and of Peking, are placed in different genera or species, as the case may be, from *Homo Sapiens*; to this are assigned all existing men, and all those who have lived since the end of Mousterian times, say 20,000 years ago.²⁰

The Peking Man. In December 1929, scientists reported the discovery of one skull and several skeletons found in the stone quarries at Chow Outien, 30 miles from Peking, China. The skull was unearthed by Chinese geologists who claimed it belonged to a species of the famous Peking Man, the *Sinanthropus Pekinensis*, said to be associated with the period of the Piltdown skull and the Java ape-man. The dispatch making the announcement said, that “while the scientists who knew of the discoveries were sworn to secrecy, it was understood here (Peking), that they regarded them as perhaps the greatest human finds ever made.” The discoveries were made in the same limestone quarries where a very primitive type of men was found in 1928. The location of the more recently discovered skeletons was said to have convinced the discoverers that the ancient home of a distinctive type of primitive man had been discovered. “It was understood,” so the dispatch continued,

that the scientists believed with the various skeletons as well as the complete skull, they have material enough to reconstruct the entire drama of the life of the prehistoric colony or at least to sketch a portrait of man as he existed in the region of Peiping (near Peking) more than a million years ago. In addition to the human skull and skeletons, the fossil skull of a rhinoceros has been found in the quarry. Also there were uncovered heaps of bones believed to be those of other animals. Many of the bones were clearly broken as if by human hands, possibly, the scientists believe, by hungry men, seeking marrow as food.²¹

Dr. J. G. Anderson. Dr. J. G. Anderson, Swedish adviser to the Chinese Geological Survey and others continued searching eagerly for the heads of the headless skeletons found. The first trace of the Peking Man was discovered [in] 1920 by Dr. A. Zedansky, a Russian, who found a tooth near the site where the latest recoveries have been reported.

²⁰*New York Times*, November 30, 1930.

²¹Peking Man is now classified as *Homo erectus* and is dated from the Middle Pleistocene.

Dr. Davidson Black. Dr. Davidson Black, an American at Peiping [Peking] Union Medical College, placed the Peking Man on a stage of development between the modern human and more ancient human or semi-human creatures. The time estimate of a million years ago as the period in which the Peking Man inhabited the district was based on recent advances in geology, whereby the age of the earth and that of its living creatures is calculated at far higher figures than it was a few years ago; by that scale, the Peking Man is believed to include the Neanderthal Man and to be about contemporaneous with the Heidelberg Man of Europe.

Such the dispatch concerning the discovery of December 15, 1929, to the press of America. On July 30, 1930, a second dispatch was received from Peking, announcing the discovery of still another human skull in the same vicinity, in which it was announced that Dr. Davidson Black had been lent to the survey by the Rockefeller Foundation to devote his entire time to the first skull of the Peking Man. He announced the decision in this second dispatch that the first find was a female skull and the second a male skull, and goes on with a lengthy statement of the new discovery. There came at the same time a cable from London to the *New York Times* in which Professor G. Elliot Smith—one of the foremost geological authorities of England, and connected with the University of London, who declared the discovery of a second skull of the Peking race of antiquity was of great importance as dealing with the fossil remains of extinct types of living creatures.

Still later, namely, December 14, 1930, a dispatch from New Haven, Connecticut to the *New York Times*, giving an account of Professor G. Elliot Smith of the University of London, delivering a lecture at Yale University on the Peking man, who in the meantime had visited Peking to participate in the discoveries, made at that distinct point, said, “that instead of one Peking man there were now available parts of the skulls of ten individuals, and that at least one is the skull of a female.”

“It is certain,” Professor Smith said, “that the prehistoric man of 500,000 years ago (the age assigned to these Peking finds), could speak.”

The skull of the Peking Man he said bridges the gap between the Pithecanthropus Erectus and the Piltdown Man which had been considered heretofore two distinct types and representative of two entirely separate eras in the development of man. The skulls which have been found in China disclose a relationship between the two types.

Of course such statements as these from leading scientists could be multiplied almost indefinitely, but surely sufficient is here set forth to show that the unbroken thread of researches made concerning the

antiquity of man, establishes so far as such researches and human knowledge can establish anything, the great antiquity of the human race on the earth; and certainly that man's life on the earth goes further back than any time fixed by the Bible sources of information; which, at best, as to the advent of Adam and his race, goes no further back than from 6,000 to 8,000 years, and the lesser date is the one usually accepted by orthodoxy. In references made to the existence of man in the earth in our modern revelation, say in Section 1:24 of the Doctrine and Covenants, no earlier existence for man is given than the Bible revelation;[†] and sure it is that the archeological evidences for man's existence even if all the claims of a great antiquity may not be allowed, still go far beyond anything that is set down in our sacred chronology, ancient or modern; and therefore far beyond Adam's period; which forces the recognition of the existence of pre-Adamite races, if there is to be any ~~reconciliation~~ **adjustment** between man's discoveries and the records of scripture; and therefore I am urging the recognition of the advent of Adam to the earth as merely the introduction of an Adamic dispensation of man's existence, all of which will tend to account for all the facts forced upon our attention, and give reasonable standing for what has been revealed with what man by his searching has found out.

There is no other way to account for the stone ages, old and new, than to say that they began in a culture far beyond the period of Adam's advent. The facts of revelation contained in the Bible and our modern revelation which accepts and coalesces with them, do not fit in with the facts of man's evident prolonged existence before the Adamic period **on any other basis**. Here is a fine opportunity for the development of a great truth.

A mighty stride forward in truth was made when it became known that the revelation given to Moses had reference not to the whole, vast universe, but to just this earth on which man lived and to its immediate heavens associated with it (see Moses 1:35); and now with the evidence of life and death on the earth so indisputably evident, including the pre-Adamite life and death of man, in various stages of a successive race-life, why not recognize that truth, and see that which is inevitable, that in the advent of Adam the time had come for the achievement of some special purpose in relation to man—some spiritual relationship—that brought about the introduction of the Adamic dispensation? Otherwise the whole volume of facts as they are disclosed

[†]It is unclear how D&C 1:24 pertains to the subject at hand.

are thrown into confusion; and the revealed truths themselves for most men rendered doubtful, being out of harmony with the facts ascertained as to man's antiquity.

Moreover, by giving this interpretation to Bible facts and the evident truths science has discovered, we shall be doing just now not only a service to our own church, especially to the youth of it, but a service to all Christendom, and to humanity in general, in that we shall make it possible to all Christendom and the world to see a way to harmony between the Bible facts of revelation and the truths revealed by science, which is but the facts discovered by human research placed in orderly array.

On the other hand, to limit and insist upon the whole of life and death to this side of Adam's advent to the earth, some six or eight thousand years ago, as proposed by some, is to fly in the face of the facts so indisputably brought to light by the researcher of science in modern times, and this as set forth by men of the highest type in the intellectual and moral world; not inferior men, or men of sensual and devilish temperament, but men who must be accounted as among the noblest and most self-sacrificing of the sons of men—of the type whence must come the noblest sons of God, since the glory of God is intelligence; and that too the glory of man. These searchers after truth are of that class. To pay attention to, and give reasonable credence to their research and findings is to link the Church of God with the highest increase of human thought and effort. On that side lies development, on the other lies contraction. It is on the former side that research work is going on, and will continue to go on, future investigation and discoveries will continue on that side, nothing will retard them, and nothing will develop on the other side. One leads to narrow sectarianism, the other keeps the open spirit of a world movement *with* which our New Dispensation began. As between them, which is to be our choice?

Addendum

[Draft 2 of chapter 31, pages 43–49, contains the following additional material. One can safely conclude that when Roberts presented his ideas to the Quorum of the Twelve on January 7, 1931, he read the draft of chapter 31 together with the preceding sections and this conclusion. Counting the cover sheet, these total fifty pages:]

[[Well, here is my presentation of the evidence for the antiquity of man and of life and death in the earth previous to Adam. Do not, I pray you, regard it as all the evidence in hand. From my own files of accumulated evidence I could supply several more such papers as this here

submitted. I have said nothing of the frequently reported discoveries of a great antiquity of animal life and death unearthed in the bed of the old sea that once occupied our own Great Basin of this Rocky Mountain plateau ~~region~~ and which ante-date any antiquity that can possibly be assigned to Adam, although I have preserved in my files some of these reported discoveries of ancient life and death in this region.

You Brethren will have observed also perhaps that I have not followed any pin-picking method of argument in dealing with the excerpts from Elder Smith's discourse presented here, but rather have depended upon great, sweeping cumulative, and to me, overwhelming evidences of man's ancient existence in the earth, his life and death in the world through such great periods of time that the facts pertaining to his advent upon the earth **at the time of Adam** ~~at~~ the utmost of the claims made for his coming—~~from six to eight thousand years ago~~ cannot by any process whatsoever of technical interpretation of words or passages of scripture be made to stretch over and explain the facts of the antiquity of man in the earth. If the evidence submitted proves the fact that races of men existed in the earth long ages ago, fifteen or twenty thousand years ago, to say nothing of the longer time of hundreds of thousands of years ago, ~~that in those long ages ago~~ **when** these men lived and died, then *amen* to the claim that all this existence with its life and its death have been wrought within the period of Adam's advent to earth, and his fall, and his life and death. ~~upon it, some six or eight thousand years ago: and so far as I know no greater antiquity than this or can be claimed for the advent of Adam upon the earth and his life and death upon it, on the basis of revelation ancient or modern.~~

The argument based on the interpretation of scripture. Of course there is the statement of scripture quoted and emphasized by Elder Smith, **to be accounted for**, that Adam is the "ancient of days" (Dan. 7:9), "the first man of all men" (Moses 1:34) upon the earth; that if "Adam had not transgressed he would not have fallen" and there would have been no death, for "all things which were created must have remained in the same state . . . forever" and have "had no end" (2 Ne. 2:22); also that God when he had finished the creation pronounced it "good" and the inference is drawn that it could not have been "good" if death existed in the created world; "nor was there any death upon the earth," Elder Smith assures us, in terms as strong as type can be made to say it; and of course we are reminded that these are things said by our scriptures and must be true. But they may be reconciled with the facts of death upon the earth in ages previous to Adam—as the discoveries of men undoubtedly prove—if Adam's advent is understood as describing the introduction of a special dispensation on the earth to accomplish some particular purpose of God in the development of man such as bringing ~~man~~ **him** into special spiritual relationship with ~~him~~, **the Lord**, and men **into special relationships** with one another. Then it is not difficult to see a reasonable understanding

of these passages of scripture relied upon by Elder Smith to sustain his views. For example, to take the very strongest scriptures he quotes, Adam is called by the Lord “the first man of All men” upon the earth; and called by the Prophet of the New Dispensation, “The Ancient of Days, or in other words “the first and oldest of all.” All right, but let it stand as applying to Adam with reference to his particular dispensation and his mission to the earth, and all the difficulties of interpretation disappear, and all the facts are accounted for, as follows: Adam was the first man of all men upon the earth—in *his dispensation*. The first and oldest of all—of his time **or period; the ancient of days**; and had he not transgressed he would not have fallen, nor would he have died and all things must have remained in the same state in which they were *after the earth was prepared for Adam* and his race; and they must have remained forever and had no end; **had it been possible for him to have maintained the status quo, this life, previous to his fall!—But, of course, it was not possible. But** What fact of scripture referred to by Elder Smith is not accounted for and harmonized by this suggestion and interpretation? If it is not accepted, then it remains for those advocating Elder Smith’s theory of all life and death in the earth having occurred since Adam’s advent, to give such interpretation as will accord with the stern proven facts of life and death, ages and ages before Adam appears on the scene.

One other item I wish to present that is mentioned in the excerpt made from Elder Smith’s discourse that is not brought out in the discussion I have presented here on the Antiquity of Man in the earth; and really does not specifically enter into that subject, nor is it my purpose to discuss the matter at length on this occasion. I mention it now merely to bring it into the record of this case that it may receive consideration and not be lost sight of, for it is very important, and should receive more attention than I am attempting to give it here.

It is in relation to Adam, and the physical status of him at his advent upon the earth. I quote from the excerpt of Elder Smith’s discourse read at the commencement of ~~my~~ **this** paper.

“By revelation we are well informed that Adam was not subject to death when he was placed in the garden of Eden, nor was there any death upon the earth.” Then:

“He ⟨Adam⟩ did not come here a resurrected being to die again for we are taught most clearly that those who pass through the resurrection receive eternal life, and can die no more. It is sufficient for us to know, until the Lord reveals more about it, that Adam was not subject to death, but had the power through transgressing the law, to become subject to death, and to cause the same curse ⟨?⟩ to come upon the earth and all life upon it. For this earth once pronounced good, was *cursed* after the fall. It is passing through its mortal probation as well as the life which is upon it, and will eventually receive the resurrection and a place of exaltation which is decreed in the heavens for it.”

I am very glad to observe that Elder Smith in opening this subject says, speaking of Adam ~~in the above~~—“He did not come here ~~to the earth~~ a *resurrected being to die* again for we are taught most clearly that those who pass through the resurrection receive eternal life, and can die no more.” I am pleased I say, that Elder Smith makes this declaration that “Adam was not a resurrected being,” for it makes it possible for me to add, *then he was not an immortal being, for the only way to the status of immortality sometimes referred to as “eternal life,” is through mortality and the resurrection from death to immortality.* The resurrected Christ is the true type and ensample of an immortal man, deathless; *he can die no more!*

But Elder Smith says, in the above, “Adam was not subject to death”; Then he was immortal.—Quoting again: “But (he) had the power, through the transgression of the law, to become subject to death, and to cause the same ~~curse to come upon it~~ **to come upon the earth and all life upon it.**” Well, if Adam *could* die, as he did, then he was after all *subject to death*. No matter what means, I repeat, if he *could* die, by any means whatsoever, then he was subject to death; he was not immortal; and the proof that he was subject to death is in the fact that ~~Adam~~ **he** did die. It does not help matters to say “but (he, Adam) had the power through transgressing the law, to become subject to death”; for if he had that power, he was subject to death, and he did die. In the face of that stern fact it is useless and illogical to say Adam “was not subject to death.”

Let us recapitulate: “Adam was not a resurrected being,” we are assured. Then he was not an immortal being, for the only way to bring about immortality to men is through mortality, and the **resurrected from the dead.**

But Adam was not a resurrected being, yet, according to Elder Smith, when he came to earth though not a resurrected being, “he was not subject to death”!

But by transgression of law Adam brought death upon himself and upon all life in the earth:! Therefore, after all, he *was* subject to death ~~for he died:~~ **he brought it upon himself, and he did die!**

It seems to me that before you put a straight line of consistency through all this, we shall have to understand Adam to be of a different order of men, that is, in a different stage of development, than *not* a resurrected being, yet not subject to death; and yet dying!

Let it be remembered that there is no such thing as conditional immortality. Men are ~~either~~ **either mortal or translated**, or immortal, ~~if for if~~ **if they die for any cause no matter from what cause**; they are mortal; for they are subject to death. **Translated men are those in whom death is (?) but are still subject to death.** If they are immortal then they are not subject to death, **They cannot**; they are like the Christ, in that respect, spirit and element are inseparably connected in them (D&C 93); **which is what God is aiming at through man’s earth life**; and they cannot die under

any condition, they truly are not subject to death. The prophet Alma of the Book of Mormon describes the status; speaking of **the** resurrection from the temporal death of the human body he says:

The spirit and the body shall be reunited again in its perfect form; both limb and joint shall be restored to its proper frame, even as we now are at this time; and we shall be brought to stand before God. . . . I say unto you that this mortal body is raised to an immortal body, that is from death, even from the first death unto life, that they can die no more; their spirits uniting with their bodies, *never to be divided*; thus the whole becoming spiritual and immortal, that they can no more see corruption. (Alma 11:43, 45; italics added)

Of the earth being “good” before death entered it. Elder Smith argues that this earth when created was pronounced “good”; and as necessary to that “good,” there was no death upon it. This his language: “The Lord pronounced the earth *good*, when it was finished. Every thing upon its face was called *good*. There was no death in the earth before the fall of Adam.” Then later: “This earth once pronounced *good*, was *cursed* after the fall.” And all this because death came upon it. But was the death of Adam and **of** all life on the earth a curse? But the earth was pronounced “good” before death came upon it? Yea, and more than that, it was pronounced, “*very good*” (Gen. 1:31); ~~and~~ **But** it was “good,” not so much ~~that~~ **because** no death was upon it, but because it was put in the way of becoming better, even best; for it was put in the way of becoming through death, a celestial world, the habitat of immortal, resurrected men. I have never understood that death was to be considered a *curse* no matter what words God had to use in his revelation to meet the understanding of man in marking off the changes to take place in the experiences of men in their progress through the world—through death and sorrow to immortality an everlasting joy, which ~~for man~~ God has designed in his purposes for man; and one may not—looking at the matter in **large**—refer to any of the means to the accomplishment of this as “a curse,” unless one is prepared to pronounce God’s program for man in the earth a curse. That I am sure none of us is prepared to do, or has the desire to do.]]

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: “The standard works on anthropology”; Genesis; Moses; and Abraham.

CHAPTER XXXII
LIFE STATUS OF ADAM AND EVE AT THEIR EARTH ADVENT

Scripture Reading Lesson

Analysis

- I. The coming of Adam.
- II. The "Royal Planters" - Adam and Eve.
- III. The kind of beings Adam and Eve were when brought to earth.
- IV. Translation and translated beings.
- V. Translation of Enoch and his city.
- VI. The prophet of the New Dispensation on translated beings.
- VII. Immortality means deathless; Testimony of the Book of Mormon.
- VIII. The process of becoming immortal.

References

- "Key to Theology", Parley P. Pratt (5th Ed., 1883, chapter VI)
- "Science and Immortality", by Sir Oliver Lodge, F. R. S. 1908, Section 3, chapters 8, and 9.
- "Journal of Discourses" Vol. I p. 50, April 1852.
- Discourse of the prophet Joseph Smith on Priesthood, "History of the Church" Vol. IV. p. 207 ~~et sq.~~ Ditto p. 425.
- Book of Mormon passim - especially Mosiah 18; Alma 11. Also Alma chapter 40.

Life Status of Adam and Eve at Their Earth Advent

The coming of Adam. The outcome of reflections inspired by the last two chapters would lead us to the acceptance of all that has preceded from the days of Adam as an Adamic dispensation of the things of God with reference to the earth and its inhabitants; and not an entire and complete record of all the happenings upon the earth from the beginning of its first physical creation.

Let us consider how this works out in the long course of the earth's existence. Some cataclysm, some excessive heat period or some overwhelming glacial calamity emptied the earth of all its forms of life—including the human or near-human life. And perhaps in preparation of a better order of things; then come to pass conditions under which the desolated earth may be replenished with life, vegetable and animal life, in sea, and air, and earth. When this is so, the intelligences of some more highly developed world conclude to bring this to pass, and one from among their number, physically and in every way fitted to fulfill such a mission, is brought to the earth and with him his spouse, whose mission together it will be to “replenish” the earth, as it was in the case of Noah after the cataclysm of the flood. A man is ~~created~~ **brought**, and a woman; a garden is planted in a desolate earth, and many forms of life are brought to the earth, and take on existence and spread until the whole earth is abundantly supplied with life in all its varied forms; and human life begins as set forth in the revelations of God in the Bible—especially as recorded in the second chapter of Genesis.

The “royal planters”—Adam and Eve. As for the man and his spouse, Adam and Eve, in the account of their origin that is given under the symbols of procreation. Man created from the dust of the earth, and a human preexistent spirit infused into him. Woman produced truly of man, so also man was produced of man and woman; but symbols of the

phallic generation of woman are used in the account of her creation. The body of man is created from the dust of the earth, and so with woman, and that is true today through the process of generation, and the slowly gathered material from the earth integrating through food and the digestion of it, and growth to the attainment of the appointed height and frame of man. So indeed it was with reference to Adam and Eve, generated in the same way (under nature's law), as men and women are generated today, but upon another world than this we inhabit and where they grew to the state of physical and spiritual development, which fitted them for the mission assigned to them on this earth. Let it be remembered that they came out of an eternal universe, where this process of creation from spiritual to temporal (**material or physical**), and from temporal up to a higher spiritual, has been going on eternally; without beginning, and will continue without end, going on in one everlasting present. For the God-mind all distinctions of time as to past and present and future, so stand that they live and work in the eternal "*now*." So there is nothing mysterious—only as all existence is mysterious—in the matter of Adam and Eve being created by act of generation, the process here suggested, and then, when they had attained suitable development to receive this mission appointment to open a dispensation with reference to the purposes of God on the earth, they came to plant their race in a desolate earth,[†] and to become Patriarch and ~~Mother~~ **Matriarch** to earth's future teeming millions in that dispensation they were honored to begin.

The kind of beings Adam and Eve were when brought to earth. Further consideration is necessary as to Adam and Eve, an inquiry into their degree of development in the process of life, when they came to the earth; that is to say, had they attained unto resurrection in some former world, or had they in the process of life that has been already described in these pages halted somewhat this side of resurrection and immortality? This is mentioned here because it has been suggested that when Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a

[†]On the statement "They came to plant their race in a desolate earth," the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve remarked: "This is questioned by the committee. According to the revelations bearing on the question, the earth was fully prepared for Adam and pronounced 'good,' before he was placed upon it, and was full of life and beauty." Reporting to President Clawson on October 10, 1929, George Albert Smith explained: "Reference to the destruction of the pre-Adamites is objected on the grounds previously stated." Reporting to President Clawson, George Albert Smith explained also: "It does not harmonize with the Temple ceremonies."

“celestial body”; and *that* would mean an immortal body—he would be a resurrected personage.^a This is sustained by a subsequent explanation of the theory here referred to as follows: “When Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden fruit, their bodies became mortal from its effects, and therefore their offspring were mortal.”¹ It would appear from this conception of things pertaining to Adam’s status in life that he came to the earth with a “celestial body,” that is, an immortal body, and then became mortal by partaking of the forbidden fruit, and this in order that he might beget children that would be mortal, in order to accomplish the purpose of God with reference to man’s earth life, that he might have his experiences in broken harmonies, ending in death—separation of spirit and body, to be followed by resurrection and an immortal life, as set forth in previous pages. But there is an inconsistent thing in such a conception of Adam’s status in life when brought to the garden of Eden. Immortality means “exempt from liability to die”; “imperishable”; “undying”; “lasting forever”; “having unlimited or eternal existence”; it means death-less! To say that a person is “immortal,” and then claim that by eating forbidden fruit or anything else, he can become subject to death is a solecism, a rank misunderstanding of terms. *If a person is immortal then he can not die under any circumstances.* If one supposed to be immortal should die, you have conclusive evidence that he was not immortal.[†]

Translation and translated beings. There is nothing in the scriptures, or any utterances equivalent to scripture, that requires us to

^aThis “suggestion” was offered by Brigham Young in the same discourse that Roberts cites below. Roberts’s reasoning that Adam and Eve were not resurrected personages when placed in the garden of Eden is in harmony with current Church teaching, although his belief that they were translated beings is not widely accepted. It may be more appropriate to refer to Adam and Eve’s pre-fall condition as premortal rather than immortal.

¹Young, *Journal of Discourses* 1:50. This discourse **was** delivered April 9, 1852.

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve responded: “The doctrine that Adam came here a ‘translated’ being from some other world is not accepted as a doctrine of the Church. The theory that he came here from some other world a ‘translated’ being does not take care of the element of ‘death’ as that condition came into the world, for translated beings are subject to death according to the teaching in the Book of Mormon (3 Ne. 28:36–40). The scriptures teach us that Adam was not subject to death before the ‘fall,’ and would have lived forever in that innocent state if he had not ‘transgressed’ the law. His ‘fall’ changed the condition and brought death into the world, which could not have happened if death was already here. It is true that Adam had not passed through the resurrection (2 Ne. 2:22, Alma 12:26 and other passages).”

believe that when Adam was brought to the earth he was an immortal personage; the fact that he died is proof positive that he was not immortal. On the other hand, the scriptures give an account of an order of men in whom the process of death is suspended by the power of God, ~~in order~~ that there might be an order of beings capable of performing such special missions to worlds where by the nature of them they would be fitted to such work as might be assigned to them. These are “translated” personages, such for instance as Elijah, who, we are told, was taken into heaven without tasting death (2 Kgs. 2:11). Also we are told in the Bible that Enoch “walked with God: and he was not; for God took him” (Gen. 5:24). This is explained by St. Paul who said: “By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him”; which is generally understood that, as in the case of Elijah, he was taken to heaven without tasting death (Heb. 11:5).

Translation of Enoch and his city. Through modern revelation we obtain further knowledge as to Enoch and his translation, viz., in the fragment of the writings of Moses, known as the book of Moses, in the Pearl of Great Price. Here is given an extended account of the ministry of Enoch as a preacher of righteousness. Those whom his ministry brought to a knowledge of the truth were gathered together into a holy city called “Zion,” which signifies, among other things, the “pure in heart” (D&C 97:21), or the “City of Holiness” (Moses 7:19). We are also told that “Zion, in process of time, was taken up into heaven” (Moses 7:21); so that not only was Enoch translated, but his whole city, for not only did Enoch walk with God, but “Enoch and all his people walked with God, and he [Enoch] dwelt in the midst of Zion; and it came to pass that Zion was not, for God received it up into his own bosom; and from thence went forth the saying, ZION IS FLED” (Moses 7:69).²

The Prophet of the New Dispensation on translated beings. The Prophet of our New Dispensation, Joseph Smith, also had something of importance to say concerning this principle of translation. In an article presented and read to the Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints at Nauvoo, October 3, 1840, the Prophet said, commenting on Genesis 5:24, which deals with the translation of Enoch:

Now this Enoch God reserved unto Himself, that he should not die at that time, and appointed unto him a ministry unto terrestrial bodies,

²For the whole ministry of Enoch see Moses 6-7.

(~~i.e. terrestrial world~~), of whom there has been but little revealed. He (Enoch) is reserved also unto the Presidency of a dispensation (~~same as Adam~~),³ and more shall be said of him and terrestrial bodies in another treatise. He (Enoch) is a ministering angel, to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation. . . . Now the doctrine of translation is a power which belongs to this Priesthood (i.e. the Melchizedek). There are many things which belong to the powers of the Priesthood and the keys thereof, that have been kept hid from before the foundation of the world; they are hid from the wise and prudent to be revealed in the last times.

Many have supposed that the doctrine of translation was a doctrine whereby men were taken immediately into the presence of God, and into an eternal fullness, but this is a mistaken idea. Their place of habitation is that of the terrestrial order, and a place prepared for such characters He held in reserve to be ministering angels unto many planets, and who as yet have not entered into so great a fullness as those who are resurrected from the dead.⁴

This means that translated persons have not altogether escaped from death; for it is most solemnly declared that, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22). And if this holds true, then Elijah, Enoch, and Enoch's people, all who have been translated, in fact, must also pass through the change that is wrought by physical death.

Later, namely at the Church Conference of October 3, 1841, the Prophet on this same subject said: "Translated bodies cannot enter into rest until they have undergone a change equivalent to death. Translated bodies are designed for future missions."⁵

With these facts and principles **relative to translation** before us, established upon authoritative sources of knowledge accepted by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, as authoritative teachings on this subject of translated beings, and the possible missions to which they may be assigned, we are prepared to apply this principle to the commencement of things in this earth life of man under the Adamic dispensation. We have pointed out that it would be inconsistent to say that immortal beings came to the earth to start things as Adam and Eve did and then to say that by partaking of forbidden fruit they were so changed in their immortal nature that they died, since a person who is once become immortal can not again be subject to death; and on this we have the most positive testimony from the Book of Mormon.

³Shall we say, even as Adam was reserved to the Presidency of the Dispensation he opened on our earth?

⁴Smith, *History of the Church* 4:209-10.

⁵Smith, *History of the Church* 4:425.

Immortality means “deathless”: *Book of Mormon Testimony*.
Speaking of the Christ, the prophet Mosiah [sic] says:

He is the light and the life of the world; yea, a light that is endless, that can never be darkened; yea, and also a life which is endless, that *there can be no more death*. Even this mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruption shall put on incorruption. (Mosiah 16:9-10; italics added)

If this be true of the resurrected Christ, it is true of all resurrected personages.

The prophet ~~Zeezrom~~ **Amulek** is represented as saying:

Now, there is a death which is called a temporal death; . . . that all shall be raised from this temporal death. The spirit and the body shall be reunited again in its perfect form; both limb and joint shall be restored to its proper frame, even as we now are at this time; . . . Now, behold, I have spoken unto you concerning the death of the mortal body, and also concerning the resurrection of the mortal body. I say unto you that this mortal body is raised to an immortal body, that is from death, even from the first death unto life, that they can die no more; their spirits **uniting** with their bodies, *never* to be divided; thus the whole becoming spiritual and immortal, that they can no more see corruption. (Alma 11:42, 45; italics added)

The process of becoming immortal. The only way of obtaining immortality is in accordance with God’s plan in bringing about the immortality of man, namely, they are begotten mortal men into an earth life; they die and are resurrected to their immortality, and when so made immortal then it happens to them according to the above teaching of the Book of Mormon, they become immortal, that is, *deathless! They cannot die under any circumstance*. They have become “soul,” and also “sole,” a single thing—a spiritual being, compounded of a union of imperishable earth elements, and imperishable intelligent and spirit elements, that admit of no possible tearing apart or sundering, or dissolution. They are deathless—immortal! Proof against all possibility of dissolution; so that if Adam came to this earth a “celestial,” an “immortal being,” he could not have died, and since he did die the conclusion must be that he was not immortal when he came to the earth, but was possibly a translated being, such as Elijah or Enoch and the people of Enoch’s city were. In that state he could be brought to this earth to people it with offspring that would be mortal, subject to death as he himself was, and subject also to resurrection from the dead as he himself was; and brought by that resurrection to a glorious immortality.

Thus we have our start of the human race in the earth through Adam and Eve, children of God from some other world, begotten in

the image of God, after his kind, and now to beget offspring after their kind, and perpetuate the race of God's children in this earth in order that they might attain, ultimately, to immeasurable heights of power, and glory, and honor, and immortality—eternal life—physical and spiritual.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Lodge, *Science and Immortality*, sect. 3, chs. 8 and 9; Pratt, *Key to the Science of Theology*; Mosiah 18; and Alma 11; 40.

The Problem of Evil

The garden of Eden. In the garden of God's planting, mentioned in Genesis second chapter, and into which man was brought and made the keeper, were two special trees, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Of this tree, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the Lord said to Adam: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:16-17). Thus God's commandment to man; thus the challenge of law to man's obedience, the application of God's pre-terminated test:

We will make an earth whereon these ⟨preexistent spirits of men⟩ may dwell; And we will prove them herewith, to see if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them; And they who keep their first estate ⟨i.e. preexistent spirit estate⟩ shall be added upon; . . . and they who keep their second estate ⟨man's earth estate⟩ shall have glory added upon their heads for ever and ever. (Abr. 3:24-26)

*Symbols of knowledge and life: The tree of death and **the tree of life**.* In the above symbols, together with the announced penalties to follow disobedience, we have assembled the great mysteries of this world—life, death, good, evil, the fact of man's agency—power to order his own course, to obey or disobey **God**; continued life for obedience, which is but conformation to the law of life; and death for disobedience, or departure from the conditions on which life is predicated. The tree of life was the symbol of eternal life, for later when man had partaken of the fruit of the tree of death—the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—God is represented as saying, in effect, "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, *and eat, and live for ever*;" let us send him forth from the Garden of Eden to till the ground,

and guard the tree of life by cherubims with a flaming sword. And so it was ordered (Gen. 3:22–25; italics added).

Death was symbolized in the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (in the day thou eatest of it, thou shalt surely die), hence the tree of death. Death, we learn from scriptures other than Genesis, is both temporal and spiritual. What is here called temporal death is physical death, separation of the spirit and body, the dust returning to the earth whence it came; but the spirit, being a thing immortal, survives in conscious life and goes to the world of spirits. “Dust thou art, and [un]to dust shalt thou return” (Gen. 3:19), was not written of the spirit of man. The spiritual death is disruption of the union of the soul of man with God, and hence spiritual death, since union with God is the source of man’s spiritual life. But while partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge would bring death, both spiritual (**separation from God—hence from good**) and temporal (**separation of spirit and body—physical death**); yet it would bring also the knowledge that would make men as Gods, to know good and evil; and so far become like Gods.^a

The world’s great mystery—the existence of evil. Here let us face this world’s great mystery, the existence of evil, especially of moral evil, which one high in religious and philosophical thought speaks of as “the real riddle of existence—the problem which confounds all philosophy, aye, and all religion too.” He represents that the real riddle is “that evil should exist at all!” “Against this immovable barrier of the existence of evil,” he continues,

the waves of philosophy have dashed themselves unceasingly since the birthday of human thought, and have retired broken and powerless, without displacing the minutest fragment of the stubborn rock, without softening one feature of its dark and rugged surface.¹

Testimony from the Book of Mormon: Lehi on the eternity of evil. In the Book of Mormon, which here we hold to be an ancient volume of American Scripture written by the inspiration of God in its prophets and seers, and translated also by the inspiration of God, is a master stroke of philosophy, as also an authoritative theological doctrine of highest value, the doctrine of necessary opposition in all things, the antinomies of the universe. This Book of Mormon treatise on necessary opposite existences, boldly carries the necessity of such existences to such an extreme that the sacred writer Lehi (of the first part

^aRoberts corrected Draft 2 to read *Gods*.

¹Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought*, 197.

of the fifth [*sic*] century B.C.), makes existence itself, and even the existence of God, to depend upon the fact of things existing in duality: “things to act and things to be acted upon” (2 Ne. 2:14). Opposite physical forces are seen in attraction and repulsion, the centripetal and centrifugal forces, the action and reaction of which hold the worlds in balance; in ~~the~~ chemistry, the composing and decomposing substances; in electricity, the positive and negative forces; and in the whole universe is to be seen what is called the antinomy, or opposites, of light and darkness, movement and repose, energy and matter, heat and cold, life and death; “the one and the multiple”; in the moral order, good and evil, joy and sorrow, courage and cowardice, righteousness and wickedness. And now Lehi’s statement of the case and his reasoning thereon, and his startling conclusion:

For 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 nor misery, neither good nor bad. Wherefore, all things (*i.e. in that event*) must needs be a compound in one; wherefore, if it should be one body it must needs remain as dead, having no life neither death, nor corruption nor incorruption, happiness nor misery, neither sense nor insensibility. Wherefore, it must needs have been created for a thing of naught; wherefore there would have been no purpose in the end of its creation. Wherefore, this thing must needs destroy the wisdom of God and his eternal purposes, and also the power, and the mercy, and the justice of God. And if ye shall say there is no law, ye shall also say there is no sin. If ye shall say there is no sin, ye shall also say there is no righteousness. And if there be no righteousness there be no happiness. And if there be no righteousness nor happiness there be no punishment nor misery. And if these things are not there is no God. And if there is no God we are not, neither the earth; for there could have been no creation of things, *neither to act nor to be acted upon*; wherefore, all things must have vanished away. (2 Ne. 2:11–13; italics added)

This doctrine unique to modern revelations. The antinomies of the universe—things in necessary duality, essential to the existence of things at all—is the doctrine of this passage. Who before this in ancient times taught this doctrine? Who of modern times, prior to 1830, the year in which the Book of Mormon was published, ever taught it? And especially whoever, either in ancient or modern times, ever carried the daring thought to the height of making existences of the universe and the universe itself, and even the existence of God, depend upon the existence of things in duality, in a necessary opposition in all things? I shall make bold to claim this as a uniqueness of the Nephite scripture. But pride of it is not in its uniqueness, but in the self-evident truth of it, and in the tremendous consequences that draw with it, and the light

it throws athwart the world's mystery of the existence of evil; the aid it is to philosophy; the aid it is to religion; the assistance it will afford in our exposition of the fall of man.

Evil among the eternal things. We can be assured from the Book of Mormon doctrine that evil as well as good is among the eternal things. The existence of evil did not begin with its appearance on our earth. Evil existed even in heaven; for Lucifer and many other spirits sinned there; rebelled against heaven's matchless King, waged "war," and were thrust out into the earth for their transgression.

Evil is not a created quality. It has always existed as the background of good. It is as eternal as goodness; it is as eternal as law; it is as eternal as the agency of intelligences. Sin, which is *active evil*, is transgression of law, and so long as the agency of intelligences and law have existed, the possibility of the transgression of law has existed; and as the agency of intelligences, and law have eternally existed, so, too, evil has existed eternally, either potentially or active, and will always so exist. Evil may not be referred to God for its origin. He is not its creator. Evil is one of those independent existences that is uncreate, and stands in the category of qualities of eternal things.² The good cannot exist without the antithesis of the evil, the foil on which it produces itself and becomes known. The existence of one implies the existence of the other; and conversely, the non-existence of the latter would imply the nonexistence of the former. It is from this basis that Lehi reached the conclusion that either his doctrine of the existence of opposites is true, or else there is no existence.

Lehi's conclusion is woven into the very fabric of the things of the universe. It cannot be otherwise. The opposite, the absence of one or

²Lest some text-proofer should retort upon me and cite the words of Isaiah, "I make peace *and create evil*," the only text of scripture ascribing the creation of evil to God, I will anticipate so far as to say that it is quite generally agreed that no reference is made in the words of Isaiah to "moral evil"; but to such evils as may come as judgments upon people for their correction, such as famine, or tempest, or war; such an "evil" as would stand in natural antithesis to "peace," which word precedes, "I create evil," in the text—"I make peace and create"—the opposite to peace, "The evils of afflictions and punishments, but not the evil of sin" (Catholic *Bible*, comment on Isaiah 45:7). Meantime we have the clearest scriptural evidence that moral evil is not a product of God: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man," that is to say, God has nothing to do with the creation of moral evil, "but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (James 1:13-15). "The evil and the good are necessary co-relatives." Lodge, "Christianity and Science," 657.

the other member in a given series of antitheses is unthinkable. The fact of the ~~existence~~ **reality** of opposite existences must be recognized as a necessary truth, a truth the opposite of which is inconceivable.

The testimony of a modern (Harvard) philosopher. Since the publication of the Book of Mormon (spring of 1830), consideration of this subject of evil has been more frequent and fuller, but in none of these more recent discussions is to be found those who in consideration of the theme take on the coloring of Lehi's conclusions until you come to John Fiske, professor, historian and philosopher of Harvard fame, from whose writings is to be obtained full warrant for all that the Book of Mormon passage on opposite existences sets forth, and this in his great treatise on the "Mystery of Evil" (1899) and published in his *Studies in Religion*.

Mr. Fiske says:

Whatever exists is part of the dramatic whole, and this can quickly be proved. The goodness in the world—all that we love and praise and emulate—we are ready enough to admit into our scheme of things, and to rest upon it our belief in God. The misery, the pain, the wickedness, we would fain leave out. But if there were no such thing as evil, how could there be such a thing as goodness? Or to put it somewhat differently, if we had never known anything but goodness, how could we ever distinguish it from evil? How could we recognize it as good? How would its quality of goodness in any wise interest or concern us? This question goes down to the bottom of things, for it appeals to the fundamental conditions according to which conscious intelligence exists at all. Its answer will therefore be likely to help us. It will not enable us to solve the problem of evil, enshrouded as it is in a mystery impenetrable by finite intelligence, but it will help us to state the problem correctly; and surely this is no small help. In the mere work of purifying our intellectual vision there is that which heals and soothes us. To learn to see things without distortion is to prepare one's self for taking the world in the right mood, and in this we find strength and consolation. . . .

It is an undeniable fact that we cannot know anything whatever except as contrasted with something else. The contrast may be bold and sharp, or it may dwindle into a slight discrimination, but it must be there. If the figures on your canvas are indistinguishable from the background, there is surely no picture to be seen. Some element of unlikeness, some germ of antagonism, some chance for discrimination, is essential to every act of knowing. I might have illustrated this point concretely without all the foregoing explanation, but I have aimed at paying it the respect due to its vast importance. I have wished to show how the fact that we cannot know anything whatever except as contrasted with something else is a fact that is deeply rooted in the innermost structure of the human mind. It is not a superficial but a

fundamental truth, that if there were no colour but red it would be exactly the same thing as if there were no colour at all. . . .

If our palates had never come in contact with any tasteful thing save sugar, we should know no more of sweetness than of bitterness. If we had never felt physical pain, we could not recognize physical pleasure. For want of the contrasted background its pleasurable-ness would be nonexistent. And in just the same way it follows that without knowing that which is morally evil we could not possibly recognize that which is morally good. Of these antagonist correlatives, the one is unthinkable in the absence of the other. In a sinless and painless world, human conduct might possess more outward marks of perfection than any saint ever dreamed of; but the moral element would be lacking; the goodness would have no more significance in our conscious life than that load of atmosphere which we are always carrying about with us.

We are thus brought to a striking conclusion, the essential soundness of which cannot be gainsaid. In a happy world there must be sorrow and pain, and in a moral world the knowledge of evil is indispensable. The stern necessity for this has been proved to inhere in the innermost constitution of the human soul. It is part and parcel of the universe. To him who is disposed to cavil at the world which God has in such wise created, we may fairly put the question whether the prospect of escape from its ills would ever induce him to put off this human consciousness, and accept in exchange some form of existence unknown and inconceivable! The alternative is clear: on the one hand a world with sin and suffering, on the other hand an unthinkable world in which conscious life does not involve contrast.

The profound truth of Aristotle's remark is thus more forcibly than ever brought home to us. We do not find that evil has been interpolated into the universe from without; we find that, on the contrary, it is an indispensable part of the dramatic whole.³

Summary of Fiske's contribution. There can be no doubt that this is strong and direct support to the essential things in Lehi's philosophy. Let me throw the evidence of it in sight:

Whatever exists is part of the dramatic whole. . . . This question goes down to the bottom of things, for it appeals to the fundamental conditions according to which conscious intelligence exists at all; . . . It is an undeniable fact that we can not know anything whatever except as contrasted with something else; . . . If the figures on your canvas are indistinguishable from the background, there is surely no picture to be seen. . . . It is not a superficial but a fundamental truth that if there were no colour but red, it would be exactly the same thing as if there were no colour at all (so as to **the** good). . . . If we had

³Fiske, *Studies in Religion*, 242-43, 249-52.

never felt physical pain, we could not recognize physical pleasure. . . . Without knowing that which is morally evil, we could not possibly recognize that which is morally good. . . . In a happy world there must be sorrow and pain, . . . and in a moral world the knowledge of evil is indispensable. . . . We do not find that evil has been interpolated into the universe from without; we find that, on the contrary, it is an indispensable part of the dramatic whole.⁴

God did not create evil, nor is he responsible for it. From this view of things we get a new conception of evil. It is not a created thing, it exists in the sum of things, in the constitution of things. It is "part of the dramatic whole." As already suggested God is not the creator of evil. It is repulsive to every worthy thought of Deity to think so; and contrary to the unity and consistency of his attributes of righteousness and true holiness, and justice and love that he should be the author of evil, or the creator of the devil to produce evil, and be responsible for it in our world or in any other world, for in that case God would still be responsible for the existence of evil.

Evil rests upon the eternal nature of things, of existences in both their eternal positive and negative forms. God did not create space (i.e. expanse or extension in which things exist); God did not create duration—limitless time; God did *not* create matter—the stuff that things are made of, and that occupies space; God did not create force, or energy, or mind, or intelligence—the thing in Lehi's philosophy which "acts." All these are eternal things, and God working among these brings to pass changes and ordains events, these his creative acts. God is not the author of evil or wickedness; neither did he create the devils of this or of other worlds; such devils as exist are intelligences possessed of free moral agency, who chose to do evil and rebelled against good and against God, and have had perverse inclination to seek to induce other intelligences to follow their evil course. There is no more mystery about the existence *of devils, than there is about the existence* of evil men. Meanwhile, but apart from devils or evil-minded wicked men, evil exists eternally, active or potential, in the very constitution of things. By the side of the virtue of courage lurks the evil of danger, without which courage would be unknown. In the same way, good must have its background of evil, else it would never be known; to employ Fiske's illustration: "If the figures on your canvas are indistinguishable from the background, there is surely no picture to be seen." So it stands that evil is as eternal as good; as eternal as space, or duration or matter or force. God did not create any of these things, nor is he

⁴Fiske, *Studies in Religion*, 242-43, 249-52.

responsible for them. He found himself, so to speak, coeternal with these other eternal things, and so works out his creative designs in harmony with those existences; not creating intelligences, but begetting intelligences, spirits. God is not responsible for the inner fact of them, the entity which ultimately determines the intellectual and moral character of spirits and of men, which are but spirits incarnate in human bodies. God is not responsible for their nature as if he had created them absolutely of nothing—intelligences, spirits, men; and created them as he would have them, measuring to each severally as he pleased to have them in intellectual degree and intensity of moral value. Had he so absolutely created them, he could have made the man of lowly degree the same as the man of highest degree: the man of brute mind and nature the same as the man of refined sentiment and aesthetic instincts. Why this inequality, if God absolutely created men, intelligence, spirit, body; and created them as he willed to have them, and could have had them different had he so willed? Why then did he not have them of higher grade all round? Why were not all the men made brave and all the women fair? The answer to all this is that God did all that could be done as the immanent, eternally, active, and creating and causing power in the universe under the limitations of other eternal existences such as we have previously enumerated, and including consideration of the intractableness of the material with which the Creator had to work. If that did not eventuate in the best conceivable of worlds, under the limitations of our human thinking, we may be assured that it has resulted in the best of possible worlds. And while this best possible world presents apparent limitation to the power of its Creator, such as he may not create space, nor matter, nor force, nor intelligence; nor annihilate evil, yet all the power that is, creative, or destructive, or controlling is his; he holds it, and hence he is all-powerful; all the might that exists is his; hence he is the Almighty; all the good that exists is his, hence he is the All Good; and the All Benevolent, and the All Loving One, for the same reason that he is the Almighty.

These are matters that affect our conceptions of God, and have now of a long time puzzled the minds of men leading to such troublesome questions as these.

Troublesome problems: Antitheses of Epicurus. If God is absolutely omnipotent, why does he not prevent evil? The fact that evil exists and persists, generally in the economy of the world, leads to the conclusion that the Deity is limited in power.

If God is absolutely benevolent or good why has he created a world where pain, sorrow, suffering, and death, are the common lot of men?

And the conclusion formed from such a question is that either the Creator is not benevolent, or that again he is limited in power. The most celebrated formula of these time-worn problems is known as the antitheses of Epicurus, namely:

- (1) Is God willing to prevent evil but not able? Then he is impotent.
- (2) Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent!
- (3) Is he both able and willing? Then why is evil?

These questions are supposed to present an *impasse* to any harmony in the nature of Deity on the basis of his omnipotence, benevolence and the existence of evil. Yet in the light of our reflections in this chapter on evil, and especially in the light of the philosophy of Lehi in the Book of Mormon and John Fiske's faultless reasoning, the antitheses of Epicurus are not so formidable as might otherwise appear.

Answer to Epicurus. God may not be able to prevent evil and destroy the source of it, but he is not impotent, for he guides intelligences, notwithstanding evil, to kingdoms of peace and security. Evil is a means of progress, for progress is overcoming evil.

God may not be able, nor willing if he were able, to prevent evil, and yet he is not malevolent. For knowing that evil exists in the whole scheme of things as the necessary antithesis of good, and that one may not be destroyed without destroying both, why wreck the universe in order to prevent evil? And which if achieved would be the greatest of evils, since all things else would go with it.

"Why then is evil?" the last of the questions of Epicurus? The answer is, that it is a necessary and eternal part of "the dramatic whole," as set forth in both Lehi's philosophy and John Fiske's ~~faultless~~ reasoning. And the kingdom of righteousness wherein dwelleth peace, the beatific vision and hope of the faithful, is the kingdom to be won by the conquest over evil; and which never may be realized but by that conquest.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Baring-Gould, *Origin and Development of Religious Belief* 2:22-23; Emerson, "Compensation"; Roberts, *Seventy's Course in Theology* 2:54-59; Gen. 1-3; 2 Ne. 2; and Alma 42. This chapter draws verbatim on many sections of Roberts's essay entitled "A Master Stroke of Philosophy in the Book of Mormon," *Deseret News*, Church Section, June 16, 1928, 5. For additional discussion about the problem of evil, see pages 607, 610-13 below.

The Affair in Eden—The “Fall” of Man

With the doctrine of a necessary opposition in all things set forth as essential to any existence at all, that good can only exist and be known in antithesis with evil, that both joy and sorrow are essential to be a happy world,^a and recognizing evil as [a]mong the eternal things not created or made, but existing as part of the “dramatic whole,”^b we are prepared to approach the affair in Eden—“the fall of man”—with larger assurance of understanding than could otherwise be hoped for.

The symbol trees—the tree of death; the tree of life. The story of the “Fall” is well known: we shall have small need of entering upon its details. In the garden of God’s planting, Eden, were two symbol trees. (1) The tree of the knowledge of good and evil: to eat of its fruit meant death to the life then known to man—the life of innocence, and the ~~temporal~~ physical life.[†] This tree, then, could also be known as “the tree of death.” (2) Opposite to this, and in the midst of the garden, was “the tree of life.” Here in the last analysis, are the symbols of the necessary “opposition in all things”—the tree of life, the tree of death—symbols of the antinomies of the universe!^c

With the necessity of knowing both good and evil in order to know anything, it can scarcely be expected that man was placed in the

This chapter is a more concise version of Roberts’s discussion of the Fall found in *Seventy’s Course in Theology* 4:35–45. Compare Roberts’s article “The Affair in Eden: The Fall of Man,” *Deseret News*, Church Section, June 30, 1928, 7. On Roberts’s attitude towards the Fall, see pages 657–59 below.

^a2 Ne. 2:11, 23–25.

^bSee the discussion in the preceding chapter.

[†]Regarding the statement about “temporal physical life,” the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve simply asserted: “This we question in the light of the Book of Mormon revelation” (2 Ne. 2:22). Evidently in response, Roberts crossed out the word “temporal.”

^c2 Ne. 2:15.

Garden of Eden to refrain from partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. Notwithstanding the commandment not to partake of the forbidden fruit, why is he there if not to partake of it? And may not the “commandment,” respecting the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, saying: “thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Gen. 2:17)—may not this be regarded more as announcing the nature of the fruit of the tree and the consequence of eating it, than an expected and effective prohibition of partaking of this fruit?^d

Back of all this iterated “commandment,”—“thou shalt not eat of the fruit of this tree, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die”—is felt the fact of the agency of man, his power to choose for himself, to eat or not to eat. Only know the consequences, O Man! If you eat of it, death to your life of innocence will follow; death to your physical life will follow; for “dust thou art, and [un]to dust shalt thou return” (Gen. 3:19). It is full of risk, this eating of the forbidden fruit! It is full of danger. There are real losses to face. It means adventure. It will inaugurate a new order of things. Man, thou art forewarned, but thou art free!

The tree of knowledge not an evil tree. Let it be observed that the tree of knowledge, even though the tree of death, is nowhere called an “evil tree,” or its fruit bad. “And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil” (Gen. 2:9). No intimation of this tree of knowledge being in itself evil. Rather to the contrary: it is included among the trees “pleasant to the sight, and good for food,” in the same verse in which it is named (Gen. 2:9). The observation ~~respecting of~~ Eve in the commencement of her conversation with Lucifer (symbolized by the serpent)^e may have been ~~really and~~ wholly true of the fruit of the tree of knowledge ***of good and evil***: “And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise” (Gen. 3:6), she was not merely echoing something that Lucifer ~~and~~ **had** suggestively infused into her

^dThis is suggested in the scriptural account in Moses 3:17: “But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, nevertheless, thou mayest choose for thyself, for it is given unto thee; but, remember that I forbid it, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

^eMoses 4:6 specifically connects the biblical serpent with Satan: “And Satan put it into the heart of the serpent.”

mind, but was uttering a truth respecting the tree itself, and what it stood for. It is good to know; and since the good may not be known without also knowing the evil, it is good—since from the constitution or nature of things it can not be otherwise—it is good to know both. Besides, throughout the whole narrative of Genesis, it is taken for granted that to eat the forbidden fruit “will make men as gods, knowing good and evil” (cf. Gen. 3:5); and is it not good for men to be as gods, knowing good and evil—in any way *to be* as gods? Who shall say nay? “The fall of man!” Is it not here that man begins to rise? True it is Lucifer who in the Genesis narrative ~~have~~ first suggests, and doubtless with evil intent, that eating the fruit would open the eyes of man, “and make him as God.” Yet it was a truth; for God himself is represented as saying *later*, after Adam and Eve had eaten the forbidden fruit—

Behold, the man is become as one of us (the Gods), to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground. . . . And he placed . . . Cherubims, and a flaming sword . . . to keep the way of the tree of life. (Gen. 3:22-24)

Which only means that the time had not then come for man to attain immortality, nor then to know the way to the tree of life. Opportunity to reap the full harvest *from eating* of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil must be granted, not only to Adam and his spouse, but to their posterity also—to the race; a testing period and a testing place is provided where the whole drama of good and evil in conflict shall work out the purposes of God in the planned earth life of man.^f

But for man to become as God, in any respect, in any way, and by any means must be great gain, and surely embraced from the beginning in God’s general and positive plan for man’s advancement. **It** must have been included in the covenant of “eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began” (Titus 1:2); and not an incident that surprised the purposes of God and provoked his anger.

The doctrine of the Fall according to the Book of Mormon. And now as to the effects of the Fall according to the account of it given in the Book of Mormon: if Adam had not fallen

He would have remained in the garden of Eden. And all things which were created must have remained in the same state *in* which they were after they were created; and they must have remained forever, and had no end. And they (Adam and Eve) would have had no children;

^fThis period is called a “state of probation” in 2 Ne. 2:21.

wherefore they would have remained in a state of innocence, having no joy, for they knew no misery; doing no good, for they knew no sin. But behold, all things have been done in the wisdom of him who knoweth all things. (2 Ne. 2:22–24)

The parts to emphasize in these statements are (1) but for the “Fall” all things must have remained in the same state in which they were created without end: no change, hence no progression; (2) the state of man’s innocence before the “Fall” would have brought no joy, for in it man knew no misery; (3) Adam and Eve could do no good, for they knew no sin.

The dilemma: What shall Adam do? What then? Shall the creation in which they stand remain static? Know no good because, forsooth, to know good and to do good, evil must also be experienced! And that because of the eternal nature of things, for which no one is responsible, no; not God. No one has created that “eternal nature of things” any more than anyone has created space, duration, matter, force, or intelligences: these are eternal things. So too, are good, beauty, truth, righteousness, life, peace, joy. These **latter**, however, as we have seen, may be known only in duality—they are known only in contrast with their respective opposites; good by its opposite or antinomy of evil; joy by its opposite of sorrow; life by its opposite of death, and so following. To know any one of these you must experience its opposite.[†] The question resolves itself into this: Is the knowledge of the good, the beautiful and the true, the realization of life—even immortal life—worth while? Is conscious existence better than nonexistence? Even when conscious existence involves misery and suffering, but is attended by the hope that sometime, somewhere, there will be relief: such as “weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning”? (Ps. 30:5).

These were the principles involved in the Fall. These the issues set before man in Eden. And Adam and his spouse chose the way of life, even the way of immortal and eternal life, though the way led through the valley and the shadow of temporal death; and though by necessity they

[†]Reflecting on the statement “To know any one of these you must experience its opposite,” the reviewing committee in 1929 wrote: “This thought raises some questions. While it is necessary that there be opposition in all things, yet a man does not have to sin, or come in contact with wickedness by partaking of it, to know it. We may have failed in grasping the meaning here.” Reporting to President Clawson, George Albert Smith reasoned: “Christ did not sin, yet he ‘experienced’ evil. Can this be changed to avoid this ambiguity?”

must experience the mingled joys and sorrows of a world of broken harmonies, with good and evil, life and death in conflict—and fiercely in conflict—disclosing the pain of the universe, yet in all this Book of Mormon doctrine, there is no complaint of the hard condition the “Fall” imposes on the participants or on their descendants who fall heirs to their woes; no upbraiding of the Creator as being responsible for the evil. No, on the contrary the affirmed assurance is: “All things have been done in the wisdom of him who knoweth all things” (2 Ne. 2:24).

Later, when prophetically the coming of Messiah in the fulness of time is made known to Adam and the men who by now were with him, and the purpose of Messiah’s coming and mission is declared to be the redemption of “the children of men from the Fall,” then listen to the full organ-tones of the joy in which these things are recounted, and it will not be difficult to understand how the “Fall” is really held to be “the beginning of the rise of man.”

And the Messiah cometh in the fulness of time, that he may redeem the children of men from the fall. And because that they are redeemed from the fall they have become free forever, knowing good from evil; to act for themselves and not to be acted upon, save it be by the punishment of the law at the great and last day, according to the commandments which God hath given. Wherefore, men are free according to the flesh; and all things are given them which are expedient unto man. And they are free to choose liberty and eternal life, through the great Mediator of all men, or to choose captivity and death, according to the captivity and power of the devil; for he seeketh that all men might be miserable like unto himself. (2 Ne. 2:26–27)

Effect of the Fall. I shall doubtless be told, however, that this rejoicing is over the “redemption from the Fall” rather than rejoicing over the “Fall”; but it was the “Fall” which brought forth the need of the “redemption”; and therefore mediately if not immediately the cause of the rejoicing. Moreover, it is the things brought about by the “Fall” that are mentioned as the occasion for the rejoicing: men have a new-found freedom—“they have become free forever”; they know now “good from evil”; that knowledge came through the “Fall”; henceforth they will be free “to act,” and not merely to be “acted upon,” save to meet the consequences of their acts in judgments. A great change has been wrought in their status. Henceforth they will be self-centers of free agency, agents of self-determining power, centers of intelligent force with power of initiative. They are awakened to a knowledge of good and evil; they have become as God, at least so far as to know good and evil, and have become conscious of the power to choose between

them. This affair in Eden, the “Fall” is something more, allow me to repeat, than a thing “permissively embraced in the sovereign purpose of the Deity,” which he “designed to order to his own glory.”¹ The necessity of its taking place was something ~~rather~~ that is imbedded in the very constitution of things. The only way by which man could come to knowledge of good, and to do good, was by partaking of the fruit of the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” This is the only way to be “as God” in respect of knowing good and evil, which knowledge is the source of man’s free agency, the consciousness of the freedom of the human will, of true morality, and of self-given loyalty to God. With so many things of high import and precious to man and dear to God, there can be no doubt but what the “Fall” was as much a part of God’s earth-planned life for man as the “redemption” provided for him; indeed there would have been no need of redemption but for the “Fall,” and ~~none~~ **no redemption** would have been provided but for anticipation of that “Fall.”

The attitude of Christendom on the Fall. Though all this seems so clearly set forth, or is very reasonably implied from the story of the “Fall” in Genesis, yet the attitude of Christendom, both in Roman Catholic and Protestant divisions, on the doctrine of the “Fall” of man seems to be one of profound regret that the “Fall” ever happened. As self-constituted interpreters of the event, these churches deplore the “Fall” and strongly hold that man and the world would have been better off had the thing never happened. And upon Adam is laid a heavy burden of responsibility. It was he, they complain, who “brought death into the world, and all our woe.”

(a) *The Roman Catholic view.*² The Roman Catholic doctrine of the “Fall” is set forth straight forwardly in the Douay Catechism, from which I quote:

Q. How did we lose original justice?

A. By Adam’s disobedience to God in eating the forbidden fruit. . . .

Q. How do you prove that?

A. Out of Romans 5:12: “By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death; and so into all men death did pass, in whom all have sinned.”

¹*Westminster Confession*, chapter 6, section 1.

²This is a shortened form of the discussion in *Seventy’s Course in Theology* 4:143–48.

Q. Had man ever died if he had never sinned?

A. He would not, but would live in a state of justice and at length would be translated alive to the fellowship of the angels.²

Again, "The Catholic Church teaches," says Joseph Fàa di Bruno, DD.,

that Adam by his sin has not only caused harm to himself, but to the whole human race; that by it he lost the supernatural justice and holiness which he received gratuitously from God, and lost it, not only for himself, but also for all of us; and that he, having stained himself with the sin of disobedience, has transmitted not only death and other bodily pains and infirmities to the whole human race, but *also sin, which is the death of the soul*.³

And again:

Unhappily, Adam by his sin of disobedience, which was also a sin of pride, disbelief, and ambition, forfeited, or, more properly speaking, rejected that original justice; and we, as members of the human family, of which he was the head, are also implicated in that guilt of self-spoliation, or rejection and deprivation of those supernatural gifts; not indeed on account of our having willed it with our personal will, but by having willed it with the will of our first parent, to whom we are linked by nature as members to their head.⁴

(b) *The Protestant view*.^h For the Protestant view I quote the following from Buck's *Theological Dictionary*, published in 1844 (American Edition). It was the Protestant Encyclopedia on Protestant theology at the period of publication:

In the fall of man we may observe, 1. The greatest infidelity.—2. Prodigious pride.—3. Horrid ingratitude.—4. Visible contempt of God's majesty and justice.—5. Unaccountable folly.—6. A cruelty to himself and to all his posterity. . . . *That man is a fallen creature*, is evident, if we consider his misery as an inhabitant of the natural world; the disorders of the globe we inhabit, and the dreadful scourges with which it is visited; the deplorable and shocking circumstances of our birth; the painful and dangerous travail of women; our natural uncleanness, helplessness, ignorance, and nakedness; the gross darkness in which we naturally are, both with respect to God and a future state: the general rebellion of the brute creation against us; the various poisons that lurk in the animal, vegetable and

²*Douay Catechism*, 13.

³Fàa di Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, 5-6; italics in original. The work carries the approval of Cardinal Henry E. Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, England.

⁴Fàa di Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, 330.

^h*Seventy's Course in Theology* 4:49-51.

mineral world, ready to destroy us; the heavy curse of toil and sweat to which we are liable; the innumerable calamities of life, and the pangs of death.⁵

God, it is said, made man upright (Eccl. 7:29); without any imperfection, corruption, or principle of corruption in his body or soul; with light in his understanding, holiness in his will, and purity in his affections. This constituted his original righteousness, which was universal, both with respect to the subject of it, the whole man, and the object of it, the whole law. Being thus in a state of holiness, he was necessarily in a state of happiness. He was a very glorious creature, the favorite of heaven, the lord of the world, possessing perfect tranquillity in his own breast, and immortal. Yet he was not without law; for the law of nature, which was impressed on his heart, God super-added a positive law, not to eat of the forbidden fruit (Gen. 2:17) under the penalty of death natural, spiritual, and eternal. Had he obeyed this law, he might have had reason to expect that he would not only have had the continuance of the natural and spiritual life, but have been transported to the upper paradise. . . . Man's righteousness, however, though universal, was not immutable, as the event has proved. How long he lived in a state of innocence cannot easily be ascertained, yet most suppose it was but a [very] short time. The positive law which God gave him he broke, by eating the forbidden fruit. The consequence of this evil act was, that man lost the chief good; his nature was corrupted; his powers depraved, his body subject to corruption, his soul exposed to misery, his posterity all involved in ruin, subject to eternal condemnation, and forever incapable to restore themselves to the favor of God, to obey his commands perfectly and to satisfy his justice.⁶

From another Protestant source:

The *tree of knowledge of good and evil* revealed to those who ate its fruit secrets of which they had better have remained ignorant; for the purity of man's happiness consisted in doing and loving good without even knowing evil.⁷

(c) *Presbyterian modification of the Protestant view of the Fall.*

All this severity is relieved but by one division of Christendom of any considerable numbers and standing; and by that division the modification is but slight. This is by the Presbyterian Church in its Westminster Confession of Faith and an authoritative comment upon it by A. D. Hodge. The confession dealing with the "Fall" concedes that "God

⁵Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s.v. "Fall of Man."

⁶Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s.v. "Man."

⁷Smith, *Old Testament History*, 26.

was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit it (the “Fall”) having purposed to order it to his own glory.”⁸

In the authoritative exposition of this chapter, it is set forth, “that this (aim) [sin] (the “Fall”) was permissively embraced in the (sovereign) [eternal] purpose of God.”⁹ Its purpose being God’s general plan, and one eminently wise and righteous, to introduce all the new created subjects of moral government into a state of probation for a time in which he makes their permanent character and destiny depend upon their own action. Still, this “sin” described as being “permissively embraced” in the sovereign purpose of the Deity and that God designed “to order it to his own glory,” nowhere appears to be of any benefit to man. The only thing consulted in the theory of this creed seems to be the manifestation of the glory of God—a thing which represents God as a most selfish being—but just how the glory of God *even* can be manifested by the “Fall” which, according to this creed, results in the eternal damnation of the overwhelming majority of his “creatures,” is not quite apparent.

Those who made this Westminster Confession, as also the large following which accept it, concede that their theory involves them at least in two difficulties which they confess it is impossible for them to meet. These are respectively:

First, how could sinful desires or volitions originate in the soul of moral agents created holy like Adam and Eve?

Second, how can sin be permissively embraced in the eternal purpose of God, and not involve him as responsible for the sin? “If it be asked,” they say,

why God, who abhors sin, and who benevolently desires the excellence and happiness of his creatures, should sovereignly determine to permit such a fountain of pollution, degradation, and misery to be opened, we can only say, with profound reverence, “even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.”¹⁰

Such the theology of yesterday, and also of today in official creeds and their expositions; but rapidly these are becoming obsolete to the thoughtful; who are doubtful if this lauded life of innocence in Eden would have been as desirable as the theologians of past generations would have us think. Dr. John Fiske of Harvard, in his “Studies in Religion” challenges it squarely, and on the “Fall,” as in the matter of the necessity of “opposite existences” in order to [have] existences at all,

⁸*Westminster Confession*, chapter 6, section 1.

⁹Hodge, *Commentary on the Confession*, 107.

¹⁰Hodge, *Commentary on the Confession*, 108.

is in strict accord with both the theology and with the philosophy of Lehi, the Book of Mormon prophet.ⁱ

Views of John Fiske on life in Eden without “the Fall.”

What would have been the moral value or significance of a race of human beings ignorant of sin, and doing beneficent acts with no more consciousness or volition than the deftly contrived machine that picks up raw material at one end, and turns out some finished product at the other? Clearly, for strong and resolute men and women an Eden would be but a fool’s paradise. How could anything fit to be called *character* have ever been produced there? But for tasting the forbidden fruit, in what respect could man have become a being of higher order than the beasts of the field? An interesting question is this, for it leads us to consider the genesis of the idea of moral evil in man. . . . We can at least begin to realize distinctly that unless our eyes had been opened at some time, so that we might come to know the good and the evil, we should never have become fashioned in God’s image. We should have been the denizens of a world of puppets, where neither morality nor religion could have found place or meaning.¹¹

In this passage, the Harvard philosopher unwittingly supports the sober doctrine of the Book of Mormon that partaking of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was an absolute necessity to a life worthwhile; for thereby was brought to pass the broken harmonies of the world out of which would be forged the experiences that would lead to virile manhood, high character, human freedom, morality, and loyalty to righteousness; and therefore the “Fall” is not an incident to be deplored. Again: It was “the beginning of the rise of man.”

Adam fell that men might be. One item mentioned in the passages quoted from the Book of Mormon on the “Fall” has not yet been mentioned in these comments; but it is worthy of a paragraph. The item is: “And all things . . . must have remained forever, and had no end. And they would have had no children. . . . Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy” (2 Ne. 2:22–23, 25).

From this we learn that in some way, the “Fall” seems to be associated with the having of children, and also we learn that the purpose of man’s existence is that “he might have joy.” That is God’s good intent towards him. Tentatively I suggest the following as a possible solution of this phase of the “Fall.”

ⁱSee chapter 33 for a discussion of Fiske.

¹¹Fiske, *Studies in Religion*, 252, 266.

Paul in his first letter to Timothy, referring to the experience in Eden said: “Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression” (1 Tim. 2:14).

Reference to the order of the happenings in Eden verifies the truth of this statement. Eve was persuaded to eat of the forbidden fruit, ~~and undertook the persuasion of Adam to the forbidden fruit~~, and undertook the persuasion of Adam to the same act of disobedience. Eve was already in “the transgression,” and stood in the shadow of the penalty of the law—banishment from Eden, union broken with God, separation from Adam, death! Under these circumstances what shall Adam do? Conjointly they had received this mission to “replenish the earth” (Gen. 1:28)—refill it with inhabitants. If this penalty falls upon Eve alone there will be separation of the pair, and the high purpose of their conjoint mission will be defeated. Again, what shall Adam do? Shall he draw about him the consciousness of his own innocence, and let his spouse bear the burdens of her violations of the law pertaining to the knowledge of good and evil? I refrain from what my comment would be could I think the progenitor of the human race guilty of such procedure. But no! Our Prince Michael did no such thing.¹ Not deceived, but with eyes open, and knowing all the consequences he ate the forbidden fruit offered by a loving hand—one who so loved him that she would have him as “God, knowing good and evil” (2 Ne. 2:18). He resolved upon fulfilling the major part of his mission, which might not be fulfilled in separation from Eve. And hence “Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy” (2 Ne. 2:25). Despite the “Fall”? Nay, rather because of it! He has partaken of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, he has become as God that far; he shall *yet* find his way to the tree of life!

¹Adam is identified as Michael in D&C 27:11; 107:54; 128:21.

After the Fall: The First Dispensation of the Gospel

The “Fall” has become reality. The judgments have been pronounced. Adam, Eve, and Lucifer know their earth-fate. Broken union with God for both man and woman; banishment from Eden—guarded away from the tree of life. No access to it—yet. It must have been a comfort to the stricken pair to know of its existence in the midst of God’s garden—a ray of hope which would linger in blurred memories of Eden. Cherubims and gleaming sword now barred “the way to it”; but would it always be so?

Penalties: (a) Upon Adam. For Adam as a result of his special part in the changed conditions through partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge: “Cursed is the ground for ⟨your⟩ [thy] sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth ⟨un⟩to thee; . . . ⟨by⟩ [In] the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return [un]to the ground; . . . for dust thou art, and [un]to dust shalt thou return”—**physical death** (Gen. 3:17-19).

(b) Upon Eve. To the woman: “I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee” (Gen. 3:16).

Let it be remembered that these were but announced consequences of the “Fall,” resulting from the changed condition following the new order brought about by it, not vindictive cruelties invented from the anger of God. This parenthetically, now to return.

On the contents page introducing this chapter, Roberts noted: “Any of the standard dictionaries of the Bible or commentaries can be consulted sometimes with profit on these subjects, although they may not be relied upon as sustaining the views of the text of this work which is so largely influenced by the ‘new knowledge’ brought to light by the Prophet of the New Dispensation, Joseph Smith.”

(c) *Upon Lucifer*. To Lucifer (symbolized by the serpent), the Lord God said:

Because thou hast done this <thing> <his part in the drama of early days in Eden and with evil intent towards man, and malice towards God>, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it <the woman's seed> shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. (Gen. 3:14-15)

Victory shall be with the seed of the woman; for, mark you, while Lucifer shall have power to bruise his [the woman's seed] heel; he **[the woman's seed]** shall have power to bruise Lucifer's head—wound him in a vital part. ~~bruise his head!~~

The “decrees” written in the book of experience. It is worthy of remark that these decrees forecasting what should befall man, and woman are as truly written in human experience as well as in the book of Genesis. And as for Lucifer, the sign and symbol and personification of evil, and in rebellion against God—who so despised, dreaded, feared, hated, as he? Well symbolized in the serpent—cold sinuous, clammy, noiseless in approach, fascinating, cunning, strong to crush in coils, deadly to strike with fang and poison with tooth, and merciless withal! And dreaded, and repulsive above all animals living, **his symbol—the serpent**. And as the symbol is, so the spirit of incarnate evil is—Lucifer! Of which “serpent” is the fitting sign.

The veil of forgetfulness. So man went forth from Eden bowed by the weight of sorrow, to his life and toil, and death. His “vision splendid” not yet risen, and as it was later said of a more glorious “Adam,” “In his humiliation his judgment <knowledge on which judgment is based> was taken <from him> [away]” (Acts 8:33),^a so may we say of this our first Adam—and more abundantly—“in his humiliation his judgment was taken from him”—a veil of forgetfulness cast over him, shutting out most memories of the creation days on this earth, and of the former home and friends and associates of the home-world where he had come to translation development^b to prepare him for this earth

^aActs 8:33 refers to Christ, but Roberts is identifying Adam as the “first Adam,” following the terminology of 1 Cor. 15:45, where Christ is identified as the “last Adam,” thus making it possible to apply the phrase in Acts 8:33 to Adam.

^bWhat Roberts meant by this phrase is unclear.

dispensation.[†] He perhaps remembered some little of the glory and splendor of the Lord God. Some recollection of the “tree of life” in the midst of the garden—did the memory carry with it a gleam of hope? Some remembrance, too, may have survived from that half-veiled promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent’s head. Perhaps a memory of the Lord God’s kindness survived seen in the gracious act of God making and giving to Adam and his wife coats of skin to “clothe them,” better covering than the fig-leaved aprons they had made to hide their nakedness in the first confusion following their disobedience. This was the parting act at the portals of Eden when they were driven forth. They would likely remember that and cherish it. Surely it portended good will. It was an act of mercy.

Adam’s world under the Fall. But Adam had come into no mere make-believe world, where there was to be no real hardships, only mock sorrows and sins that did not hurt, and that would have no lasting effect; where punishments would be light and all would be well in the end. Surely the Lord God had not framed such a thing as this for the earth-planned life of man! Charge not such folly to the Lord omniscient, and the Lord omnipotent!

Adam and Eve and all their posterity, numerous as the stars of heaven, or as the sand upon the seashore, were to learn that earth life was to be tremendously real; and in it would be real losses. There would be sorrows heart-breaking; suffering both mental and physical; severe tests of painful endurance to the point of blood-sweat and terror; disappointments to be endured that would stretch the heart strings to the point of breaking; death universal, and cruel, and pitiless, without remorse, without respect of persons, falling upon the young as upon the aged, upon the innocent as upon the sinful; striking quite recklessly, sinking some by slow and painful decay, cutting others off with the flash of lightning or the tempest’s fierceness, or the earthquake’s horror; by slow famine, or the shock of red battle—by any and all means by which life can be snuffed out, or crushed out—and so permanently! This a world where hope pales, faith falters, love weeps! Things are so obscure, so uncertain, so apparently meaningless; the light so dim and far away, the mists so recurrent and dense—they shut out the pathway to the tree of life. Scarce need to guard it, one would think, by cherubim and flaming sword!

[†]As in response to chapter 32, the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve noted on this occasion: “The question of ‘translation’ comes in here, and is questioned as in 32.”

Such was Adam's world into which he was driven from his Eden. How long it lasted so no one knows. Long enough to teach him the lessons to be derived from the knowledge of good and evil, no doubt. He is said to have lived nine hundred and thirty years in this world of broken harmonies!^c Cain's, Lamech's, and other wickedness appeared within his own days; his life doubtless approached sufficiently near the wickedness of Noah's times for him to see that the wickedness would be so great that "every imagination of the thoughts of his ⟨man's⟩ heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5).

The two deaths. Under the "Fall" Adam was confronted by two phases of death: spiritual death and physical death. The first a broken union with God; the second the separation of the spirit from the body, and the passing of the body back to dust whence it came. Both these deaths Adam realized in experience.

(a) *The spiritual death.* The first, or the spiritual death was experienced when Adam and his wife were driven from Eden, and shut out from the presence of God, the source of his spiritual life, and fountain that fed his spirit with love of the true, and good, and the beautiful. Separated from the source of spiritual life his spirit would languish into sluggish dullness and brutality; hope all but fled, faith strained to the breaking point, desire for righteousness fading—Adam wandering further and ever further from God! Let it but continue long enough and without renewal of conscious fellowship with the source of spiritual life, and there could be no doubt but that it would end in completely placing him beyond the power to repent, or desire for forgiveness—spiritual death.

The spiritual death consists of separation from God; and, with the banishment from Eden, is thus described in a modern revelation:

It came to pass that the devil tempted Adam, and he partook of the forbidden fruit and transgressed the commandment, wherein he became subject to the will of the devil, because he yielded unto temptation. Wherefore, I, the Lord God, caused that he should be cast out from the Garden of Eden, from my presence, because of his transgression, wherein he became spiritually dead, which is the first death, even that same death which is the last death, which is spiritual, which shall be pronounced upon the wicked when I shall say: Depart, ye cursed. (D&C 29:40–41)

"The last death, which is spiritual, . . . Depart, ye cursed!" (D&C 29:41). "Then will I ⟨confess⟩ [profess] unto them, I never knew you:

^cAdam's age is stated in Genesis 5:5.

depart from me, ye that work iniquity” (Matt. 7:23). “Then shall he say also unto (those) [them] on (his) [the] left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matt. 25:41). In each case *separation from God; and in each case* spiritual death; banished into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth (cf. Matt. 13:49–50).

(b) *Physical death.* The dreadful reality and mystery of physical death came into man’s experience first through a greater calamity than death itself—through a murder. By this the first pair were shocked into a realization of the sentence passed upon them while yet in Eden, upon their posterity—upon the race—as well as upon themselves, and of this they had stern evidence in the death of their second son, Abel, murdered by his brother Cain.[†] It must have been mysterious and doubly painful, this first death. First because inflicted by a brother’s hand; second because falling upon one least deserving of it; one strong, manly, gentle withal, a keeper of sheep—righteous, for he is so alluded to in the scriptures in many places (Heb. 11:4; also 1 Jn. 3:12), and according to the story in Genesis, he and his offering were acceptable to God, while Cain and his offering were rejected. Why should thus fall upon the righteous—the innocent—this first **recorded** instance of death? But here it was, this physical death, the very palpable evidence of it, thrown into the trembling arms *of Adam and Eve*—a strange silence, and coldness!

The mystery of sacrifices. Sometime before the death of Abel, something significant happened, but one gets only slight knowledge of it in Genesis, and nothing directly. Nothing may be learned from Genesis on the origin of sacrifices, either of first fruits or animal, that is to say, blood sacrifices.¹ They are simply referred to as an established

[†]On “Abel, Adam’s second son,” the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve stated: “We question this in the light of the writings of Moses. Adam may have had many sons and daughters before Cain was born, so it appears.”

¹In tracing the history of sacrifice, from its first beginning to its perfect development in the Mosaic ritual, we are at once met by the long-disputed question, as to the *origin of sacrifice*; whether it arose from a natural instinct of man, sanctioned and guided by God, or whether it was the subject of some distinct primeval revelation. . . . The great difficulty in the theory which refers it to a distinct command of God is the total silence of Holy Scripture—a silence the more remarkable, when contrasted with the distinct reference made in Genesis 2 to the origin of the Sabbath. Sacrifice when first mentioned, in the case of Cain and Abel, is referred to as thing of course; it is said to have been brought by men; there is no hint of any command given by God. This consideration, the strength of which

thing with the first sons of Adam: “In the process of time”—“at the end of days,” is the marginal rendering of the text, as if it were at the end of some fixed period of days, that the time of sacrifice recurred, and so at the end of that recurring period—

it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought ~~sacrifice, but~~ of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. (Gen. 4:3-5)

Such the first mention of the offering of sacrifice in Genesis. What its origin or purpose, or significance we may not know from this introduction to it. Also the account is silent as to why the offering of the lamb by Abel—a blood sacrifice—was acceptable to the Lord God; and why the fruit offering by Cain was not acceptable. But while Genesis is strangely silent on this subject the fragment of the writings of Moses, brought to light by the Prophet of the New Dispensation, supplies the much needed information.

The first revelation after “the Fall”—“the morning breaks!” This revealed fragment of the writings of Moses makes it known that after the banishment from Eden,[†] Adam and Eve amidst their toil and labors in cultivating the earth and subduing the animal kingdom to their dominion, they begot both sons and daughters “and they began to multiply and replenish the earth. And from that time forth, the sons and daughters of Adam began to divide two and two in the land, and to till the land, and to tend flocks, and they also begat sons and daughters.” Then it would appear that moved by their recollections of the Lord God in Eden, both “Adam and Eve, his wife called upon the name of the Lord” (and apparently for the first time since being driven from Eden), and ~~O, Joy!~~

They heard the voice of the Lord from the way toward the Garden of Eden, speaking unto them, and they saw him not; for they were shut out from his presence. And he gave unto them commandments, that they should worship the Lord their God, and should offer the firstlings of their flocks, for an offering unto the Lord. And Adam was obedient unto the commandments of the Lord. (Moses 5:4-5)

no ingenuity has been able to impair, although it does not actually disprove the formal revelation of sacrifice, yet at least forbids the assertion of it, as of a positive and important doctrine. (Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. “Sacrifice.”)

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve noted: “There is a question as to the time the law of sacrifice was given, whether it was in or out of the Garden.”

Observe, however, in all this there is no explanation as to “why” the sacrifice should be offered; but its kind was designated. It was to be of the firstlings of the flocks—a blood sacrifice. Perhaps that was the reason why Cain’s offering was not acceptable to the Lord God. He brought that for an offering which the Lord God had not appointed. He apparently set aside that which God had appointed and substituted something of his own devising, and insulted the majesty of God therewith.^d **A fruit offering did not symbolize the sacrifice to be offered up finally by the Christ.**

Communication with God established—revelation. But what a joy for Adam, this renewal of contact with the Lord God must have been! God’s silence was broken: “From the way toward the Garden of Eden” they had heard the voice of the Lord speaking to them. He had given a commandment, no matter what. The important thing was that communication with God had been resumed. The darkness in which Adam and Eve had lived, relieved only by fragment recollections, was breaking up, the shadows were fleeing. Of course they will obey the commandment, nor even ask the reason why. Blind obedience this? Nonsense! Intelligent obedience, under the circumstances; the unquestioning obedience was but natural obedience—the obedience which sprung from their joy—joyful obedience which forgot to ask the reasons why from the haste to obey.

A dispensation of the gospel to Adam. Then

after many days an angel of the Lord appeared unto Adam, saying: Why dost thou offer sacrifices unto the Lord? And Adam said unto him: I know not, save the Lord commanded me. And then the angel

^dIn regard to the reason the Lord rejected Cain’s sacrifice, Joseph Smith taught:

By faith in this atonement or plan of redemption, Abel offered to God a sacrifice that was accepted, which was the firstlings of the flock. Cain offered of the fruit of the ground, and was not accepted, because he could not do it in faith, he could have no faith, or could not exercise faith contrary to the plan of heaven. It must be shedding the blood of the Only Begotten to atone for man; for this was the plan of redemption; and without the shedding of blood was no remission; and as the sacrifice was instituted for a type, by which man was to discern the great Sacrifice which God had prepared; to offer a sacrifice contrary to that, no faith could be exercised, because redemption was not purchased in that way, or the power of atonement instituted after that order; consequently Cain could have no faith; and whatsoever is not of faith, is sin. (*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 58)

spake, saying: This thing is a similitude of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father, which is full of grace and truth. Wherefore, thou shalt do all that thou doest in the name of the Son . . . forevermore. And in that day the Holy Ghost fell upon Adam, which beareth record of the Father and the Son, saying: I am the Only Begotten of the Father from the beginning, henceforth and forever, that as thou hast fallen thou mayest be redeemed, and all mankind, even as many as will. (Moses 5:6-9)

Rejoicing: (a) Of Adam. What a sermon of enlightenment is here! What a gospel revealed! No wonder that the record quoted goes on to say—

And in that day Adam blessed God and was filled, and began to prophesy concerning all the families of the earth, saying: Blessed be the name of God, for because of my transgression my eyes are opened, and in this life I shall have joy, and again in the flesh I shall see God. (Moses 5:10)

(b) Of Eve. And Eve, too, sent forth her paean of praise:

And Eve, his wife, heard all these things and was glad, saying: Were it not for our transgression we never should have had seed, and never should have known good and evil, and the joy of our redemption, and the eternal life which God giveth unto all the obedient. And Adam and Eve blessed the name of God, and they made all things known unto their sons and their daughters. (Moses 5:11-12)

This original pair of the earth's inhabitants in their joy were breaking into the harmonies that had prevailed in the heavens when God "laid the foundations of the earth. . . . When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy" (Job 38:4, 7), at the prospects opening before them for an earth-planned life. They would now live in hope of that "Eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began" (Titus 1:2). A dispensation of the gospel had been imparted to them, and they delivered knowledge of it unto their posterity.

The earth antiquity of the gospel. Quite contrary to the general belief of Christendom, now and of old, knowledge was had of the gospel from the earliest ages—from Adam.^c Our enlightening fragment

^cRoberts discussed the meaning and significance of the dispensations in the second year of the *Seventy's Course in Theology*, subtitled *Outline History of the Dispensations of the Gospel*. In particular, see his definition of dispensation (37-38), and his discussion that each dispensation had the gospel of Jesus Christ (100-101).

from the writings of Moses, brought to light by modern revelation, closes the fifth chapter I have been quoting with this declaration:

Thus the Gospel began to be preached, from the beginning, being declared by holy angels sent forth from the presence of God, and by his own voice, and by the gift of the Holy Ghost. And thus all things were confirmed unto Adam, by an holy ordinance, and the Gospel preached, and a decree sent forth, that it should be in the world, until the end thereof; and thus it was. (Moses 5:58-59)

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: 2 Ne. 2:14-30; Mosiah 4:4-12; Alma 11:38-46; 42; D&C 84; Moses 5-8.

Further Development of the Gospel in the Adamic Dispensation

In addition to the knowledge concerning Adam and the dealings of God with him and his posterity, learned from ~~our Mosaic fragment~~, the book of Moses, and set forth in the preceding chapter, we have still further knowledge revealed concerning him from the same source. Full knowledge was given to Adam concerning the whole plan of salvation as it had been wrought out in the council of Divine Intelligences when they contemplated the creation of the world and the mission to be given to the Christ as Redeemer, and doubtless the mission of Adam to the then desolate world; and we are told in this revelation to Adam concerning these things that the Lord said by his own voice to him:

Exposition of the gospel by direct word of God.

I am God; I made the world, and men before they were in the flesh. . . . If thou wilt turn unto me, and hearken unto my voice, and believe, and repent of all thy transgressions, and be baptized, even in water, in the name of mine Only Begotten Son, who is full of grace and truth, which is Jesus Christ, the only name which shall be given under heaven, whereby salvation shall come unto the children of men, ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, asking all things in his name, and whatsoever ye shall ask, it shall be given you. (Moses 6:51-52)

And the Lord further said unto him:

Inasmuch as thy children are conceived in sin, even so when they begin to grow up, sin conceiveth in their hearts, and they taste the bitter, that they may know to prize the good. And it is given unto them to know good from evil; wherefore they are agents unto themselves, and I have given unto you another law and commandment. Wherefore teach it unto your children, that all men, everywhere, must repent, or they can in nowise inherit the kingdom of God, for no unclean thing can dwell there, or dwell in his presence; for, in the language of Adam, Man of Holiness is his name, and the name of his

Only Begotten is the Son of Man, even Jesus Christ, a righteous Judge, who shall come in the meridian of time. . . . By reason of transgression cometh the fall, which fall bringeth death, and inasmuch as ye were born into the world by water, and blood, and the spirit, which I have made, and so became of dust a living soul, even so ye must be born again into the kingdom of heaven, of water, and of the Spirit, and be cleansed by blood, even the blood of mine Only Begotten; that ye might be sanctified from all sin, and enjoy the words of eternal life in this world, and eternal life in the world to come, even immortal glory; For by the water ye keep the commandment; by the Spirit ye are justified, and by the blood ye are sanctified; Therefore it is given to abide in you; the record of heaven; the Comforter; the peaceable things of immortal glory; the truth of all things; that which quickeneth all things, which maketh alive all things; that which knoweth all things, and hath all power according to wisdom, mercy, truth, justice, and judgment. And now, behold, I say unto you: This is the plan of salvation unto all men, through the blood of mine Only Begotten, who shall come in the meridian of time. (Moses 6:55–62)

Adam's baptism—born of the water and of the spirit.

And it came to pass, when the Lord had spoken with Adam, our father, that Adam cried unto the Lord, and he was caught away by the Spirit of the Lord, and was carried down into the water, and was laid under the water, and was brought forth out of the water. And thus he was baptized, and the Spirit of God descended upon him, and thus he was born of the Spirit, and became quickened in the inner man. And he heard a voice out of heaven, saying: Thou art baptized with fire, and with the Holy Ghost. This is the record of the Father, and the Son, from henceforth and forever; And thou art after the order of him who was without beginning of days or end of years, from all eternity to all eternity. Behold, thou art one in me, a son of God; and thus may all become my sons. (Moses 6:64–68)

Adam made an high priest. “Thou art after the order of him who was without beginning of days or end of years, . . . thou art one in me, a son of God” (Moses 6:67, 68). From other sources of knowledge, through revelation, we have reason to believe that these words carry with them peculiar significance; namely, that Adam was made an high priest of God, after the order of the Son of God. This was the same order of priesthood as that which later was held by Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18–20), of whom Paul said that he was king of righteousness, also king of peace; that he was “made like unto the Son of God; and abideth a priest continually” (Heb. 7:2–3).^a

^aFurther scriptural discussion about Melchizedek and the priesthood can be found in Alma 13 and JST Gen. 14:25–40.

Priesthood: God's authority given to man. Priesthood it may **be** well to remark here, is that power which God gives to men by which they become representatives of, or agents of, God; by reason of which they are authorized to act for God, that is to say, in his stead, in delivering the word of God unto men, preaching righteousness, and conveying to men from time to time such messages as God may have to send into the world. Also to administer in the ordinances pertaining to the salvation of men. ~~The degree of~~ This priesthood conferred upon Adam is after the order of that priesthood which the Son of God held.

Thus early in the Adamic dispensation ~~this~~ **the** priesthood after the order of the Son of God was conferred upon men, and was designed to be perpetuated among them that there might always be priests of the Most High God to minister in things pertaining to God, even as described by Paul:

For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. . . . And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God. (Heb. 5:1, 4)

Even as Adam, Noah, Melchizedek, Abraham, and **as** many others were called.

"This priesthood," we are assured by the Prophet of the New Dispensation,

was first given to Adam; he obtained the First Presidency, and held the keys of it from generation to generation. He obtained it in the Creation. . . . He had dominion given him over every living creature. He is Michael the Archangel, spoken of in the Scriptures. . . . The Priesthood is an everlasting principle, and existed with God from eternity, and will to eternity, without beginning of days or end of years.¹ The keys have to be brought from heaven whenever the Gospel is sent (i.e., to the earth).²

The last days of Adam's life. The closing scene with reference to the ministry of Adam upon the earth **is** described in the following revelation to the Prophet of the New Dispensation:

Three years previous to the death of Adam, he called Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, and Methuselah, who were all high priests, with the residue of his posterity who were righteous, into

¹This supplies the material for an explanation of Paul's somewhat mysterious saying when speaking of Melchizedek, he says: "Without Father, without Mother, without descent, [having] neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually" (Heb. 7:3). But it was the priesthood which Melchizedek held that was without father or mother, without beginning of days or end of life, not the man Melchizedek.

²Smith, *History of the Church* 3:385-86.

the valley of Adam-ondi-Ahman, and there bestowed upon them his last blessing.

And the Lord appeared unto them, and they rose up and blessed Adam, and called him Michael, the prince, the archangel. And the Lord administered comfort unto Adam, and said unto him: I have set thee to be at the head; a multitude of nations shall come of thee, and thou art a prince over them forever.

And Adam stood up in the midst of the congregation; and, notwithstanding he was bowed down with age, being full of the Holy Ghost, predicted whatsoever should befall his posterity unto the latest generation. These things were all written in the book of Enoch,³ and are to be testified of in due time. (D&C 107:53–57)

Cain and his descendants. Running parallel with these events, which make up the development of the dispensation of the gospel given to Adam, is the continued opposition to the way of righteousness, set up and perpetuated by Cain and his coadjutors. Cain's wickedness did not end with the murder of his brother Abel. By direct decree of God he was cursed as to the earth which had opened her mouth to receive his brother's blood from his hand. The earth would no more yield her strength to his tillage—a fugitive and a vagabond should he become. He complained that under this decree his punishment was greater than he could bear; also he feared that every one that should find him would slay him. Whereupon God set a mark upon him (~~doubtless the mark of a black skin~~) and decreed that whosoever should slay Cain, vengeance should be taken upon him sevenfold (Gen. 4:9–15). He naturally would withdraw himself from the more righteous of the descendants of Adam, and Genesis recounts his living eastward from Eden, where he founded a city which he named for a son born to him—Enoch. And here the Genesis account of Cain ends, save that a descendant of Cain's—Lamech—fifth in the direct line of descent, also became a murderer, killing most likely two men, for in his confession to his wives he said: "I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold" (Gen. 4:23–24).

³Jude makes reference also to this book of Enoch wherein he says after speaking of certain vicious characters and what would befall them:

And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him (Jude 1:14–15)

[Jude 1:14–15 is quoting from 1 Enoch 1:9.]

While the account of Cain in Genesis is brief, the historian Josephus, doubtless following Hebrew tradition, gives a very much fuller account of his life and of the character of the people who followed him.

Josephus on the people of Cain.

When Cain had travelled over many countries, he with his wife, built a city named Nod, which is a place so called, and there he settled his abode; where also he had children. However, he did not accept of his punishment in order to ammendment, but to increase his wickedness; for he only aimed to procure every thing that was for his own bodily pleasure, though it obliged him to be injurious to his neighbors. He augmented his household substance with much wealth, by rapine and violence; he excited his acquaintance to procure pleasure and spoils by robbery, and became a great leader of men into wicked courses. . . . He changed the world into cunning craftiness. . . . Even while Adam was alive, it came to pass, that the posterity of Cain became exceeding wicked, every one successively dying, one after another, more wicked than the former. They were intolerable in war, and vehement in robberies: and if any one were slow to murder people, yet was he bold in his profligate behavior, in acting unjustly, and doing injuries for gain.⁴

Cain and his relationship to Lucifer: All this is in harmony with the further knowledge we have of Cain in the Mosaic fragment familiar to us now as the book of Moses. Here Cain is represented as loving “Satan more than God,” and this even before the murder of his brother. Could it be that Satan had suggested the offering of a sacrifice that God had not appointed, the offering of “first fruits of the ground,” rather than the “firstlings of his flock”? A fruit offering rather than a “blood offering”—such as would symbolize the offering to be made by the Son of God, who is called “the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (Rev. 13:8)? Nothing could be more insulting to the majesty of God than this,[†] and nothing could be more gratifying to Lucifer than through Cain to offer such an insult to God—it would be mockery to his liking! A similar passage occurs in the Genesis account of the conversation between God and Cain in the matter of Cain’s rejected sacrifice:

And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?

⁴Josephus, “Antiquities of the Jews,” bk. 1, ch. 2, p. 27.

[†]On “Cain’s sacrifice, not what the Lord appointed [and] also the statement in regard to Cain’s offering, because he offered fruits,” the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve suggested a different explanation: “It was not because he offered fruits, but because he hearkened unto Satan rather than unto God (Moses 5:18-23).” Roberts wrote a question mark beside this suggestion.

and if thou doest not well, sin **⟨Satan⟩** lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him. (Gen. 4:6-7)

This passage has given the commentators much trouble, and many and various explanations have been suggested for it. Light from the Mosaic ~~fragment~~, the book of Moses, however, makes complete understanding clear. The conversation on the matter of the rejected sacrifice is enlarged to read:

And if thou doest not well, sin **⟨Sin⟩** lieth at the door, and Satan desireth to have thee; and except thou shalt hearken unto my commandments, I will deliver thee up, and it shall be unto thee according to his desire. And thou shalt rule over him; For from this time forth thou shalt be the father of his lies; thou shalt be called Perdition; for thou wast also before the world. And it shall be said in time to come—That these abominations were had from Cain; for he rejected the greater counsel which was had from God; and this is a cursing which I will put upon thee, except thou repent. And Cain was wroth, and listened not any more to the voice of the Lord, neither to Abel, his brother, who walked in holiness before the Lord. And Adam and his wife mourned before the Lord, because of Cain and his brethren. (Moses 5:23-27)

Something like this could well be supported from the text in Genesis: “And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him” (Gen. 4:7).

If “Sin” be regarded as one of the many names of Satan, then the reading becomes simple. Then it would stand: If thou doest not well Sin (Satan) lieth (or standeth) at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire (he will hope to possess thee); and then—strangely enough—“Thou **⟨Cain⟩** shalt rule over him **⟨Satan⟩**.” Cain shall rule over Satan!

League and covenant between Cain and Lucifer: Turning again to ~~our Mosaic fragment~~ **the book of Moses**, the account is given of the league and covenant of evil between Cain and Lucifer:

And Satan said unto Cain: Swear unto me by thy throat, and if thou tell it thou shalt die; and swear they brethren by their heads, and by the living God, that they tell it not; for if they tell it, they shall surely die; and this that thy father may not know it; and this day I will deliver thy brother Abel into thine hands. And Satan sware unto Cain that he would do according to his commands. And all these things were done in secret. And Cain said: Truly I am Mahan, the master of this great secret, that I may murder and get gain. Wherefore Cain was called Master Mahan, and he gloried in his wickedness. (Moses 5:29-31)

All this is in character with both Lucifer and Cain, and especially in keeping with that account of Cain and his following given by both the Bible and Josephus, and in harmony with the development of that wickedness in the antediluvian world which finally justified its destruction.

Of Cain and his place in the scheme of things we shall have occasion to speak in a future chapter. What is said here is merely to show how was launched that stream of evil in the world which ran counter to the plan of righteousness inaugurated by the introduction of the Way through the dispensation of the gospel given to Adam, the progenitor of the race.

Taking this chapter with the two immediately preceding it, chapter thirty-three on: “The Problem of Evil”; and chapter thirty-four, on “The Affair in Eden—The Fall of Man”; and now *the preceding chapter and* this on events “After the Fall,” and the first dispensation of the gospel as it was revealed to Adam—all this covers the transition period from men as spirits existing before the beginning of earth life, and the launching of the race into earth life as the progeny of Adam and Eve. We may now consider the gospel—the Way—at the commencement of its earth career.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: D&C 84; 107; and Moses 4–6.

The Gospel in the Patriarchal and Prophetic Ages

The line of righteous patriarchs. This dispensation of the gospel opening with the experiences and revelations imparted to Adam, and the events proceeding from such introduction, was continued through a line of ten patriarchs down to and including Noah in whose days came the flood. These patriarchs were in their order: Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah. Lamech the father of Noah, according to the Ussher *Bible* chronology, was fifty-six years of age when Adam died at nine hundred and thirty years of age. So that nine of these patriarchs were all living in the earth together. And according to the book of Moses, "They were preachers of righteousness, and spake and prophesied, and called upon all men, everywhere, to repent; and faith was taught unto the children of men" (Moses 6:23). Also in tracing this genealogy in the book of Moses, it is run through from Enoch back to Adam, "who was the son of God, with whom God, himself, conversed" (Moses 6:22).

Dispensation of Enoch. In tracing the dispensations after Adam, we will begin with the patriarch Enoch, since Adam's life overlapped into the life of Enoch, Adam's dispensation would be joined to that of Enoch's. Enoch is represented in the Mosaic fragment of revelation (book of Moses) as both a prophet and a seer; for "he beheld the spirits that God had created; and he beheld also things which were not visible to the natural eye; and from thenceforth came the saying abroad in the land: A seer hath the Lord raised up unto his people" (Moses 6:36). In the course of his preaching, Enoch recapitulates much that had been revealed unto Adam, also his vision extended into the future, even forward to the time when the purposes of God would culminate in the salvation of men and the complete redemption of the earth. The writer of the book of Jude bears witness to some of this, for in describing some of evil mind who would follow in the way of Cain,

become as “wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever,” he says: “Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds” (Jude 1:13–15). All of which has reference to the glorious coming of the Lord Jesus in the clouds of heaven and in great glory in the commencement of that righteous reign on earth that is testified of in the scriptures as “the Millennium”—the thousand-year reign of righteousness.

Enoch and his city “Zion.” Enoch made a special gathering together of the people whom he converted ~~of~~ **to** his doctrines and established them in a city, and they were called “the people of Zion, because they were of one heart and one mind, and dwelt in righteousness; and there ~~⟨were⟩~~ [was] no poor among them,” also this city was called “the City of Holiness, even Zion” (cf. Moses 7:18–19). “And lo, Zion, in process of time, was taken up into heaven” (that is to say, it was translated), together with the inhabitants thereof, including Enoch (Moses 7:21). These translated persons, as we have before seen, were preserved for special work **and missions**, which the Lord had in mind.

The dispensation of Noah. Noah was the next prominent member of this patriarchal group. In his day came the flood, which cataclysm emptied the earth of its inhabitants, only Noah and his family being preserved to perpetuate inhabitants in the earth under the commandment of God. This commandment was given to him as it had previously been given to Adam—“multiply and replenish the earth” (Gen. 9:1), so that Noah may be regarded as a “second Adam,” from whom a new “beginning” of things started. It should be remembered that with Noah in the postdiluvian world, all the traditions received from Adam and succeeding patriarchs, and a knowledge of all the dispensations of the gospel were retained and taught to the new generations of men following the flood.

Cause of the flood. Much speculation has been indulged **in** with reference to the cause of the flood, which resulted in the destruction of the antique world, excepting Noah and his family. It is represented in Genesis (authorized version), that it was occasioned by the utter wickedness of man in the earth, and “every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually”; and so great was this wickedness and so universal, that “it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart” (Gen. 6:5–6).

This would lead one to believe that the great wickedness in Noah's period had quite surprised God, and was not present to his foreknowledge of things. It is certainly unthinkable that God would repent of having made man; *as surely nothing had happened up to this time that God had not foreseen*. The rendering of the text in the book of Moses is, "And it repented Noah, and his heart was pained that the Lord had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at \langle his \rangle [the] heart" (Moses 8:25). This rendering is certainly more in conformity with reason than the rendering of the authorized version.

The "sons of God" and the "daughters of men." It is also written in Genesis "That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh" (Gen. 6:2-3). That is to say, perishable; and so he shortened the years of man's life, evidently to curtail wickedness. "Also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bear children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown" (Gen. 6:4). Then follows the declaration of the races' universal wickedness, Noah's regret that God had made man, and the decree of God is entered for their destruction.

These paragraphs, Genesis 6:1-7, have perplexed the commentators and a number of solutions for the difficulties they present have been discussed,^a among them that we have here a trace of the stories of unions between deities and the women of earth which resulted in gigantic, monstrous, and cursed races. Others have suggested that the "sons of God" were evidently the angels, and that they had *carnal* union with the women of earth. None of these suggested explanations, however, is the truth. Running parallel with the descendants of Adam—through Seth—in the earth, was also the race of Cain, and they were known as the "sons of men," in contradistinction to the descendants of Adam, and the succeeding patriarchs of that line, who were called "the sons of God."^b The descendants of Adam were forbidden to intermarry

^aRoberts offers a more complete discussion and documentation of this issue in *Seventy's Course in Theology* 4:79-80. The articles "Noah" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* and Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, review the various interpretations of the "sons of men" and the "daughters of men." For a discussion of this issue, see page 659 below.

^bThe identification of the "sons of God" with the descendants of Seth and the "daughters of men" as the descendants of Cain is found in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* in the article entitled "Noah" as well as in the *Commentary* by Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown, 21. See the introductory material.

with the descendants of Cain, the “sons of men”; and the violation of this commandment by which a mongrel race^c was being produced by the intermarriage of descendants of Cain and the “sons of God,” was part of the wickedness which prepared the antediluvian world for its destruction.

Earth life: A sphere of rewards for conduct in previous states of existence. Reference to our chapter dealing with the “War in Heaven” (chapter 29) will recall the fact that Lucifer in that controversy drew away with him one-third of the hosts of heaven, and that they with him became the “fallen angels,” and by their rebellion forfeited their right of participation in the earth-planned life of man. They kept not their first estate—their spirit life estate (see Abr. 3:26–28). And of those who remained and were not cast out, there were doubtless among them a great variety of degrees as to greatness of soul, nobility of character and moral value. God himself showed unto Abraham such distinctions among the intelligences that were to inhabit the earth.

The Lord had shown unto me, Abraham, the intelligences that were organized before the world was; and among all these there were many of the noble and great ones; And God saw these souls that they were good, and he stood in the midst of them, and he said: These I will make my rulers. (Abr. 3:22–23)

If there were such outstanding intelligences as these among those destined for habitancy of the earth, then by plain implication there were many who possessed the qualities of greatness, nobility, and of goodness in less varying degrees than these whom God declared he would make his “rulers.” And doubtless this all but infinite variety of intelligence, greatness and goodness would lead to a corresponding variety in faith and action in the “war in heaven,” calling again for corresponding variety ***of capacity for service, as also*** of rights and opportunities granted in earth life as rewards for ~~capacity, faith, action,~~ and demonstrated loyalty in the spirit life. Hence the endless variety of opportunity and apparent privileges granted to some races, tribes,

^cRoberts may have taken the term “mongrel race” from a passage he cited in *Seventy's Course in Theology* 1:166, from the book *The Color Line: A Brief in Behalf of the Unborn*, in which the author argues against social relations between blacks and whites because such relations would eventually lead to intermarriage and what the author called the “mongrelization of the Southern people.” William Benjamin Smith, *The Color Line: A Brief in Behalf of the Unborn* (New York: McClure, Phillips, 1905), 12. See pages 658–60 for further discussion.

families and individuals in [the] earth process of events and changes making up the earth life of man.

The limitations of certain races. One of these distinctions in the earth life of man is to be observed in this marked difference between Cain and his descendants and the descendants of Adam through Seth, and the distinguished line of patriarchs to Noah: the “sons of men,” and the “sons of God.” The distinction rests primarily upon the difference in the intrinsic nature ~~or soul value~~ of the ***eternal, uncreated*** intelligences themselves, who were begotten ~~men~~ ***spirits***; and ***then*** what their faith and actions were ***as spirits*** in the preexistent spirit life. Evidently there were some who so demonstrated their worthiness in that ***life—pre-earth life—in*** greatness, nobility, and goodness, that God could entrust them with his power to act for him as his representatives and agents; and in this special way and sense become ~~his~~ ***“sons of God”*** by holding appointed power from him—his priesthood, which is God’s authority in man.

And now among the hosts of the spirit world destined for earth ***life*** ~~the world~~ were ~~doubtless~~ many who would be unworthy of the distinction of holding this power from God—“the priesthood”—and yet had not so far transgressed as to have forfeited all right to an earth life, albeit under limitations, one of which might well be the right to hold power from God, to represent God and act in his name. These, the less “noble,” and “great” and “good,” whom God would not, and could not, in justice, make his rulers, hence their limitations in this respect in the earth life.^d

The progenitor of the less noble. Yet they are worthy, under such limitations as God’s justice may provide, to participate in earth life. Through what lineage shall they come? Obviously through those worthy only to be the progenitors of such classes as these less noble ones: Hence Cain, Lamech, Ham—this the line of progenitors whose progeny are worthy only to be called “the sons of men”; while those whom God has decreed he would make his “rulers” come of a line of progenitors, worthy only to be accounted in a special sense the “sons of God.” Hence Cain, jealous, evil-minded, covetous, murderous, loving Satan more than God—perhaps closely and dangerously allied with Lucifer in that “War in Heaven”—became the earth progenitor of those least

^dRoberts’s explanation of the denial of priesthood to Cain’s seed as a result of unworthiness in the preexistence was a common explanation among Latter-day Saints before the revelation in Official Declaration—2.

noble and valiant spirits who were permitted to come to earth, but under very serious and painful limitations, denial of right to the priesthood being among them; they are to be known merely as the sons of men.¹

It was doubtless to check this mingling of races between the descendants of Cain—the “sons of men,” and the race descending from the line of Seth to Noah—men of racial and character fitness to receive the priesthood—having right in this special way to be “sons of God,” that the flood was sent to cut off a growing mongrel race, unsuited to the purpose of God.

The descendants of Cain preserved through the flood. It will be of interest to note in what way provision was made to carry someone through the flood by whom fit ancestry could be provided for the less noble spirits of the spirit world. This was through Ham, the least noble of the sons of Noah. And now, after the flood, the numerical adjustment was so made that there would never be likelihood of the descendants of a forbidden race menacing the existence of the race competent to perpetuate those among them who could become, in the special way pointed out, the “sons of God.”

Of the low character of Ham we have the evidence in the unfortunate circumstance of his father Noah’s drunkenness after the flood, and Ham’s exposure of both his father’s weakness and his shamefulness to his brother’s nakedness,^c but which the nobler sons of Noah, Shem and Japheth, covered *and* with becoming delicacy. And when the patriarch of the two worlds—antediluvian and postdiluvian—awoke from his drunken sleep, and learned what shame his youngest son had put upon him, he cursed the posterity of Ham through Ham’s son, declaring an inferiority for him, saying: “Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he *said*, Blessed *be* the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant” (Gen. 9:25–27).

¹For these distinctions see and cf. D&C 76:50–60, where those who receive the priesthood “after the order of the son of God” (the Melchizedek Priesthood), are declared to be “the sons of God”; Moses 6:67–68, account of Adam’s becoming a son of God (cf. D&C 84:6, 7, 17; 107:39–53); Adam referred to with other patriarch’s as “high priests.” Also Moses 8:13–15, where Noah and his sons are called “the sons of God,” and the daughters of these “sons of God” are reproved for having sold themselves to “the sons of men.” See also Moses 5:51–53, where descendants of Cain through Lamech are “the sons of men” and cursed of God—*i.e.*, *deservedly limited in opportunities granted to others*. See also Abraham 3.

^cGenesis 9 discusses Noah’s nakedness, not Ham’s brothers’ nakedness.

In addition to his low character exhibited in the shameful exposure of his father's plight during his intemperance, Ham had also married into the forbidden race of Cain. The name of his wife was "Egyptus," which interpreted means "forbidden" (see Abr. 1:23), evidence of the race whence she came—the forbidden race of Cain. And thus was the race of Cain perpetuated in the earth after the flood. The descendants of Ham were settled in Egypt by his daughter, also named "Egyptus" after her mother; and who named the land in which she settled her sons *in* Egypt, either in honor of herself or of her mother. "And thus," says the authority I am following, "from Ham, sprang that race which preserved the curse in the land" (Abr. 1:24).

Our authority, however, speaks well of the *eldest* son of Egyptus, daughter of Ham, who founded the first government in the land. This *government was* patriarchal in form and character, "imitating" the order of the patriarchal forms of his forefathers, including Noah; who, we are informed, "blessed him with the blessings of the earth, and with the blessings of wisdom, but cursed him as pertaining to the Priesthood" (Abr. 1:26).

Enoch, the patriarch seventh from Adam, and preeminently a seer, in the pre-vision God gave him of things to happen in generations future from his time, throws much light upon what would be the status of this Canaanitish race in the world.

The Lord said to this seer, "Look, and I will show unto thee the world for the space of many generations" (Moses 7:4). And among the things fore-visited to him were the movements and some of the wars waged by the Canaanites:

And the people of Canaan shall divide themselves in the land, and the land shall be barren and unfruitful, and none other people shall dwell there but the people of Canaan; For behold, the Lord shall curse the land with much heat, and the barrenness thereof shall go forth forever; and there was a blackness came upon all the children of Canaan, that they were despised among all people. (Moses 7:7-8)²

And here we may leave that "forbidden race"—forbidden to intermarry with those races whence may arise those who are not cursed by denial of the priesthood to them, but from whose midst may arise those who in a special way, may become the sons of God through receiving the priesthood—the power of God—by which they may be accounted sons of, or multiples of, God.

²The land occupied by descendants of Cain was northern Africa, and the barren land referred to as cursed with excessive heat was, doubtless, the desert of Sahara.

Other limitations. Among other limitations to the descendants of Ham, and to some other races might be named the tardy appearance of civilized enlightenment and knowledge of truth among them, because of their incapacity for, and their unworthiness of these things; and so they live their earth lives under necessary and deserved limitations. And yet this present earth life will and does hold high values for them, in that it affords them the necessary union of spirit and element essential to such “joy” as they may be capable of; and they shall be heirs, too, of salvation; for it is made known in our modern revelations that the inhabitants of the higher kingdoms of glory shall minister to the kingdoms of lower degrees of glory; and speaking of the angels who in the hereafter shall minister to those of “the telestial glory”—the very lowest of the kingdom—whose inhabitants come not forth until “the last resurrection”—even these shall be “heirs of salvation” (D&C 76:88). And of the heathen nations—“they that knew no law,” it is written: “The heathen nations shall be redeemed, and they that knew no law shall have part in the first resurrection; and it shall be tolerable for them” (cf. D&C 45:54).

The Postdiluvian Dispensations

Melchizedek, priest of the Most High God. Noah after the flood lived three hundred and fifty years, being nine hundred and fifty years old when he died (Gen. 9:28-29).

Standing out in bold relief among the patriarchs of the postdiluvian period is Melchizedek, described in Genesis as the King of Salem, who met Abraham after his conquest of several of the petty kings in the land of Canaan. This Melchizedek was “priest of the most high God,” and he brought forth bread and wine and administered it to Abraham saying: “Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: And blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand” (Gen. 14:19-20).^a And Abraham gave Melchizedek tithes of all (that is, one-tenth of the spoils taken from the kings he had conquered).

Paul in the book of Hebrews makes reference to this high priest of the early postdiluvian age as being a priest-type after the order of the Son of God, saying, “Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he ⟨God⟩ [that] said unto him, Thou art my Son, ⟨this⟩ [to] day have I begotten thee. . . . Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec . . . called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec” (Heb. 5:5, 6, 10). It must ever be that the Christ, being the Word that was in the beginning with God, and that was God, and afterwards “was made flesh” and dwelt among men (cf. John 1:1-14), must have precedence over Melchizedek; and the question then arises, how comes it that the Christ is spoken of as being a “priest forever after the order of Melchisedec?” The mystery disappears when we come to the knowledge that it is Melchizedek who is a high priest after the order of the Son of God, rather than the Son of God an high priest after

^aRoberts introduced the word “administered.” The King James Version simply reads, “brought forth bread and wine.” The Joseph Smith Translation, however, adds, “he brake bread and blest it; and he blest the wine.”

the order of Melchizedek; and this is learned from a revelation to the Prophet of the New Dispensation in the following language:

There are, in the church, two priesthoods, namely, the Melchizedek and Aaronic. . . . Why the first is called the Melchizedek Priesthood is because Melchizedek was such a great high priest. Before his day it was called the Holy Priesthood, after the Order of the Son of God. But out of respect or reverence to the name of the Supreme Being, to avoid the too frequent repetition of his name, they, the church in ancient days, called that priesthood after Melchizedek, or the Melchizedek Priesthood. (D&C 107:1-4)

This changing of the name of the priesthood, however, from “the Holy Priesthood after the Order of the Son of God” (who was to come in the meridian of time) to the “Melchizedek Priesthood,” did not change the nature of the priesthood itself, and it was still after the change of the name “the Holy Priesthood after the Order of the Son of God”; and the Son of God, of course, takes precedence over Melchizedek, and it is Melchizedek that derives his priesthood from the Son of God, rather than the Son of God deriving ought from Melchizedek. Melchizedek was merely a prototype of that high priest, that was to be developed in the Christ, the Son of God, when he should appear in the earth in the meridian of time.

Much speculation has been indulged in regard to ~~who~~ Melchizedek *who* was *he*. Little doubt can exist, however, but that he was Shem, the son of Noah,¹ and therefore in the direct line of both the postdiluvian patriarch Noah, and through him in the line of antediluvian patriarchs back to Adam. It is most appropriate, therefore, that Abraham who was to become the great head of the Hebrew race should receive blessing from him, and take his place in the line of the patriarchs from Adam to his own day, and then pass on that same connection through his descendants Isaac and Jacob, whence sprang the Hebrew race and nation, destined to become God’s witness, par excellence in the earth.

“The call” of Abraham. This connection established between the patriarch Shem (Melchizedek) and Abraham, the head of the Hebrew race, introduces the Abrahamic dispensation of things in the earth, for in addition to this connection with the patriarch Shem, God also directly revealed himself to Abraham and called him to the special work unto which he had been appointed, even in the spirit world before his earth life began (cf. Abr. 3:22-23). The genealogy of Abraham, and some of his history, is given in the eleventh chapter of Genesis,

¹See note in text at close of this chapter.

and from it we learn that he originally dwelt in the land of Ur of the Chaldees and here the Lord spake unto Abraham commanding him to leave that country and his kindred and go into a land that the Lord had appointed unto him—the land of Canaan, “and I will make of thee a great nation,” said the Lord; “and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed” (Gen. 12:2–3). This is generally referred to in theological writings as the “call of Abraham.” A famine diverted him from immediately possessing Canaan and hence came Abraham’s sojourn in Egypt from which he afterwards returned and settled in Canaan where came his contact with Shem (Melchizedek). God’s reason for calling Abraham is thus given: “I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him” (Gen. 18:19). That is, make of him the head of a people and nation and that all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him and in his seed. Also the patriarch received the further compliment of being called the “friend” of God (2 Chr. 20:7), and “I ⟨God⟩ have chosen ⟨Jacob⟩, the seed of Abraham my friend” (Isa. 41:8).

“The gospel” preached to Abraham. We learn from another scripture that a dispensation of the gospel was given to Abraham.^b This is the passage: “The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed” (Gal. 3:8). Let it be remembered that there is but one gospel, but one plan for man’s salvation, one covenant which God made of eternal life, and though an angel should preach any other than this one gospel he is under apostolic anathema (Gal. 1:6–9; Titus 1:2). Paul himself asks the question, “wherefore then serveth the law?” (Gal. 3:19)—having reference to the law of Moses, given, of course, subsequently to this gospel, which had been preached unto Abraham, and which was “the law of [a] carnal commandment(s)” (Heb. 7:16; 9:10), under which Israel lived, and of which we shall say something more later. But the question again: “wherefore then serveth the law,” if the gospel was preached to Abraham? The answer of Paul to that question is,

It was added because of transgressions, till the seed ⟨the Christ⟩ should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels

^bOn dispensationalism, see pages 657–58 below.

in the hand(s) of a mediator. Wherefore the law (again referring to the law of Moses) was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. (Gal. 3:19, 24-26)

Which simply means that the gospel was preached unto Abraham, but later, when his posterity had developed into a people who proved themselves unfaithful and inadequate to live in harmony with the gospel as it had been revealed to Abraham, (and later to Moses), because of transgression, an inferior law, called in the scriptures “the law of carnal commandments,” a law of symbols and ceremonies for their training, was given to them in place of the gospel of faith and grace and the higher spiritual life and union with God. But the gospel as known from of old was given to Abraham *and also to Moses* before the law, known as the law of Moses, was given.

Mosaic dispensation. This course of events brings us now to Moses, the next great prophet following after the patriarchal period which seems to have closed with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob; and Joseph, son of Jacob. And we now enter the prophetic period in the development of God’s purpose in the earth.

To Moses and to Israel under Moses the gospel was first presented before a coming in of the law of Moses.[†] This is evident from the scriptures. It is written by Paul:

Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ. (1 Cor. 10:1-4)

It is written, and here let me say, in quoting this passage from Hebrews, I take no note of the fact, except for this remark, that the passage is made up of the closing verses of chapter three and the opening verses of chapter four. It must be remembered that the inspired writers of the scriptures are not responsible for these divisions of their writings into chapters or verses, and sometimes passages of scripture that relate to one thing and ought not to be divided by so much as a period, are

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve cautioned regarding chapter 39, page 7: “The law of Moses not an eternal law. In the chapter it is so stated with other law.” Roberts commented: **not in ch. 39.** In fact, the relevant material was on this page of chapter 38.

nevertheless sometimes torn apart by being placed in separate chapters. The passage I am about to quote is an instance of this kind. Paul speaking of Israel, part of whom provoked God by their transgressions, as they were led out of Egypt by Moses, says:

But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: (ancient Israel under Moses mentioned above), but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. (Heb. 3:17-19; 4:1-2)

And so the gospel was preached not only to Abraham, but also to Israel under Moses, before the law was given; but not being equal to living in harmony with its excellence, and because of their transgression, God gave them the law of carnal commandments. The fact that the gospel was first offered to Israel through Moses established by the above scriptures, makes clear also the knowledge that Moses evidently had knowledge of the Christ to come in the future, for it is written of him,

By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward. (Heb. 11:24-26)

The priesthood under the Mosaic dispensation. Again the fragment, which we call the book of Moses revealed to Joseph Smith, contains the evidence that the gospel was made known unto Moses from the council in heaven to the full development of the gospel as it had been revealed unto Adam after the "Fall," and to Enoch, and also to Noah. Also Moses organized the priesthood after the order of the Son of God, the same that is known as the Melchizedek priesthood or priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. And in our modern revelation to the Prophet of the New Dispensation it is made known that Moses received this priesthood under the hands of his father-in-law Jethro, the priest of Midian (Ex. 3:1),^c who received this priesthood through a line of men reaching back to Abraham, and thence to Melchizedek who conferred that priesthood upon Abraham, and thence

^cExodus 3:1 identifies Jethro as Moses's father-in-law and priest of Midian. The lineage of Moses' priesthood is found in D&C 84:6-18.

back to Noah, and from Noah **back** to Adam, through the line of the ten patriarchs to Adam, who is the first man. “Which priesthood,” says this revelation, “continueth in the Church of God in all generations, and is without beginning of days or end of years” (cf. D&C 84:6–17). In this revelation also is mentioned the fact that “the Lord confirmed a priesthood upon Aaron and his seed, throughout all their generations” (D&C 84:18). Why it is called the lesser priesthood, is because it is an appendage to the greater, or the Melchizedek priesthood and has power in administering **chiefly** outward ordinances. This “priesthood also continueth and abideth forever with the priesthood which is after the holiest order of God” (D&C 84:18)—i.e., after the order of the Son of God.

Referring again to this higher order of priesthood, the Melchizedek—the revelation continues:

And this greater priesthood administereth the gospel and holdeth the key of [the] mysteries of the kingdom, even the key of the knowledge of God. Therefore, in the ordinances thereof, the power of godliness is manifest. And without the ordinances thereof, and the authority of the priesthood, the power of godliness is not manifest unto men in the flesh; For without this no man can see the face of God, even the Father, and live. Now this Moses plainly taught to the children of Israel in the wilderness, and sought diligently to sanctify his people that they might behold the face of God; But they hardened their hearts and could not endure his presence; therefore, the Lord in his wrath, for his anger was kindled against them, swore that they should not enter into his rest while in the wilderness, which rest is the fulness of his glory. Therefore, he took Moses out of their midst, and the Holy Priesthood also (i.e., the priesthood after the order of the Son of God); And the lesser priesthood (i.e., which he had conferred upon Aaron) continued, which priesthood holdeth the key of the ministering of angels and the preparatory gospel; Which gospel is the gospel of repentance and of baptism, and the remission of sins, and the law of carnal commandments, which the Lord in his wrath caused to continue with the house of Aaron among the children of Israel until John (i.e., the Baptist), whom God raised up, being filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother’s womb. For he was baptized while he was yet in his childhood, and was ordained by the angel of God at the time he was eight days old unto this power, to overthrow the kingdom of the Jews, and to make straight the way of the Lord before the face of his people, to prepare them for the coming of the Lord, in whose hand is given all power. (D&C 84:19–28)

Visions of God under Moses. Notwithstanding what is written above about the failure of Moses to bring his people into full and sustained contact with God because of the hardening of their hearts,

which made it impossible for them to endure the presence of the Lord, and that ~~which~~ ultimately resulted in the Lord taking Moses and *the* higher priesthood as an organization out of their midst, still there are some bright spots during that time when Moses was seeking to induce his people to live in harmony with the higher law of the gospel, and he was able to bring some part of his people into visible and actual communion with God. As for instance—we read in Exodus:

And he (the Lord) said unto Moses, Come up unto the Lord, thou, and Aaron, (and) Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and worship ye afar off. And Moses alone shall come near the Lord: but they shall not come nigh; neither shall the people go up with him. (Ex. 24:1-2)

This commandment Moses delivered to assembled Israel, and

then went up Moses, [and] Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the Elders of Israel: and they saw the God of Israel: and *there* was under his feet as it were a paved work of *a* sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand: also they saw God, and did eat and drink. (Ex. 24:9-11)

Above in this chapter it has been set forth that without holding the Melchizedek priesthood, the priesthood after the order of the Son of God, man may not see the face of God and live. But since this number of men out of Israel could be brought into the presence of the Lord and eat and drink in his presence (was it a sacramental eating and drinking on that occasion?) it is evident that they must have held the priesthood after the order of the Son of God, ~~after the order of Melchizedek~~, and to that extent, at least, that Moses succeeded in bringing his people into that intimate relationship which he would have brought all Israel into, had it not been for the hardening of their hearts; but because of “transgression,” the gospel which had been preached to Abraham, and which was given to Moses to introduce to Israel, but which they were unworthy of and unable to live, therefore this holy priesthood ~~after the order of Melchizedek~~, was taken from them as an organization, and also Moses, who held the keys of it. And Israel was left with the lesser priesthood, and the law of carnal commandments to be their schoolmaster to prepare them finally for the coming of that great high priest himself, from whom all others in the world, in ancient times, in meridian times, and in the last days shall derive whatsoever of priesthood they may hold.

Taking away Moses and the Melchizedek priesthood, and leaving for the purpose named the lesser priesthood, left Israel also with only

the lesser law. Later the gospel dispensation, graced by the presence of the Christ, the great high priest, who offered himself as a sacrifice for the redemption of the world, was ushered in—then the higher priesthood again assumed the direction of things, the lesser priesthood occupying its proper subordinate relationship, and the law was supplanted *by* the gospel, with its higher spiritual powers and life.

Melchizedek priesthood held by the prophets of Israel. There remains but one thing more to be accounted for, namely, that some of the prophets in Israel between the departure of Moses and the coming of the Christ, seem to function in a manner that could only be warranted by their possessing the Melchizedek priesthood, as for instance: Where Isaiah had the face to face vision of God,

In the year that King Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims. . . . And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke. Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts. (Isa. 6:1-5)

The explanation of this must be, that while the priesthood as an organization, together with Moses was taken away from Israel, from time to time individual prophets received direct individual ordination from God in order to accomplish his purposes in the earth.^d We have such an instance as this in the case of Esaias, where the revelation of God to our Prophet of the New Dispensation traces back the line of Jethro's priesthood (father-in-law of Moses and of whom Moses received the ordination to the priesthood), through four predecessors in the line of his priesthood to Esaias who also lived in the days of Abraham and of whom it is said, "and Esaias received it <the priesthood> under the hand of God" (cf. D&C 84:7-12).^e Since Esaias lived in the days of Abraham and Abraham was blessed of him, is it not quite possible that

^dThis is supported by a statement by the Prophet Joseph Smith: "All the prophets had the Melchizedek Priesthood" (*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 181). Further evidence that the Melchizedek Priesthood was available to various individuals in the Old Testament period can be seen in Alma 13.

^eIn reference to the "hand of God," note D&C 36:2, where the Lord said to Edward Partridge, "And I will lay my hand upon you by the hand of my servant Sidney Rigdon."

this “Esaías” *under that name* was Melchizedek[†] and that he was the one to whom the priesthood of Jethro is traced in this revelation here considered, for Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law, received his priesthood from one Caleb, “who received the priesthood from Elihu, who received the priesthood under the hand of Jeremy, and Jeremy received the priesthood under the hand of Gad, and Gad under the hand of Esaías,” who is also the one who received his priesthood under the hand of God, and Esaías also lived in the days of Abraham and blessed him (cf. D&C 84:7–14). He doubtless was the Melchizedek and this name, which he appears under here (“Esaías”) accounts for the variation perhaps of this Elias who appeared in the Kirtland Temple.

This brief historical sketch made possible by reason of the revelations given in the New Dispensation to Joseph Smith, and quoted in this chapter, unites the dispensations of Moses and the prophets of Israel with Abraham on the one hand, and with Christ, the Messiah, on the other, which dispensation we are to consider in the next chapter.

Note: *Melchizedek-Shem*.[‡] That Melchizedek was Shem is recognized by the “Palestinian Targum” and also by Jerome of the fourth and fifth centuries in his comments on Isaiah 41.² It may be interesting to record also that it was Shem who offered the sacrifices ~~on the earth~~ after Noah and his family came out of the ark (cf. Gen. 8:20), since tradition has it that Noah had been crippled by the lion, and was therefore unfitted for the priestly office (Lev. 21:17–23); Noah gave Shem the priestly garments also which he had inherited from Adam. This, too,

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve succinctly stated: “We question the statement that Esaías and Melchizedek are the same, based on what is written in D&C 84.” Roberts noted in response: **Obj[ection] not valid**, but nevertheless he appears in response to have made a slight modification by adding “under that name.”

[‡]In his argument identifying Shem with Melchizedek, Roberts is summarizing evidence from articles in Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible*, Kitto’s *Cyclopaedia*, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. See also a similar summary in *Seventy’s Course in Theology* 2:86–88. A recent LDS scholar has summarized the discussion since Roberts’s time: “It was asserted by some early LDS leaders that Melchizedek was Shem, son of Noah (see, for example, *Times and Seasons* 5:746). Though Shem is also identified as a great high priest (D&C 138:41), it would appear from the Doctrine and Covenants 84:14 that the two might not be the same individual (*Mormon Doctrine*, 475), and Jewish sources equating Melchizedek and Shem are late and tendentious.” Bruce Satterfield, “Melchizedek: LDS Sources,” *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* 2:879–80. See also the excellent review of ancient sources in Birger A. Pearson, “Melchizedek: Ancient Sources,” *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* 2:880–82.

²*Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th ed.), s.v. “Melchizedek.”

confirms the tradition held in relation to Shem being the successor to Noah in the patriarchal line.³ The Samaritans also identified the city of Samaria with the city of Salem,[†] and their sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim. The Rabbis of later generations also identified Melchizedek with Shem, the ancestor of Abraham.⁴ In one of the Messianic Psalms (Ps. 110:4) it is foretold that the Messiah would be a priest after the order of Melchizedek, which the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 5:20) cites as showing that Melchizedek was a type of Christ, and the Jews themselves certainly, on the authority of this passage of the Psalm, regarded Melchizedek as a type of the regal priesthood, higher than that of Aaron to which the Messiah should belong.⁵

A mysterious supremacy came also to be assigned to Melchizedek,⁶ but by reason of his having received tithes from the Hebrew patriarch Abraham; and on this point the author of the epistle to the Hebrews expatiates strongly (Heb. 7:1–2); but the Jews in admitting this official or popular superiority of Melchizedek to Abraham sought to account for it by alleging that the Royal priest~~hood~~ was no other than Shem, the most pious of Noah's sons, who according to the shorter chronology (Ussher's) might have lived at the time of Abraham (according to that chronology Shem's life overlapped into the life of Abraham over one hundred and fifty years). Shem as a survivor of the deluge is supposed to have been authorized by the superior dignity of old age to bless even the father of the faithful, and entitled as the paramount Lord of Canaan (Gen. 9:26) to convey his light to Abraham (Gen. 14:19). This opinion (i.e. that Shem was Melchizedek) was embraced by Martin Luther, his strong supporter and learned friend Melancthon, by H. Broughton, Selden, Bishop Lightfoot, Jackson, and many others.

Jerome of the fourth and fifth centuries in his epistle written in Rome⁷ which *is* entirely devoted to consideration of the person and dwelling place of Melchizedek, states that this (i.e., that Melchizedek is Shem) was the prevailing opinion of the Jews in his time, and it was also ascribed to the Samaritans.

³*Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905), s.v. "Shem."

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve added: "We also question the statement that Salem and Samaria are the same." Roberts defended the point: **Obj not valid. (not mine. quote. Ency. Jewish see)**

⁴*Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Shem."

⁵McClintock and Strong, *Encyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, s.v. "Melchizedek," covering the two next paragraphs.

⁶Philo, *Opp. Rom.* 2:34 [Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis*, 2, 3, 79–82; and Philo, *On Abraham*, 235]. [No work by Philo entitled *Opp. Rom.* has been found. An account of Abraham giving tithing to Melchizedek in Philo is found in *On Abraham (De Abrahamo)*, 235.]

⁷Jerome, *Epistle 73* [in *Patrologia Latina* 22:681].

Also it is interesting to note that in an editorial in the *Times and Seasons*, December number for 1844, published at Nauvoo, Illinois, the statement is made, that Melchizedek was Shem: "And with the superior knowledge of men like Noah, Shem (who is Melchizedek), and Abraham the father of the faithful, holding the keys of the highest order of the priesthood," etc.⁸

Other conjectures in relation to Melchizedek on account of the mystery that shadows his name and career, is that he was an impersonal power, virtue, or substance of God personified; that he was the son of God, appearing in human form; that he was the Messiah (Jewish opinion); also that he was Ham, which, of course, in the light of what we have already said of Ham would be *obviously* ridiculous.

*Shem, Melchizedek, and Elias identical?*⁹ The establishment of the identity of Shem and Melchizedek leads to the likelihood of an important fact connected with the New Dispensation. We read in the Doctrine and Covenants of the appearing in the Kirtland Temple to the Prophet Joseph Smith and to Oliver Cowdery, first the Savior; ~~afterwards~~ *then* Moses, who restored to the Prophet the keys of the gathering of Israel from the four parts of the earth and the leading of the ten tribes from the land of the North; then of Elias who appeared and committed the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham, saying to Joseph and Oliver that in them "and in their seed all generations after them should be blessed." Then follows the account of the appearing of Elijah the prophet, who was taken to heaven without tasting death (see D&C 110).

The question arises, who is this "Elias" who committed the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham? Why is it that in all our modern revelations Abraham never appears as coming with the keys of a dispensation, since he is so prominent a figure of antiquity? The answer, of course, would be that a greater than Abraham lived in his day, and held the keys of that dispensation; and who ordained Abraham to his special work of perpetuating the patriarchal line after the departure of

⁸Unsigned editorial, *Times and Seasons* 5 (December 15, 1844): 745–46.

⁹The identification of Elias has generated various opinions. For example, Joseph Fielding Smith argued that Elias in D&C 110 was probably Gabriel (Noah), basing his argument on D&C 27:6–9, where Gabriel is identified as an Elias. *Answers to Gospel Questions*, 5 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1957–66), 3:138–41. The only direct scriptural evidence about Elias is found in D&C 110:12, where he "committed the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham." The article "Elias" in the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* declares: "Nothing more is known about this man." George A. Horton, Jr., "Elias," *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* 2:449.

that greater one, who held the keys of the dispensation in which Abraham was started upon his career in the priesthood. Between Noah and the appearance of Abraham on the scene, the one intervening great character that looms large, is Melchizedek, and with the fact established that he was Shem, we have a beautiful and unbroken line of God's great servants from antediluvian patriarchs through Noah into the postdiluvian period in which period Noah continued his life for three hundred and fifty years. Shem continuing to live contemporaneously with him through that period, meeting with Abraham, conferring the priesthood upon him and thence the line continuing until Israel arose to be enlarged into a nation to perpetuate the work of God through the earth. This conception of the course of things arising out of the identification of Elias who appeared in the Kirtland Temple to the Prophet Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery with Melchizedek, and Melchizedek with Shem, perpetuates the patriarchal line of the priesthood, and it was doubtless that patriarchal feature of the priesthood and the work of God linking the generations of men together in the patriarchal line that Elias—or Melchizedek—came to restore.

“Elias appeared, and committed the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham, saying that in us and our seed all generations after us should be blessed” (D&C 110:12).

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1901–1906, s.v. “Melchizedek” and “Abraham”; Josephus, *Works of Flavius Josephus*, bk. 1, ch. 10; standard Bible commentaries and dictionaries, esp. Kitto, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, s.v. “Melchizedek” and “Abraham”; Roberts, *Seventy's Course in Theology* 2:86–90; Gen. 20; Ps. 110:4; Heb. 5:6–10; 6:20.

The Meridian Dispensation

The mission of the Christ in outline. We come now to the dispensation of the gospel that is to be graced by the advent of the Son of God and the performance of his great mission. That mission is to reveal in person God the Father; and all that is or can be called God in the universe: “For . . . in him ⟨shall⟩ [should] all fulness dwell . . . ⟨even⟩ the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 1:19; 2:9; and context). To redeem man from the consequences of Adam’s transgression, from the “Fall.” To introduce the element of mercy into the divine economy, by making it possible under a reign of moral and spiritual law to forgive the personal sins of men without violence to justice; also bringing men from their alienation from God back to fellowship and union with him; by which they are redeemed from spiritual death, and restored to spiritual life. To bring to pass the resurrection from physical death, by which shall be established immortality—a deathless, physical life. Lastly, the Christ came to stand as a witness for the truth of all the foregoing things; for he said unto Pilate, when brought before the Roman procurator by the Jews. “To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth” (John 18:37). These several things constituted the very heart and life of the mission of the Christ, and, of course, of the gospel, the whole plan of God for the establishment of both the physical immortality of man, and also the eternal spiritual life of man.

The two great Christian sacraments. We pass over the historical features of the meridian dispensation as being too well known to require restatement: viz, the coming and mission of the forerunner of the Messiah, John the Baptist; and the birth and youth and early ministry of the Messiah himself. It should be noted, however, that to set forth in concrete form and perpetuate the main features of his mission, the Christ established two sacraments; each having two parts, viz., first, baptism; and second, the Lord’s supper. Baptism, as stated

above, consists of two parts: (a) baptism, or birth of the water; and **(b)** baptism, or birth of the spirit.

(a) Water Baptism. Water baptism is to be performed by immersion, or complete burial of the candidate in water. The official formula for this ordinance as given by the risen Christ to the Nephites in America, was as follows:

Behold, ye shall go down and stand in the water. . . . And now behold, these are the words which ye shall say, calling them (the candidates) by name, [saying]: Having authority given me of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And then shall ye immerse them in the water, and come forth again out of the water. (3 Ne. 11:23-26)

This ordinance is to be preceded by a confession of faith, in God the Father, in Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Ghost. In baptism is represented, symbolically, the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ; as the Christ died and was buried, so the candidate dies to his old life of sin, by separating himself from it by repentance; and he is buried with Christ in baptism. And as the Christ rose from the grave to “newness of life” (Rom. 6:4)—to immortal life—so the immersed candidate rises from the watery grave of baptism to a newness of life in righteousness. The symbolism is complete.

Through this ordinance comes remission of sin by visible acceptance of the Atonement of the Christ, and the cleansing power of his sacrificial blood in that atonement made for sin. Also it is partial entrance, or a preparation for entrance, into the kingdom of heaven—the Church of Christ. Also this water baptism is a preparation for the other part of baptism—the baptism, or birth, of the spirit: this by cleansing from sins, by forgiveness of them, through the grace of God (John 3:3; Mark 1:4; Acts 2:37-39; Rom. 6:4).

(b) The baptism of the spirit—The Holy Ghost. The second part of this one baptism—the baptism of the spirit, is administered by the laying on of the hands by those having authority to minister the spirit, by which the properly prepared water-baptized convert receives an immersion of the Holy Ghost to his soul. He is born again into a union with God—into a renewal of spiritual life. This baptism of the spirit completes his entrance into the kingdom of God. He is born both of the water and of the spirit, without which he could neither see nor enter into the kingdom of God—the Church of Christ. This baptism brings him to possession of that spirit which guides him into all truth; which takes the things of God and makes them known to him; by which he

may know that Jesus is the Christ (John 3:3–4; 14; Acts 2:37–39; 8:14–24), by which also he may know the truth of all things (John 14, 15, 16; 1 Cor. 12:3; Moro. 10:4–5). Blessed baptism into a union with God; and to a knowledge of all the things of God.

The sacrament of the Lord's supper. The nature of this sacrament will best be learned from the prayer of consecration of the bread and the wine of the supper. This is to be found both in the Book of Mormon as given by the Christ among the ancient Nephites, and to the Prophet of the New Dispensation by revelation (Moro. 4:3; 5:2; D&C 20:77, 79). Moroni describing the manner in which it was administered among his people says: "The manner of their elders and priests administering the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church; and they <did> administer[ed] it according to the commandment[s] of Christ; wherefore we know the manner to be true" (Moro. 4:1). Consideration of the prayer over the broken bread will be sufficient for the present purpose.

Prayer of Consecration

O God, the Eternal Father, we ask thee in the name of thy Son, Jesus Christ, to bless and sanctify this bread to the souls of all those who partake of it; that they may eat in remembrance of the body of thy Son, and witness unto thee, O God, the Eternal Father, that they are willing to take upon them the name of thy Son, and always remember him, and keep his commandments which he hath given them, that they may always have his Spirit to be with them. Amen. (Moro. 4:3)

A similar prayer to this with only slight variations to make it appropriate as representing the blood of the Christ instead of his broken body is given in the same revelations. These prayers of consecration, are the most perfect forms of sacred literature to be found. So perfect they are that one may not add to them or take ought from them without marring them. One may say of these prayers of consecration what Archdeacon Paley says concerning the Lord's Prayer, namely—

for a succession of solemn thoughts, for fixing the attention upon a few great points, for suitableness, . . . for sufficiency, for conciseness without obscurity, for the weight and real importance of its petitions, is without an equal or a rival.¹

And as representing a few great fundamental and all-comprehensive truths concerning religion, these prayers of consecration form a rallying point—raise a standard that will make for the holding together in union and fellowship the followers of the Master, beyond all other formulas

¹Paley, *A View of the Evidences of Christianity*, 235.

known to man; and for that purpose, beyond all doubt, were they given, as well as to call up to man's consciousness the sacrifice God made for man's redemption, and man's covenant to remember and to keep God's commandments, that he might always be in union with God.

The prayers of consecration expounded. These prayers of consecration are a "creed," as well as sacramental prayers. This will sufficiently appear if we analyze the prayer over the bread.

"O God, the Eternal Father." Here, in addition to being the most solemn form in which Deity can be addressed, is expressed faith in God as "Eternal Father." Remembering that the first fact of fatherhood is creation through begetting; and next is watching over and guiding to proposed ends, loving watchfulness over the creation—fathering! We have God recognized as the Father of men, and the Eternal Creator of all things, and the eternal sustaining power of all things—"the very Eternal Father of heaven and [of] earth" (Mosiah 15:4; cf. Alma 11:38-39), not as "first cause," but as "Eternal," continuing cause, and "Eternal" sustaining power. How fortunate the form of that address, "O God, the Eternal Father!"

"We ask Thee, in the name of thy Son, Jesus Christ." This is an assertion of faith in Jesus Christ; and in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, as Son of the "Eternal Father." He was the "firstbegotten" of the spirits destined to come to the earth, called "firstbegotten" by the father himself (Heb. 1:6; cf. Rom. 8:29); and hence "Elder Brother" to all that host of spirits. Also he is "the only begotten of the Father"; of all the sons of men born into the world (John 1:14)—having reference, of course, to the Christ's birth of Mary and as the Son of the Highest—"the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). So that indeed God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, both of his spirit and of his body, and in this respect the Christ *is* uniquely "the Son of God."

"We ask Thee . . . to bless and sanctify this bread." And what is this bread? It is broken when blessed and presented to the communicants, and is the symbol of the broken body of the Christ. Symbol of the fulfillment of the prophecy: "He was wounded for our iniquities" (cf. Isa. 53:5).² Symbol of the broken body of the Christ; broken when the crown of hard thorns was pressed upon his brow, and blood streamed down his face; broken when the cruel nails were driven through the quivering flesh of hands and feet; broken when the Roman soldier's spear pierced his side and shed the life's blood that was to save

²And the serpent was given power to "bruise" the heel of the woman's seed (Gen. 3:15).

the world. The Christ's suffering in Gethsemane, where in agony he sweat blood at every pore; and his suffering on the cross, where hung his broken body in unspeakable pain: this was the price *of suffering* paid for man's salvation and the broken bread is the symbol of it. . . . "Bless and sanctify this bread to the souls of all those who partake of it." The broken bread is to be a soul-food then, not bodily food; an appeal to remembrance, to gratitude, to moral obligation.

In the prayer of consecration, then, faith is declared in God as Eternal Father; in Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of God (in the flesh); in the Atonement of Jesus Christ for the sins of men (as a race and as individuals), and this by accepting the symbols of the broken body of the Christ in the broken bread. These *are* three great fundamentals of the gospel, which if a man accepts in his convictions, all else of the gospel will follow as matter of course.

The second part of the sacrament deals with the renewal of covenant with God on the part of man:

"That they may witness unto Thee, O God, the Eternal Father:

(a) that they are willing to take upon them the name of thy Son"; become Christ's men, and Christ's women—Christians!

(b) "and always remember him"! every day remember him, every month, and through all the years—always!

(c) "and keep his commandments which he hath given them." In human weakness men may not always "keep" perfectly his commandments; but they may keep alive in their souls their "willingness" to keep his commandments; and by affirming and re-affirming that willingness, the memory of the obligation "to keep his commandment" will be ever present to consciousness.

And the end of all this? the climax? the purpose of it?

"That they may always have his <the Christ's> spirit to be with them." What an end to be attained! The spirit of the Christ to be with men always! The perpetuation of the spiritual life into which they were born when they accepted the gospel of Jesus Christ. What could be more desirable? What more admirable? What more profitable for the individual and for *the* community life, than that men should always have the spirit of the Christ to be with them? "To live and move and have their being" (cf. Acts 17:28), and work and serve in that spirit—the spirit of the Master—the Christ!

The resurrection of the dead. It is fitting that a word should be spoken here in relation to one other stupendous fact connected with the dispensation of the meridian of times, namely, the Christ's resurrection from the dead. And his resurrection *it* should be remembered, is a

prototype of the resurrection of all men, the actual, physical resurrection of the body of all men, and the immortality of the individual so raised from the dead, in fulfillment of God's covenant made to the spirits of men before the foundation of the world—namely, the covenant of eternal life (Titus 1:2). I waive all discussion as to the physical possibility of such a resurrection. We have God's assurance in his revealed word that it shall be so, and such is the manifest power of God in creation, in the miracle of man's mortal life, in the miracle of the existence of all animal and plant life, the miracle of existence of the earth itself, sun, moon, and stars, that it is not worthwhile carping over the alleged "impossibility" and "improbability" of the physical resurrection of men. It is no more difficult for God to bring to pass the physical immortality through the reunion of spirit and body, than it is impossible for God to bring to pass the mortal life of man; and in the presence of all the "miraculous" things known to men about life and its wonders. We might repeat, even to this scientific age, proud of its acquired knowledge yet confusedly ignorant of the mystery of life in general, and human life in particular, we could still say to them, as Paul did to King Agrippa, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" (Acts 26:8). This resurrection to physical, immortal life is the great unique thing of the Christian religion as founded by the Christ, and developed by the ministry of the apostles. Other faiths have presented more or less dimly the idea of a continued consciousness of being in some form or other, some spirit essence kind of existence, or some absorption back into the being whence the individual has been called into existence, some survival of ethereal existence, as the perfume of the rose after her petals are fallen, or else some pilgrimage of the soul through transmigration into varied forms of life, sometimes in the way of retribution visited upon the spirit because of the absence of some perfection or failure to fulfill purposes of existence in granted life periods, a procession of chastisements until the right is purchased to escape the painful consciousness of personal existence, and there comes the alleged blessed period of Nirvana, or rest from the weary round of struggle and effort. It is the Christian religion alone out of all the faiths that raises up as a standard this proclamation that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22). And the promise of the Christ himself, if a man "believe[th] in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live"; and also his solemn words, "I am the resurrection, and the life" (cf. John 11:25); and again the Master's words near the close of his mortal life's ministry:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is *coming*, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear

shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. . . . Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. (John 5:25–29)

The resurrection of the just and also of the unjust. God's covenant to his spirit children before the earth life of man began was that he would give unto men immortality—deathless physical existence, in the union of spirit and element; and we are assured of the possibility of such a thing by reason of the existence of accomplished things all about us equally miraculous with the fulfillment of this promise of resurrection from the dead.

The testimony of the Judean apostles. The fact of the resurrection of the Christ from death is witnessed by the apostles in their discourses in the New Testament scriptures; and is also used by them as proof positive of the divinity of the Christian scheme of things, as witnessed in Paul's speech in Athens where he represents that God hath given assurance that he hath called all men to repentance under the Christian scheme of things—"in that he hath raised him *<the Christ>* from the dead" (Acts 17:31 and context).

To all this is to be added the testimony of each of the writers of the four Gospels who represent the resurrection of the Christ as a most literal resurrection of the personal Christ by the reunion of his body and spirit. The reality of this reunion is most emphatically given perhaps in St. John's Gospel where on his second appearance to the apostles he gives the assurance of the reality of his resurrection to Thomas, who had said to his brethren who reported the first visitation of the risen Christ, "Unless I see the wounds in his hands and in his side and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." On the second visitation the Master called "Doubting Thomas" to him and said unto him, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." And Thomas answered and said to the risen Christ, "My Lord and My God!" And the Christ reproved him for his previous lack of faith (cf. John 20:24–29).

On the first visit of the risen Lord, when the disciples were affrighted at his appearing among them, supposing that they had seen a spirit, he said unto them,

Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts?
Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see;

for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. . . . And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of [a] broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them. (Luke 24:38-43)

Peter in the course of his ministry was wont to refer to this and other circumstances of physical contact with the risen Christ, an example of which is found in his discourse in the home of Cornelius, saying, “We”—referring to himself and brethren that were with him on that occasion—

we are witnesses of all things which he (the Christ) did both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem: whom they slew and hanged on a tree: Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly; Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. (Acts 10:39-41)

The testimony of a modern prophet. This is the testimony of the Jewish scripture, more especially of the New Testament, although through the whole course of the scriptures there is abundance of witness to this great truth, and especially in our modern revelation given through the Prophet of the New Dispensation: “And now, after the many testimonies which have been given of him,” said this prophet, “this is the testimony, last of all, which we give of him: That he lives! For we”—referring to himself and his early associate, Sidney Rigdon—“For we saw him, even on the right hand of God; and we heard the voice bearing record that he is the Only Begotten of the Father” (D&C 76:22-23).³

The testimony of the Book of Mormon. Also in the Book of Mormon is given a most dramatic and soul-thrilling testimony to the resurrection of the Christ by the appearance of the risen Redeemer to a multitude of people in America, shortly after the resurrection of the Christ; for to the people of America, no less than to the people of the Eastern hemisphere, did God give assurances through their ancient prophets from time to time of the existence of his gospel and of its power unto salvation; and lastly the risen Christ came to them to assure them of the verities of the plan of salvation and especially of this feature of it, the

³The whole great revelation in this section of the Doctrine and Covenants, one of the greatest outgivings of God to man in any age of the world, is based upon this testimony of the risen and present living Christ, the Son of God, and we commend that whole revelation to the consideration of the reader.

resurrection from the dead, by his own glorious appearance among them, and his quite extended ministry among them.⁴

Here the resurrected Christ according to the Nephite record, descended out of heaven and appeared to the multitude, proclaiming himself to be the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world; and the multitude blessed the name of “the Most High God,” “And they did fall down at the feet of Jesus, and did worship him” (3 Ne. 11:17).

Assurance of the resurrection. No incident in the gospel history is more emphatically proven than this great truth, the resurrection of the Son of God, and the promise of the resurrection of all men. It was the center around which all the hope of the early Christians was grouped—the hope of immortality, of eternal life. It is the vital force of the Christian religion. It is the hope of the world, ~~for~~ the only kind of a future life that can meet the aspiring, uplifting desires of the human soul. If such a life as that which is promised through the resurrection, as taught in the Christian religion, is not to be realized, then the future hopes for any existence worthwhile fall in dark confusion about the feet of men.

⁴For all which see Book of Mormon, 3 Nephi, the whole book, but especially chapter 11.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Smith, *History of the Church* 4:553–56; the closing chapter of each gospel: Matt. 27, Mark 16, Luke 24, and John 21; Acts; 1 Cor. 15; Epistles; Moro. 4–5; and D&C 20; 45; and 76.

The Atonement I— The Revealed Fact of the Atonement

Note: I must ask at the outset of this treatise on the Atonement—comprising six chapters—that there be a suspension of judgment on the respective parts of the theme until all shall have been read; as knowledge of the whole, I am sure, will be necessary to the complete understanding of the parts.

Introductory. ~~The Revealed Fact of It.~~ It is fitting that the Atonement should receive doctrinal exposition when considering the dispensation of the gospel in which the sacrifice comprising it was made. What has already been set forth in this work as to the plan of man's redemption from spiritual and physical death, together with the knowledge of what took place in the heavenly council among preexistent spirits before man's earth life in the dispensation of Adam began, relieves us of the necessity of a full statement and a long discussion in the introduction of the Atonement. Under our plan we have been able from the very first to proceed with the consciousness of the purpose of man's earth life and redemption all the while present. It still remains, however, to consider the Atonement from the scriptural and philosophical side of it, and deal with the necessity for it, and the nature of it; and first of all to be convinced as to the revealed fact of it. Upon the established fact of it by revelation is where we begin our discussion; and first by noting briefly the testimony of prophecy for the promise of it.

Prophecy of the Atonement. St. Paul says:

When Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle,

and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without \langle the \rangle shedding of blood is no remission. (Heb. 9:19–22; cited from Ex. 24:8)

It is very generally conceded that the sacrifices and oblations of the Mosaic ritual have a direct relationship to the great atoning sacrifice to be made by the Christ. From the ninth and tenth chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews it is evident that “the law” was “a shadow of good things to come” (Heb. 10:1). The law’s sacrifices for sin, and reconciliation with God but figured forth the greater and more efficient sacrifice to be made by the Son of God; nay, whatever of virtue there was in the sacrifices of the law was dependent upon the greater sacrifice to follow. Of themselves, the sacrifices of the law had no virtue at all unconnected with the sacrifice to be made by the Christ; they were but symbols showing forth that sacrifice in which the virtue was, the sacrifice of the Christ himself.

The Paschal sacrifice. In some respects the Paschal sacrifice more perfectly than any other, perhaps, foreshadowed the future sacrifice of the Son of God for the deliverance of his people—those who would trust the sign of deliverance in his blood. The institution of the sacrifice and the accompanying feast were as follows: When all other judgments upon Pharaoh failed to persuade him to let God’s people go, then said the Lord to Moses:

All the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the firstborn of the maidservant that is behind the mill; and all the firstborn of beasts. . . . But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast; that ye may know how that the Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptian[s] and Israel. (Ex. 11:5–7)

When this terrible judgment was about to be executed the Lord provided the following means of deliverance for his people: Each family in Israel was commanded at a given time to take a lamb without blemish, a male of the first year, for a “passover offering,” and it was to be killed in the evening.

And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it. And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it. . . . And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt. And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord

throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever. (Ex. 12:7-8, 13-14)

Of course it cannot be doubted that this festival of the Passover was instituted as a great memorial of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and the birth of the nation of Israel; and there are not wanting those who maintain that this was its primary and only significance. But the leading feature in the festival, the paschal lamb, "a male without blemish" (Lev. 1:3; see also Ex. 12:5); the killing of it; the blood sprinkled upon the door post, the sign of safety to God's people; the eating of the lamb in preparation of the journey; the subsequent honoring of this feast by the Christ with his disciples; the substitution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper for the Passover festival at the very time and on the very occasion of celebrating the feast of the Passover among the Jews; together with the subsequent inspired reference to Christ as the "Paschal Lamb" of the Christians, are circumstances too numerous and too nearly related to doubt of the significance of the Passover festival having reference to the great sacrifice to be made by the Son of God through the shedding of his blood in atonement for and the deliverance of his people.

The sin offering. Other sacrifices of the Mosaic law which shadowed forth the future atonement to be made by the Son of God was the "sin offering." Of Mosaic sacrifices in general and of this sacrifice in particular, the author of the article on "Sacrifices" in Dr. Wm. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (this is Rev. Alfred Barry, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge) says:

All {sacrifices} had relation, under different aspects, to a *Covenant* between God and man. The "Sin Offering" {described in detail in Leviticus chapter 4} represented that Covenant as broken by man, and as knit together again, by God's appointment, through the "shedding of blood." . . . The shedding of the blood, the symbol of life, signified that the death of the offender was deserved for sin, but that the death of the victim was accepted for his death by the ordinance of God's mercy.¹

To the same effect our author sets forth the ceremonial of the "Day of Atonement" (detail of which is given in Lev. 16:7-10). A number of the early and later "Christian Fathers" take the same view.²

The fact of the Atonement in history. The first intimation of an atonement in the earth-history of man was doubtless the statement in

¹Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. "sacrifices" 4:2774; italics in original.

²See Roberts, *Seventy's Course in Theology* 4:53-54.

Genesis that the serpent—standing for and symbolizing in the narrative Lucifer—would bruise the heel of the woman’s seed; while the seed of the woman, meaning the Christ would bruise the serpent’s, or Lucifer’s, head (see Gen. 3:15). This and the institution of sacrifice, early in Adam’s and his sons’ lives, with the explanation which some time afterwards was given of the significance of the sacrificial offering—all taken together—is our earliest historical data on the Atonement. It will perhaps be remembered that the revealed purpose of the sacrifice was (see chapter 35 above):

This thing is a similitude [of the sacrifice] of the Only Begotten of the Father, which is full of grace and truth. Wherefore, thou shalt do all that thou doest in the name of the Son . . . forevermore. And in that day the Holy Ghost fell upon Adam, which beareth record of the Father and the Son, saying: I am the Only Begotten of the Father from the beginning, henceforth and forever, that as thou hast fallen thou mayest be redeemed, and all mankind, even as many as will. (Moses 5:7-9)

Witness of the New Testament. We turn next to the testimony of the New Testament writers on the fact of the Atonement.

(a) *Testimony of the angel Gabriel.* In Matthew we read what the angel said to Joseph, when warning him not to put away Mary, his betrothed wife, because of her being found with child: “Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife. . . . She shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins” (Matt. 1:20-21; cf. Luke 1:26-35). Such the testimony of an angel of God as to the mission of the Christ.

(b) *Testimony of John the Baptist.* John the Baptist said to his own disciples as Jesus passed, “Behold the Lamb of God, ^(that) [which] taketh away the sin of the world. . . . And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God” (John 1:29, 34).

(c) *Testimony of the Christ.* The Christ’s own testimony is recorded as follows:

And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: . . . that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. (John 3:14-17)

And again the Christ, “When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he (i.e., the one that taketh away the sins of the world)” (John 8:28). And again the Christ at the Paschal supper, preceding his betrayal,

Jesus having blessed the bread brake it, and gave it to his disciples and said, take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it, for this is my blood which is the new testament which is *shed* for *many* for the remission of sins. (cf. Matt. 26:26–28)³

After the resurrection, Jesus overtaking two of the disciples on their way to Emmaus engaged them in conversation respecting the crucifixion of Jesus, and in the course of their narrative about the crucifixion and the missing body of the Christ, the risen Lord said unto them:

⟨Ye⟩ [O] fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning ⟨with⟩ [at] Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. (Luke 24:25–27)

Subsequently, appearing to the twelve, he opened their understanding that they might understand the scriptures and said unto them: “Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name in all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things” (Luke 24:46–48).

(d) *Testimony of St. Peter*: St. Peter, chief of the apostles, bears witness of this same truth when he says: “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit” (1 Pet. 3:18). Again:

Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: . . . Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. (1 Pet. 2:21–24)

Again:

Elect . . . through ⟨the⟩ sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied. . . . Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you. (1 Pet. 1:2, 18–20)

³Luke and Mark practically give the same account of the incident; and St. Paul in his account of the resurrection states, “Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures” (1 Cor. 15:3).

(e) Testimony of St. Paul.

All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the *re*mission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. (Rom. 3:23–25)

When we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. . . . But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. . . . And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement. (Rom. 5:6–11)

(f) Testimony of St. John. So St. John, in his epistles: “And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 Jn. 2:1–2).

In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. . . . Not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 Jn. 4:9–10)

And so throughout the New Testament, in an unbroken harmony the witnesses testify to the fact of the Atonement and the “propitiation” for man’s sins through that Atonement.

The same is true also as to the Book of Mormon witnesses both when speaking through the voice of prophecy and the voice of history.

Book of Mormon prophecies of the Atonement. Before the birth of Christ, early in the fifth century B.C., in the small colony Lehi led from Jerusalem to the promised land of America, it was declared:

The Messiah cometh in the fulness of time, that he may redeem the children of men from the fall. And because that they are redeemed from the fall they have become free forever, knowing good from evil. . . . Wherefore, men are free according to the flesh; and all things are given them which are expedient unto man. And they are free to choose liberty and eternal life, through the great mediation of all men, or to choose captivity and death, according to the captivity and power of the devil. (2 Ne. 2:26–27)^a

Passing over many such prophecies, ***we come to*** one written near the close of the second century B.C. [that] is peculiarly emphatic: speaking

^aThe edition of the Book of Mormon used by Roberts read “mediation.” The 1981 edition has corrected this to read “Mediator.”

of children who die in childhood before the years of accountability for sin, the Nephite prophet Benjamin says:

I say unto you they are blessed; for behold, as in Adam, or by nature, they fall, even so the blood of Christ atoneth for their sins. . . . But men (who have come to an age to understand) drink damnation to their own souls except they humble themselves and become as little children, and believe that salvation was, and is, and is to come, in and through the atoning blood of Christ, the Lord Omnipotent. (Mosiah 3:16-18)

There are many more such prophetic passages in the Book of Mormon.

Book of Mormon historical utterances on the Atonement. The most important utterances that can come to man on any subject would be what the Lord Jesus Christ himself would say upon those subjects. For that reason I am limiting the historical statements of the Book of Mormon on the Atonement, to such words as are alleged to have been spoken by the risen Lord Jesus:

Behold, I am Jesus Christ the Son of God. . . . I was with the Father from the beginning. . . . And in me hath the Father glorified his name. . . . The scriptures concerning my coming are fulfilled. And as many as have received me, to them have I given to become the sons of God; and even so will I to as many as shall believe on my name, for behold, by me redemption cometh, and in me is the law of Moses fulfilled. I am the light and the life of the world. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. . . . Behold, I have come unto the world to bring redemption unto the world, to save the world from sin. . . . Therefore repent, and come unto me ye ends of the earth, and be saved. (3 Ne. 9:15-18, 21-22)

Again he said to a multitude of Nephites, when appearing to them as the resurrected Christ:

Behold, I am Jesus Christ, whom the prophets testified shall come into the world. And behold, I am the light and the life of the world; and I have drunk out of that bitter cup which the Father hath given me, and have glorified the Father in taking upon me the sins of the world, in the which I have suffered the will of the Father in all things from the beginning. (3 Ne. 11:10-11)

Centuries later, a Nephite teacher said to his people: "Ye shall have hope through the atonement of Christ and the power of his (the Christ's) resurrection, to be raised unto life eternal, and this because of your faith in him according to the promise" (Moro. 7:41).

Testimony of the Prophet of the New Dispensation on the Atonement of Christ. The revelations to the Prophet of the New

Dispensation of the gospel as they are published in the Doctrine and Covenants are all founded upon the Atonement of the Christ as a fact, as a reality. One passage *being* ~~as~~ of special emphasis and particularization is quoted in proof of the above. It occurs in a revelation reproving one of the early disciples for his unbelief and disposition to swerve from the faith. And now the word of the Lord to him through the Prophet:

I command you to repent—repent, lest I smite you by the rod of my mouth, and by my wrath, and by my anger, and your sufferings be sore—how sore you know not, how exquisite you know not, yea, how hard to bear you know not. For behold, I, God, have suffered these things for all, that they might not suffer if they would repent; But if they would not repent they must suffer even as I; Which suffering caused myself, even God, the greatest of all, to tremble because of pain, and to bleed at every pore, and to suffer both body and spirit—and would that I might not drink the bitter cup, and shrink—Nevertheless, glory be to the Father, and I partook and finished my preparations unto the children of men. (D&C 19:15–19)

After the consideration of these scriptures, we shall regard the fact of the Atonement as a reality established by the revelations of God.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: four Gospels; Acts; Epistles; Mosiah 3–5; 3 Ne. entire book, esp. chs. 9 and 11; Book of Mormon references to the Atonement from the index; D&C 19. For a discussion about Roberts's conception of the Atonement, see pages 663–69 below.

The Atonement II— In Harmony with a Reign of Law

In a former chapter we said somewhat respecting the universe being under a reign of law (see chapter 6). That brief ~~treatise~~ **mention** had to do chiefly with physical laws, while the Atonement deals with moral and spiritual laws. However, it will be found that the physical universe and the spiritual universe are alike in this: both are under the dominion of law. And hence I am holding here that the Atonement is in harmony with a reign of law which obtains in the moral and spiritual kingdoms of the universe.

The law. “Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence (from prison), (un)till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing” (Matt. 5:26). “Think not [that] I am come to destroy the law. . . . I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled” (Matt. 5:17-18).

The essence of law. First it is necessary to remark somewhat upon the nature of the law. Inexorableness is of the essence of law. There can be no force in law, only as it is inexorable. What effect is to cause, in the physical world, so penalty or consequence must be to violation of law in the moral and spiritual kingdom. The inexorableness of law is at once both its majesty and glory; without it neither majesty nor glory could exist in connection with law; neither respect, nor sense of security, nor safety, nor rational faith. If the idea of the “reign of law” be set aside and there be substituted for it the “reign of God” by his sovereign will, independent of law, even then we must postulate such conception of the

In preparation for this chapter, Roberts suggested “a careful examination of all the citations of scripture in the text and the footnotes of this lesson with their context.”

attributes of God that regularity will result from his personal government, not capriciousness, today one thing, tomorrow another. Hence, one of old viewing God's government from the side of its being a direct, personal reign of God, rather than a reign of God through law, wrote his message from God as follows: "I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed" (Mal. 3:6).¹ And another holding the same point of view said: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." And then he adds immediately, "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (James 1:17).

The quality of regularity of law—how secured. View the matter, then, from whichever standpoint you may. Government of the world by the personal, sovereign will of God, or the government of God through the reign of law, the quality of regularity that can only come of inexorableness (arising either from the quality of God's attributes or the inherent nature of law) is necessary to a sense of security, to right mental attitude, to rational thinking and right conduct. All this becomes apparent if the matter is thought upon conversely. If a reign of law is supposed to exist and the law is not inexorable, but may be set aside, suspended, abridged, enlarged, or its penalties modified or annulled altogether; and if these changes [were to be] affected not by the operation of any fixed principle, or by some controlling higher law, but capriciously through the interposition of some sovereign will, call it "special providence" or what not, then, of course, you have no reign of law at all, but the reign of a sovereign will that operates independent of law. Under such government—if, indeed, it could be called government—all would be confusion, uncertainty, perplexity, doubt, despair. Happily no such condition exists; but instead there exists—paralleling a reign of law in the physical universe—a divine moral and spiritual government in the universe, operating through a reign of law; and the virtue and value of that government arises from the inexorableness of the laws of which it consists.

Where then is mercy? If, however, the *in*exorableness of law is to be insisted upon up to this degree of emphasis, where then does mercy, which is supposed to mitigate somewhat the severity and inexorableness of law, and furthermore, is supposed in some way to represent the direct and gracious act of God when mitigating the law's severity—where does mercy appear? At what point does she enter into the

¹For the notion expressed in the text that Malachi viewed God's government from the side of a personal government, see the preceding verses of the chapter cited.

moral and spiritual economy? A large question, this, and one not to be considered just yet, except to say that the entrance of mercy into the economy of the moral and spiritual kingdom is not in violation of law, but in harmony with it. In fact, as we shall see somewhat later, mercy takes her part in the economy of the moral and spiritual kingdoms because of the existence of a reign of law, rather than in derogation of it.

Seeming modifications of law in the moral and spiritual world in accordance with law. When a reign of law is conceived as governing in the physical world, then the conception must also include the destructive or disintegrating forces as well as the integrating forces, else your reign of law is not universal and would be imperfect. Moses stood with God and beheld the vastness of his numberless creations:

And the Lord God said unto Moses: For mine own purpose have I <created them> [made these things]. . . . And worlds without number have I created; and I <have> [also] created them for mine own purpose. . . . Behold, there are many worlds that have passed away by the word of my power. And there are many that now stand, and innumerable are they unto man. . . . 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. (Moses 1:31–35, 38)

This passage implies constant movement in the universe. The statement, “As one earth shall pass away and the heavens thereof, even so shall another come” corresponds somewhat to the modern scientist’s notion of “evolution and devolution,”[†] the operation of integrating and disintegrating forces. But the thing to be noted here is that not only is God represented as having created these worlds and world systems “by the word of his power,” but also that “there are many worlds that have passed away by the word of his power.” By which we are to understand that destructive as well as creating forces in the physical world operate under law.

So also should we understand that in the moral and spiritual world, where there appears to be a modification of the inexorableness of law, such as comes in a manifestation of mercy in the modification or

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve took exception to this as follows: “Evolution and devolution of worlds, as stated here, is questioned. Worlds pass away, just as this earth shall, but go on through the resurrection, or renewing, to continue their existence in permanent, or immortal form (D&C 29 and 88).” On all four of the committee’s remarks about points in chapter 41, Roberts simply noted in the margin of their report: **Meaningless.**

suspension or the obliteration of the penalty of a law, say by forgiveness of sins, “for sin is the transgression of the law” (1 Jn. 3:4), all this must not be thought upon as capriciousness, the arbitrary act of Deity in the interests of special favorites. No; the manifestation of mercy which seems to set aside the severity of the law, which seems to soften its inexorableness by allowing an escape from its penalty by forgiveness of sins, this must be viewed as the result of the operation of law as much so as when the law proceeds to the utmost of its severity, to the extreme manifestation of its inexorableness in the exaction of the utmost farthing of its penalty. It is not by special and personal favor that men shall have forgiveness of sins and find shelter under the wings of mercy. That must be obtained, if obtained at all, under the operation of law governing the application of mercy in the economy of the moral and spiritual world, by law that operates upon all alike. Forgiveness of sins, like other blessings, is predicated upon the obedience to law and is not based upon personal favor. “There is a law, irrevocably decreed in heaven before the foundation[s] of ⟨the⟩ [this] world,” says the Prophet of the New Dispensation, “upon which all blessings are predicated—And when we obtain any blessing from God, it is by obedience to that law upon which it is predicated” (D&C 130:20–21)—forgiveness of sins with the rest. It is because we live under this reign of law that the scriptures teach that God is no respecter of persons. God “regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward” (Deut. 10:17). “Neither doth God respect any person: yet doth he devise means, that his banished be not expelled from him” (2 Sam. 14:14). “Peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: For there is no respect of persons with God” (Rom. 2:10–11). “Call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man’s work” (1 Pet. 1:17).

Sense of security under a reign of law. Men stand under the reign of law then, before God, who administers the moral and spiritual law. No one may hope to escape the penalty due to violation of law through favor; no one will fall under the condemnation of the law through lack of favor with God, by reason of capriciousness in him, much less through vindictiveness, which is unthinkable in God. God will make no infraction of the law in the interests of supposed favorites; such “blessings,” whether in the providing of permanent opportunities for individuals, families, or races, as may reach through the apparent complexity of things to men; or occasional blessings such as seem to come to some individuals as special acts of providence; all will come in accordance with the laws upon which such blessings were predicated before the foundations of the world were laid; and this notwithstanding inequalities and diversity

of fortunes and misfortunes that exist among individuals, families, nations, races of men. Underneath all the diversities and inequalities that exist, so difficult to account for in some of their aspects, there law is operating despite all seeming incongruities; and out of all these diversities and complexities of experiences, at the last, will come justice—God’s justice; and men will be satisfied that it is so.

Meanwhile this reign of law, with all its inexorableness—nay, rather because of it—present and operating, present in the manifestations of mercy and special “acts of providence”; as also in manifestations of severity—how splendid it all is! How satisfying! What assurance, what confidence it gives! No wonder that John Fiske, remarking upon the idea of the reign of law, said: “So beautiful is all this orderly coherence, so satisfying to some of our intellectual needs, that many minds are inclined to doubt if anything more can be said of the universe than that it is a ‘reign of law,’ an endless aggregate of coexistences and sequences.”

But the deeper and truer view of things will be not to accept this “reign of law” as God nor mistake it for Deity, for mistake it would be if confounded with or mistaken for God. Let the reign of law be conceived rather as the means through which God is working to the achievement of his high purposes—God in the world and working through law “*⟨Reconciling⟩ [to reconcile] all things unto himself*” (*Col. 1:20*).² God [is] the administrative power in a perfect reign of law.

The inexorableness of law required the Atonement. It is this quality of inexorableness in law that made the Atonement of the Christ necessary to the salvation of man. The condition was this: A law is

²It is only just to John Fiske to say that such is his conception of the matter; for, commenting upon the effect upon the thinker who has this conception of the reign of law in the world, he says:

The thinker in whose mind divine action is thus identified with orderly action, ⟨reign of law⟩, and to whom a really irregular phenomenon would seem like a manifestation of sheer diabolism, foresees in every possible extension of knowledge a fresh confirmation of his faith in God. From this point of view there can be no antagonism between our duty as inquirers and our duty as worshippers. To him no part of the universe is godless. In the swaying to and fro of molecules and ceaseless pulsations of ether, in the secular shifting of planetary orbits, in the busy work of frost and raindrop, in the mysterious sprouting of the seed, in the everlasting tale of death and life renewed, in the dawning of *the* babe’s intelligence, in the varied deeds of men from age to age, he finds that which awakens the soul to reverential awe; and each act of scientific explanation but reveals an opening through which shines the glory of the Eternal Majesty. (Fiske, *Studies in Religion*, 167–68)

broken. The penalty must be paid. The majesty of law[†] has been violated; the law must be vindicated. It must be conceded that the law is just; for to suppose that the law itself is defective would be to challenge the whole moral system of the universe. If the law be conceded to be just, then its penalty must be executed by rigid enforcement ***or a propitiation made***: “The soul that sinneth, it shall die” (Ezek. 18:4).³

But the law must not be unjust; for injustice is not and cannot be law. And if in the nature of eternal things—such as a necessary opposition in all things, and the eternal existence of evil as well as of good be allowed, so that the good, the true, the beautiful and the harmonious may not be realized in the consciousness of intelligences but by setting into action the opposites of the good, the true, the beautiful, and the harmonious; and if the conditions to full equipment for eternal life and progress, such as eternally and deathlessly uniting elements of matter and spirits into immortal personages—then necessity would demand that such a program be inaugurated as would bring to pass the full achievement of these ends; and the obstacles which would hinder intelligences awaiting that opportunity for progression must be removed. And yet in bringing about these conditions, the violation of a law is involved—the law for the perpetuation of innocence. The fruit of the tree of knowledge, if eaten, will bring consciousness of evil as well as of good; and with that new and strange consciousness of evil, innocence will depart; the law on which her perpetuation depended has been violated. A new order of things will have to be brought in, a new order based upon a knowledge of good and evil. The new righteousness—for there must be righteousness—will be based upon virtue instead of upon mere innocence. It will be a righteousness founded upon experience, upon tested experimentation, an intelligent righteousness.^{††}

How harmony may be obtained in a reign of law. But again the violation of the law? How shall the harmony of a reign of law be maintained if a law be broken and no penalty inflicted which vindicates it?

[†]Wondering if Roberts overemphasized the role of law in the Atonement, the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve wondered if this chapter inferred that the law of Moses was an eternal law and asked: “The majesty of law—vindicated?” Reporting to President Clawson on October 10, 1929, George Albert Smith explained: “We feel that, inadvertantly [*sic*], the statement is made that the law of Moses was an eternal law. It was a temporary one.”

³The declaration is several times repeated in the same chapter, and the whole chapter should be studied to get the whole majesty of the doctrine.

^{††}The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve left a remark here: “Experimentation and righteousness?”

The consequences of violated law, however, did fall upon those guilty of the violation. Adam and Eve, by eating of the forbidden fruit, did come to the knowledge of good and evil and spiritual death—banishment from the presence of God—followed; and, in due time, physical death—the dissolving of the union of spirit and element—followed. Owing to the conditions under which they are born, these consequences fell also upon all the posterity of the first pair. So that the situation requires a vindication of the law[†] that there may be redemption for the race subject to its consequences. Let the developing thought of this paragraph at this point be suspended for the moment, until other data are brought into view.

The propitiation for sin. When God, according to ~~the Mosaic fragment~~—the book of Moses—was instructing Adam on the means provided for his redemption, Adam asked the question: “Why is it that men must repent and be baptized in water?” And the Lord answered: “Behold I have forgiven thee thy transgression in [the Garden of] Eden. Hence came the saying ⟨around⟩ [abroad] among the people,” says the sacred writer of the text, “that the Son of God hath atoned for original guilt,⁴ wherein the sins of the parents cannot be answered upon the heads of the children, for they are whole from the foundation of the world” (Moses 6:53–54), i.e., under the conditions provided, of course, by the Atonement. Taking this full text into account, it is evident that God had forgiven Adam his transgression in the Garden of Eden not arbitrarily as an act of sovereign will, but “because the Son of God hath atoned for original guilt.” Propitiation had been—or would be—made for “original guilt”—eating the forbidden fruit in Eden, which violated the law of innocence and of life. It brought forth the consciousness of guilt and the certainty of death, but “the Son of God hath atoned for original guilt”: he would satisfy the claims of the law. But how? By the Son of God, who was in the beginning with God and who was God, “being made flesh,” and dwelling among men, and in that human life keeping in behalf of man the law of absolute obedience to God. Living man’s life, but yielding to no temptation. Suffering, but not for his own transgressions, for he was without sin (Heb. 4:15; cf. 7:26). Such is the whole tenor of the scriptures respecting the Christ: “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve wondered about the phrase “vindication of law.”

⁴Or that he “would” atone for “original guilt” when the fulness of the time would have come; for necessarily the matter was at this time prophetic.

own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:3-4). This passage is undoubtedly to be understood as follows: For what man could not do under the law in that he was weak because of the flesh (human nature), God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh to do, and condemned sin in that he in the flesh kept the law of perfect obedience, and thus for sin condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in them who thereafter should walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.

"We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet ~~remained~~ without sin" (Heb. 4:15). "Christ also suffered . . . Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Pet. 2:21-22). "For he hath made him ~~the Christ~~ to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:21).

The Christ suffered for Adam's transgression, not for his own; and for the transgression of all men, for the sins of the world. He suffered for all men, that they might not suffer on certain conditions—***the condition of repentance, and acceptance of the Christ*** (D&C 19:16-17)—and that by reason of his stripes men might be healed (Isa. 53:1-5). He made "propitiation" for men's sins (1 Jn. 2:2), and thus satisfied the claims of the law to the uttermost even unto death—the death of the cross. But it was not "possible that he should be holden of it" (Acts 2:24), i.e., of death; for he was Lord of life and of death. He had power to lay down his life, and to take it up again: "I lay down my life for the sheep ~~men~~. . . . Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (John 10:15-18).

The Christ's suffering and death, then, wherein consists his sacrifice, will be voluntary. But since he may not "be holden of death," he will take up his life again in a resurrection from the dead; and so will all men ~~by this means~~, and ***that*** by the power of the Christ ***imparted unto them***; "For as in Adam ~~through one~~ all die, [even] so in Christ ~~by one~~ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. 15:22).

Man freed "from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2). It should ~~also~~ be observed, in passing, that in the matter of original sin, the Atonement of the Christ arrested the ***permanent*** visitation of that sin of the fathers upon the children: "Behold I have forgiven thee thy transgression

in the Garden of Eden,” said the Lord to Adam, “Hence came the saying . . . the Son of God hath atoned ⟨speaking prophetically⟩ for original guilt, wherein the sins of the parents cannot be answered upon the heads of the children, for they are whole from the foundation of the world” (Moses 6:53–54). That is to say, that while death as a result of Adam’s transgression will come upon all men, in that all must die, yet it will not be permanent, there is redemption from it, and free redemption; ~~that is~~, there is no condition precedent necessary to this redemption, **except only, of course, the Atonement made by the Christ**. For though death may have reigned from Adam to Moses, and from Moses until now, “over ⟨those who have⟩ [them that had] not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression,” yet “not as the offence, so also is the free gift. . . . And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one ⟨un⟩to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification” (Rom. 5:14–16). From all which it appears, that while death came as a result of Adam’s transgression, there came also free and universal redemption from death through the Atonement and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In view of this, the Church of the Latter-day Saints say in their summary of faith: “We believe that ⟨all⟩ men will be punished for their own sins, and *not* for Adam’s transgression” (A of F 2; emphasis added).

The Atonement infinite. Take note again that this Atonement is made by the Son of God, “who was in the beginning with God, and who was God.” It was, then, an Atonement made by God; and by virtue of that fact it was the highest atonement that could in any way be made—a supreme sacrifice indeed! And that is why, no doubt, it is so frequently referred to as “an infinite atonement.” It is a supreme sacrifice because it was made by a Deity, and because it also embraced all that could be given even by Deity; and that done, the law that was broken in Eden must stand vindicated at the bar of the reign of law.

As to whether the sacrifice by an innocent person can atone for the sin of a guilty one; or whether vicarious suffering for sin can be admitted in the scheme of things at all under a reign of law, I shall postpone the consideration of [that] to the last chapter dealing with this subject of **the** Atonement (chapter 45 below).

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Draper, *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*, ch. 9; Drummond, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, esp. introduction; Lodge, *Science and Immortality*, ch. 3; Spencer, *First Principles*, 53, 59, 203, 347 and note, 384, and 589–91; Tennyson, *In Memoriam*; White, *History of the Warfare of Science*, esp. vol. 1, ch. 4.

The Atonement III— Its Relation to the Attributes of God

The attributes ascribed to God. As the attributes of God are necessarily involved in the philosophy of the Atonement, we think it proper here to make brief allusion to them, especially to those more immediately involved in the Atonement. The attributes usually ascribed to God, either upon the ground of scripture or the supposed necessity of his nature, we shall consider as falling into two groups. First group, attributes of power: eternity, immutability, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, intelligence, wisdom; these seven attributes we shall consider as one group, out of which grows the power of God. The second group which we shall regard as the moral attributes, the spiritual forces or powers in the nature of God. **They** consist of holiness, truth, justice, mercy, love. Let it be remembered that in the main we are dependent upon God for our knowledge of him and his attributes, and therefore, we quote the scriptures freely in relation to him. And now a very brief description of the first group.

Attributes of power: 1. Eternity. By “eternity,” regarded as an attribute of God, is meant God’s eternal existence. We may not in rational thought assume a time when God was not—or when he did not exist. God’s eternity is sustained by such scripture as David’s 90th Psalm: “Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God” (Ps. 90:2). Also St. Paul bears the same witness:

And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. (Heb. 1:10-12)

2. Immutability. God’s “immutability,” his unchangeableness, is sustained in such passages of both ancient and modern scriptures as

follow: “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning” (James 1:17). “For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed” (Mal. 3:6).

For God doth not walk in crooked paths, neither doth he turn to the right hand nor to the left, neither doth he vary from that which he hath said, therefore his paths are straight, and his course is one eternal round. (D&C 3:2)

“Listen to the voice of the Lord your God, even Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, whose course is one eternal round, the same today as yesterday, and forever” (D&C 35:1). These remarks are subject to modification as noted under the discussion which follows this first group of attributes in a subsequent paragraph.

3. Omnipotence. By “omnipotence” is meant all-powerfulness. This attribute is essential to all rational thinking upon God. We may not think upon God and then think upon him as being overruled by a higher power, and still have him remain to our thought as God. The scriptures in their whole spirit present this view of the omnipotence of Deity.

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. . . . And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. . . . And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. (Gen. 1:1, 3, 9)

In this manner the work proceeds throughout the creation periods. Of this attribute David sings:

The heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Lord. . . . For who in the heaven can be compared unto the Lord? . . . O Lord God of hosts, who is a strong Lord like unto thee? . . . Thou rulest the raging of the sea: when the waves [thereof] arise, thou stillest them. . . . The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine: as for the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them. . . . Thou hast a mighty arm: strong is thy hand, and high is thy right hand. (Ps. 89:5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13)

To the same effect sang Isaiah (Isa. 11:10–15); also Jeremiah (Jer. 27:17), and Daniel (Dan. 4:35).

In the New Testament, the Christ teaches that “with God all things are possible” (Matt. 19:26); and negatively, “with God nothing shall be impossible” (Luke 1:37). The Revelation uses the term “omnipotent” direct: “And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and [as] the voice of ⟨the⟩ mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth” (Rev. 19:6).¹

¹Also Smith, *Lectures on Faith*, lecture 3; so too in *the Book of Mormon*, Mosiah 3:17–18, 21.

4. *Omniscience*. By “omniscience” is meant all-knowing. “Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world,” said the Holy Spirit-inspired council of the apostles and elders of the early Christian church (Acts 15:18).

Remember the former things of old: [for] I am God, and there is none else; . . . Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure. (Isa. 46:9–10)

A sparrow falls not without the Father’s notice (Matt. 10:29).

5. *Omnipresence*.^a “Omnipresence” means everywhere present; and perhaps the best description of this attribute of God is in David’s passage—

Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely [the] darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee. (Ps. 139:7–12)

“Will God indeed dwell on the earth?” asked Solomon, in dedicating the first temple, “behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded” (1 Kings 8:27). And Paul, in teaching the nearness of God to men, said that God had “made of one blood all nations of men” and had given to all the privilege of seeking “the Lord, if ⟨happily⟩ [haply] they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us: For in him we live, and move, and have our being” (Acts 17:26–28).

Under the attribute of “omnipotence”—all powerful—I include “power,” which is sometimes, and usually, treated separately as an attribute of God: And under “omniscience” I include “knowledge,” which is also usually regarded separately as an attribute of Deity; but both these terms—“power” and “knowledge”—may very appropriately fall under the larger terms—“omnipotence” and “omniscience.”

6. *Intelligence*. In reasoning with Abraham upon the intelligences in heaven, and the fact that they varied in degree of intelligence, the Lord said that where there were two intelligences and the one was more intelligent than the other, “there shall be another more intelligent than they; I am the Lord thy God, I am more intelligent than they all” (Abr. 3:17–19). By which is meant, as we think, not that God is more

^aRoberts left an instruction that the sections on omnipresence and intelligence were to be transposed, and that direction has been followed.

intelligent than any other one of the intelligences, but more intelligent than all of them together. On this head the Prophet of the New Dispensation gave to the world that wonderful announcement, all-comprehensive in its greatness, glorifying God as no other sentence in the language in all the ages has ever glorified him, saying: "The glory of God is intelligence" (D&C 93:36). This is the force and the power that holds in right balance and union all the attributes of God, in their application and in the working out of the purposes of God.

7. *Wisdom.* Wisdom that arises from knowledge seems essentially an attribute of Deity; as well from the nature of the attributes as from the declaration of scripture. God as unwise is unthinkable; unpossessed of this attribute, he could not appeal to the consciousness of man as God at all. Therefore it is agreeable to think with Elihu in Job, that God "is mighty in strength and wisdom" (Job 36:5). Also with David: "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches" (Ps. 104:24). And again David: "Great is our Lord, and of great power: his understanding is infinite" (Ps. 147:5). So Paul: "To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever" (Rom. 16:27); "The wisdom of \langle the \rangle [this] world is foolishness with God" (1 Cor. 3:19); He says, again so high above the wisdom of men does he esteem the wisdom of God; that even "the foolishness of God is wiser than men" (1 Cor. 1:25). We may fittingly close his testimony with his prayer: "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen" (1 Tim. 1:17).

Worth to go with this testimony is that of Joseph Smith, in which is found the same spiritual music: "The Lord is God, and beside him there is no Savior. Great is his wisdom, marvelous are his ways, and the extent of his doings none can find out. His purposes fail not, neither are there any who can stay his hand" (D&C 76:1-4).

Comments on the limitations in the attributes of God. We may now consider somewhat the limitations of the attributes so far named.

The eternity of God may be regarded as absolute. "I Am that I Am" (Ex. 3:14), the Eternal One, the Self-existent, admits of no modification. His immutability should be regarded as stability, adherence to principle. What stands among men under the name of "constitutional morality," fixed devotion to law; and working through law to achievement of his divine purposes, rather than by caprice, or by arbitrary, personal action. But God's immutability should not be so understood as to exclude the idea of advancement or progress even of God. Thus, for example: God's kingdom and glory may be enlarged, as more and more redeemed souls

are added to his kingdom: as worlds and world-systems are multiplied and redeemed and enrolled with celestial spheres, so God's kingdom is enlarged and his glory increased. So that in this sense there may come chance, enlargement, and progress even for God. Hence we could not say of God's immutability as we do of his eternity that it is absolute, since there may come change through progress even for God; but an absolute immutability would require eternal immobility—which would reduce God to a condition eternally static, which, from the nature of things, would bar him from participation in that enlargement of kingdoms and increasing glory that comes from redemption and the progress of men. And is it too bold a thought, that with this progress, even for the mightiest, new thoughts, and new vistas may appear, inviting to new adventures and enterprises that will yield new experiences, advancement, and enlargement, even for the Most High.² It ought to be constantly remembered that terms absolute to man may be relative terms to God, so far above our thinking is his thinking; and his ways above our ways.

²On this point Sir Oliver Lodge has a passage at once advanced and bold, and yet for which he claims Christian warrant. It is, however, far removed from modern Christian orthodoxy, though splendidly true:

The universe is not a "being" but a "becoming"—an ancient but (light-burning) [light-bringing] doctrine when realized,—it is in change, in development, in movement, upward and downward, that activity consists. A stationary condition, or stagnation, would to us be simple non-existence; the element of progression, of change, of activity, must be as durable as the universe itself. Monotony, in the sense of absolute immobility, is unthinkable, unreal, and cannot anywhere exist: save where things have ceased to be.

Such ideas, the ideas of development and progress, extend even up to God Himself, according to the Christian conception. So we return to that with which we started: the Christian idea of God is not that of a being outside the universe, above its struggles and advances, looking on and taking no part in the process, *solely* exalted, beneficent, self-determined and complete; no, it is also that of a God who loves, who yearns, who suffers, who keenly laments the rebellious and misguided activity of the free agents brought into being by Himself as part of Himself, who enters into the storm and conflict, and is subject to conditions as the Soul of it all; conditions not artificial and transitory, but inherent in the process of producing free and conscious beings, and essential to the full self-development even of Deity.

It is a marvelous and bewildering thought, but whatever its value, and whether it be an ultimate revelation or not, it is the revelation of Christ. (Lodge, *Science and Immortality*, 292)

The attribute “omnipotence” must needs be thought upon also as somewhat limited. Even God, notwithstanding the ascription to him of all-powerfulness in such scripture phrases as “with God all things are possible” (Matt. 19:26), “with God nothing shall be impossible” (Luke 1:37)—notwithstanding all this, ~~we~~ I say, not even God may have two mountain ranges without a valley between. Not even God may place himself beyond the boundary of space: nor on the outside of duration. Nor is it conceivable to human thought that he can create space, or annihilate matter. These are things that limit even God’s omnipotence. What then, is meant by the ascription of the attribute omnipotence to God? Simply that all that may or can be done by power conditioned by other eternal existences—duration, space, matter, truth, justice, reign of law, God can do. But even he may not act out of harmony with the other eternal existences which condition or limit even him.

So with the all-knowing attribute, omniscience: that must be understood somewhat in the same light as the other attributes just considered: not that God is omniscient up to the point that further progress in knowledge is impossible to him; but that all *the* knowledge that is, all that exists, God knows. All that shall be he will know. The universe is not so much “a being” as a “becoming,” an unfolding. Much more is yet to be. God will know it as it “becomes,” or as it unfolds; for he is universal consciousness, and mind—he is the “All Knowing One” because he knows all that is known, and all that shall yet be to become known—he will know it.[†]

“Omnipresence” is the everywhere present attribute. This must be so far limited as to be ascribed to God’s Spirit, or influence, or power,

[†]Raising a point that has remained somewhat open in LDS doctrine, the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve expressed a desire that Roberts be less definitive about the nature of God’s progression with respect to knowledge: “Progression of God in knowledge. This thought is not accepted by members of the committee. We do not feel that it is wise to express a thought limiting God in this manner, which will cause needless controversy. While we believe in eternal progression and that God is progressing, it is not in quest of hidden truth or laws yet undiscovered to Deity. We prefer to believe with Nephi: ‘O how great the holiness of our God! For he knoweth all things, and there is not anything save he knows it’ (2 Ne. 9:20). Moreover, we believe that his progress is because of his knowledge and that he is the author of law (D&C 88:42).” Here also, Roberts wrote: **Meaningless**. Reporting to President Clawson, George Albert Smith explained: “What is the need of stating that God is progressing in knowledge? In other words that there are laws and eternal truths, which he does not know? This will only lead to controversy and needless discussion and argument, and no purpose accomplished. In the judgment of the committee the statement should not be made. There are scriptures which contradict this thought.”

but may not be affirmed of God as a person or individual, for in these latter respects even God is limited by the law that one body cannot occupy two places at one and the same time. But radiating from his presence, as beams of light and warmth radiate from our sun, is God's Spirit, penetrating and permeating space, making space and all worlds in space vibrate with his life and thought and presence; holding all forces—dynamic and static—under control, making them to subserve his will and purposes.

God also uses other agencies to reflect himself, his power or authority: also his wisdom, goodness, justice and mercy—angels and arch-angels, both in heaven and on earth; and in the earth prophets, apostles, teachers—all that make for up-lift, for righteousness; all that catch some ray of the Divine Spirit in poem, music, painting, sculpture, state-craft or mechanical arts—all these but reflect God and are a means of multiplying and expressing him, the Divine. And in some special way, as witness for God, and under very special conditions, the Holy Ghost, that Being accounted the third person of the Godhead—he reflects and stands for God, his power, and his wisdom, his justice, truth, and mercy—for all that can be, or is called God, or is God. All these means, direct and indirect, convey God into the universe, and keep him everywhere present in all his essentials of wisdom, power and goodness, while his bodily presence remains as the moving center of it all.

Moral and spiritual attributes of God. There is yet to be considered the second group of attributes: holiness, truth, justice, mercy, love; and these are the attributes which are more immediately involved in the doctrine of the Atonement.

1. Holiness. "Holiness" as an attribute of God, is equally indispensable as any other of the attributes of Deity. Equally unthinkable is it that Deity should not possess it, as it is that he should not possess intelligence or wisdom. No marvel that Moses sang, "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? . . . glorious in holiness" (Ex. 15:11). "I am the Lord your God: . . . ye shall be holy; for I am holy" (Lev. 11:44) was God's word to ancient Israel. Throughout the scriptures God is spoken of as the "Holy One of Israel." "Thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises <in> [of] Israel" (Ps. 22:3). "Sing unto the Lord . . . at the remembrance of his holiness" (Ps. 30:4). "God that is holy shall be sanctified in righteousness" (Isa. 5:16). "And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory" (Isa. 6:3). Both the Old and the New Testaments are replete with the doctrine. In one of the prophets it is written: "O Lord, . . .

Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity" (Hab. 1:12-13). And again in the scripture: "I the Lord cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance" (D&C 1:31);³ which perhaps more than any other utterance of holy writ, asserts the holiness of God.

2. *Truth.* The attribute of "truth" is ascribed to God; and here we again come in touch with the absolute, as when speaking of God's eternity. God can be no other than the absolute in this quality. An untruthful God! The thought is blasphemy! "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent" (Num. 23:19). "Mercy and truth shall go before thy face" (Ps. 89:14). "A God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he" (Deut. 32:4). "Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth" (Ps. 31:5). "Abundant in goodness and truth" (Ex. 34:6). So our modern scriptures: "God doth not walk in crooked paths, neither doth he turn to the right hand nor [to] the left, neither doth he vary from that which he hath said, therefore his paths are straight, and his course is one eternal round" (D&C 3:2). It cannot be emphasized too strongly—God is a God of truth; and does not, and **could** not lie without ceasing to be God. It would wreck the moral universe for God to lie. He must be, he is truth! "A God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he" (Deut. 32:4).

3. *Justice.* "Justice," as an attribute, is of the same quality as the attribute of "truth"—it must be conceived as absolute in Deity. God not just! The thought would be unbearable. Of course we have scripture warrant for the doctrine: "Justice and judgement are the habitation of thy throne" (Ps. 89:14). "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour" (Isa. 45:21). "The just Lord is in the midst thereof" (Zeph. 3:5). "Behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation" (Zech. 9:9).

4. *Mercy.* "Mercy" as an attribute of God is in a class with truth and justice and holiness. A God without compassion—only another name for mercy—would be a monstrosity. No, God must be merciful! Else what shall become of man? God not merciful! It is unthinkable, that is all. "Mercy and truth shall go before thy face," is the testimony of the Psalmist (Ps. 89:14). "And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious" (Ex. 34:6). "But thou art a God ready to pardon, gracious and merciful" (Neh. 9:17).

³"Nevertheless," continues the passage, "he that repents and does the commandments of the Lord shall be forgiven" (D&C 1:32), showing that while God may not compromise with sin by looking upon it with any "degree of allowance," yet he has compassion upon the sinner who repents.

5. *Love.* “Love!” The crowning glory of all the attributes of God! We may revel in this attribute. “He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love” (1 Jn. 4:8). “God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him” (1 Jn. 4:16). “Every one that loveth is born of God” (1 Jn. 4:7).

In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 Jn. 4:9-10)

“God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16).

The harmony of God’s moral and spiritual attributes. These attributes of the second group, as well as those considered in the first group, must be thought upon as constituting a harmony; those—the first group—in harmony with the existences as real and eternal as ~~themselves~~ **the attributes**; and these—the second group—in a harmony within or among themselves. Thus justice may not deny the claims of mercy. Mercy may not rob justice. Even love may not allow God to intrude upon justice, or wisdom, or truth. At the same time it must be remembered that mercy and love, no less than justice, are attributes of God, and somehow and somewhere must find entrance into the divine economy, must get themselves expressed and that worthily; worthy of their intrinsic nature and value, and worthy of God in whom they inhere in perfection, and all in perfect balance. And while “all must be law”; all must also be “love”—i.e., in harmony with love; for God, from first to last, is love. The attributes of God must be preserved in perfect accord if the moral and spiritual harmony of the universe is to be maintained. And the matters relating to man must conform to the moral and spiritual attributes of God, or they cannot be conceived as substantially placed, and eternally secure. It is these considerations which unite the attributes of God with the subject of the Atonement. If God’s moral government of the universe is, like his physical government, one of law, then law, not personal, arbitrary caprice, will and must rule. And if God’s attributes constitute a moral and spiritual harmony, and are united perfectly with his attributes of power and majesty—then again in the devising of any scheme for redemption of men from the consequences of the violation of law, that scheme must take into account the attributes of God; and plan its scheme of “salvation” in accordance with the attributes of Deity and their harmonious action and reaction upon one another.

It may be thought that our exposition of the attributes of God in this chapter is unnecessarily elaborate, especially since but two or three paragraphs are devoted directly to a treatment of their relationship to the Atonement; but I am sure that a realization through consciousness of the majesty and beauty, and glory of those attributes, is necessary to a full appreciation of their relations to the Atonement, hence the space devoted to their consideration; and I offer it as all worthwhile.

The relationship of the Atonement to the attributes of God. We have already said in the chapter preceding this, that it is the quality of the inexorableness in law that made the Atonement of the Christ necessary; and now at the conclusion of the considerations of the attributes of God—which are his perfections—they also make the Atonement of the Christ necessary to the salvation of man if harmony be maintained *within* them. For the perfections of God's attributes correspond precisely with a reign of perfect law. Maintenance of the harmony of God's attributes and maintenance of a reign of perfect law is essentially the same thing; for each demands that when there is a transgression there shall be an atonement for it; which is but the vindication of the law, in the one case; and reaction to the harmony of the attributes of God in the other. So when the attributes of God are brought to bear on the squaring human conduct with either a reign of law or the attributes of God, the quality of the attributes, say of wisdom and justice, mercy and love, and their harmonious relations must needs be so taken into account that any adjustment that can make redemption from the consequences of a broken law possible, must be of a character that will make no break in the sustained harmony and interplay of God's attributes, as well as in the maintenance of perfection in the application of mercy and justice and love in a reign of law.

These are the considerations which make the ethic of the gospel so absolute. "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith" (Rom. 1:17). The only way to achieve an absolute standard of "oughtness" of righteousness, is to accept the immutable ethic founded upon the attributes of God, as the true standard of the law of righteousness.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: *Oxford and Cambridge Bible Helps*, concordance; Smith, *Six Lectures on Faith*; Wright, concordance, in *Bible Treasury*. For a discussion about the implications of Roberts's ideas concerning the attributes of God, see pages 626–28 below.

The Atonement IV— Could Other Means Than the Atonement Have Brought to Pass Man's Salvation?

The question proposed. The next question to be considered is: could any other means than the Atonement of Christ have been devised to bring to pass man's salvation? Let it be kept in mind what that term means—salvation. The declaration of the Christ concerning his mission was, “the Son of man is come to save that which was lost” (Matt. 18:11). And we have already in previous chapters shown what it was that was lost: (1) man's spiritual life, his union with God; (2) man's physical life, separation of spirit and body. And so, when considering the means of restoring that which was lost, we must have in mind these two things.

Our present inquiry is, could this salvation have been secured by any other means than the Atonement made by the Christ? Perhaps a brief summary of some of the principles previously discussed will help us approach this important theme more understandingly. We say “important” because many doubt the necessity of the Atonement and argue that if a forgiveness of Adam's transgression in Eden was needed, or if man's individual sins need a pardon, then God of his sovereign will, without any expiation for the one or the other of these sins, could have forgiven these transgressions. And now the proposed summary.

Summary of principles affecting the Atonement. Violations of law, whether ignorantly done, or deliberately planned, even for right ends, destroy the steady maintenance of law, and also involve the transgressors in the penalties inseparately [*sic*] connected with law and without which law would be of no force at all.

For this chapter, the suggested initial scripture assignment includes: “All four books of our scriptures, Bible, Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants and Pearl of Great Price—passim: diligent use of indexes and cross references therein.”

A reign of law subsists throughout the universe, as well in the moral and spiritual kingdoms as in the physical world; this perfect reign of law, and reign of perfect law, is in strict harmony with and the concomitant of God's perfect attributes.

The attributes of God, complete as they are and perfect, must exist in harmony with each other, no one supplanting another or intruding upon its domain.

Any manifestations of mercy or special providence, prompted even by love, must not violate the conception of the universal reign of law or justice; or violate the harmony subsisting in the attributes of Deity.

Love and mercy, however, must also enter into the economy of the earth[ly] order of things; they must get themselves in some way worthily expressed. No divine economy can exist without them and without expression of them. Justice cries aloud for their presence in the divine government.

To get love and mercy adequately expressed in the earthly order of things, in harmony with all the attributes of God present and active, and in harmony with a universal reign of law, is the burden and mission of the Christ through the Atonement. And now to take up our present inquiry.

The testing place and period. According to what is set forth in previous pages, God has created our earth and provided for the existence of man upon it. He designs man's earth life to be a testing period for man. His aim is to provide a means of eternal progression. His words in the great council where this purpose was planned, are—speaking of the spirits that were to come to the earth as men: “And we will prove them herewith, to see if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them” (Abr. 3:25). And those who would prove their integrity by their obedience were to “have glory added upon their heads for ever and ever” (Abr. 3:26). In other words, a pathway was to be opened to them for eternal progress. To open such a highway, however, it is necessary to create a testing period in the midst of broken harmonies. We say this is necessary, and we emphasize that word “necessary” up to the standard of being absolute, and this necessity becomes the pivot on which this whole idea of atonement turns. The end proposed by the Lord God cannot be achieved in any other way than *through* a temporal life, for the manifestation of the necessary opposition in all things. To bring that to pass, “necessity” demanded the “fall” of man, attended by the ~~falling of the~~ *veiling of* ~~over~~ his memory between his spirit life and his earth life, that he might learn to walk by faith, to master the lessons that broken harmonies have

to teach, that he may learn important truths acquired by actual experience in seeing things as through a glass darkly and in conflict; learning to know things also by seeing them in sharp contrast: light and darkness, truth and error, joy and sorrow, sickness and health, life and death, and so on throughout the whole category of antinomies which earth experience has to teach. To get all this expressed and man brought into contact with it, harmonious conditions must be violated, to produce which law must be broken and hence the “Fall.”

In that “fall,” however, law is broken and penalties must be enforced, else the reign of law is at an end. ~~or it is a mockery.~~ Its integrity is destroyed unless penalties follow. The penalties made and provided in this case, however, do follow. Those penalties are found in the events actually following the “Fall”: “in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Gen. 2:17). And that is what happened. Union with God was severed. This was spiritual death; and it happened as God decreed it would, in the day that man partook of the fruit that was forbidden. Later came the second part of the penalty: men began to die physically. Nine hundred thirty years after the “Fall,” Adam died. And having begotten children while in mortality, they became heirs to that mortality, and death has reigned in the earth from Adam until now. The race has found in its experience the decree of God to be true. Man’s physical life consists of a union of spirit and element; man’s body is of the dust, and—true to the decree of God in the event of disobedience—to dust it returns.

The law given as to an immortal being. It should be observed also that this commandment given to man is addressed, of course, to his understanding, to the intelligent entity; therefore, to the already immortal part of man, to the thing within him which cannot die! “All things,” says the Prophet of the New Dispensation,

whatsoever God of his infinite wisdom has seen fit and proper to reveal to us, while we are dwelling in mortality, in regard to our mortal bodies, are revealed to us in the abstract and independent of affinity of this mortal tabernacle; but are revealed to our spirits precisely as though we had no bodies at all; and those revelations which will save our spirits will save our bodies. God reveals them to us in view of no eternal dissolution of the body, or tabernacle.¹

¹Sermon at April Conference, Nauvoo, 1844, known as the “King Follett Sermon,” published in *Journal of Discourses* 6:7. Also in *Improvement Era* 13 (January 1909): 169-91; and now in pamphlet form by the Magazine Printing Co., 1926.

And again the Lord said to this prophet:

Not at any time have I given unto you a law which was temporal; neither . . . Adam, your father, whom I created. Behold, I gave unto him that he should be an agent unto himself; and I gave unto him commandment, but no temporal commandment gave I unto him, for my commandments are spiritual; they are not natural nor temporal, neither carnal nor sensual. (D&C 29:34–35)

Such then was the commandment of God to Adam, a commandment addressed to an eternal intelligent being; the penalty as well as the commandment, being part of the law, was so addressed to him.

What can man or God do in the face of these conditions? And now, in the presence of these facts, what can man do to mend this breach in the law? What can God do? Forgive man his transgression out of hand, as becomes the true sovereign of the universe? An ancient, and, we could well say, a time-honored suggestion. Origen, the theologian of the third Christian century, and held to be the greatest Christian mind of the Ante-Nicene age, held forth the possibility of such procedure. For, in his view,

the remission of sin is made to depend upon arbitrary will, without reference to retributive justice, as is ⟨evidenced⟩ [evinced] by his ⟨version⟩ [assertion] that God might have chosen milder means to save man, than he did; e.g., that he might by a sovereign act of his will have made the sacrifices of the Old Testament to suffice for an atonement for man's sin.²

"But logic," says Shedd's commentary on Origen's doctrine, "could not stop at this point." For if the provision for ratifying the broken law "is resolved into an *optional* act on the part of God, it follows that . . . an atonement might be dispensed with altogether." "For," he continues, "the same arbitrary and almighty will that was competent to declare the claims of justice to be satisfied by the finite sacrifice of bulls and goats would be competent, also, to declare that those claims should receive no satisfaction at all."³

The views of Origen are all the more surprising from the fact that the Epistle to the Hebrews makes clear all the inadequacy of the sacrificing of animals for the satisfaction of the claims of justice for man's transgression of the law (Heb. 9–10). On this point the Book of

²Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine* 2:234. He cites Redepenning, *Origenes* 2:409 for his authority.

³Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine*, 10th ed., 2:260–61.

Mormon prophet Alma [*sic*; Amulek is speaking], among the greatest of the ancient American prophets, is very clear:

Behold, I say unto you, that I do know that Christ shall come among the children of men, to take upon him the transgressions of his people, and that he shall atone for the sins of the world; for the Lord God hath spoken it. For it is expedient *<necessary>* that an atonement should be made; for according to the great plan of the Eternal God there must be an atonement made, or else all mankind must unavoidably perish *<i.e. remain in the condition that the “Fall” of Adam brought upon them—alienated from God, under the doom of spiritual death—and subject also to physical death>*; yea, all are hardened; yea, all are fallen and are lost, and must perish except it be through the atonement which it is expedient *<necessary>* should be made. For it is expedient that there should be a great and last sacrifice; yea, not a sacrifice of man, neither of beast, neither of any manner of fowl; for it shall not be a human sacrifice; but it must be an infinite and eternal sacrifice. . . . And behold, this is the whole meaning of the law *<i.e., of Moses, in which only symbols of the true sacrifice obtained>*, every whit pointing to that great and last sacrifice; and that great and last sacrifice will be the Son of God, yea, infinite and eternal. (Alma 34:8–10, 14)

It should be remembered that the doctrine of the reign of law in the moral and spiritual government of the world excludes arbitrary action—action independent of law—even though beneficent; and if this as to a reign of law in the spirit world were not true, even then God must act in harmony with his own attributes. Mercy must not be at variance with justice. Even God’s omnipotence must conform to the attributes of truth and wisdom, *and justice and mercy*. Satisfaction for violated law, satisfaction for divine justice, is a claim that may no more be set aside than the pleadings of mercy. A way shall be found out of these difficulties, but it must not be by a “schism in the Deity,” or a conflict among the divine attributes.

Mere Arbitrary power may not nullify law. It can be readily understood that not even God’s omnipotence could make it possible for him to act contrary to truth and justice. It ought to be no more difficult to understand that God’s omnipotence would not permit him to set aside a satisfaction to justice, any more than to grant an arbitrary concession to mercy. Mere power has not the right to nullify law, nor even omnipotence the right to abolish justice. Might in deity is not more fundamental than right. God, we must conclude, will act in harmony with all his attributes, else confusion in the moral government of the world.

These reflections lead to the inevitable conclusion that there must be a satisfaction made to justice before there can be redemption for man. They also lead to the conclusion that the necessity of expiation in order to pardon both Adam's transgression, and secure forgiveness of man's individual sins, arise[s] from the nature of the case, an existing reign of law, and harmonious reactions to the attributes of God, and not from arbitrary action. Justice is of such an absolute character that it would be as impossible to save the guilty without an antecedent satisfaction to God's attribute of justice as it would be for God to lie; and for God to lie would wreck the moral government of the universe, and result—if such a thing were possible—in his dethronement.

If other means were possible—? We have already seen that the necessity for the Atonement is established by an appeal to the revelations of God. The absolute necessity of the Atonement as it stands would further appear by the confidence one feels that if milder means could have been made to answer as an atonement, or if the satisfaction to justice could have been set aside, or if man's reconciliation with the divine order of things could have been brought about by an act of pure benevolence without other consideration, it undoubtedly would have been done; for it is inconceivable that either God's justice or his mercy would require or permit more suffering on the part of the Redeemer than was absolutely necessary to accomplish the end proposed. Any suffering beyond that which was absolutely necessary would be cruelty, pure and simple, and unthinkable in a God of perfect justice and mercy.

Much has been said, and much that is vicious has been said, about the severity of the suffering of the Christ in the Atonement; and all the more because he who is sacrificed is innocent of any transgression, and suffered vicariously for man, all which seems to make the Christ's part so pitiful. It is through suffering, however, and pain, that men are most powerfully moved and influenced, so that suffering possesses highly influential appeal. Says Oxenham:

Pain is one of the deepest and truest things in our nature; we feel instinctively that it is so, even before we can tell why. Pain is what binds us most closely to one another and to God. It appeals most directly to our sympathies, as the very structure of our language indicates. To go no further than our own, we have English words, such as condolence, to express sympathy with grief; we have no one word to express sympathy with joy. So, again, it is a common remark that, if a funeral and wedding procession were to meet, something of the shadow of death would be cast over the bridal train, but no reflection of bridal happiness would pass into the mourners' hearts.

Scripture itself has been not inaptly called “a record of human sorrow.” The same name might be given to history. Friendship is scarcely sure till it has been proved in suffering, but the chains of an affection riveted in the fiery furnace are not easily broken. So much then at least is clear, that the Passion of Jesus was the greatest revelation of His sympathy; “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.” And hence fathers (i.e., of the Christian church) and schoolmen alike conspire to teach, that one reason why He (God) chose the road of suffering was to knit us more closely to Himself. For this He exalted His head, not on a throne of earthly glory, but on the cross of death. It is, indeed, no accident of the few, but a law of our present being, which the poet’s words express:

“That to the *Cross* the mourner’s eye should turn
Sooner than where the stars of Christmas burn.”⁴

For all, in their several ways and degrees, are mourners. The dark threads are woven more thickly than the bright ones into the tangled skein of human life; and as time passes on, the conviction that it is so is brought home to us with increasing force.

The Christ doubtless was aware of the force that attached to suffering when he, contemplating his mission, said: “And I, if I be lifted up . . . will draw all men unto me” (John 12:32). “Crowns of roses fade, crowns of thorns endure.” “(The) [A] man of sorrows” and *the* one “acquainted with grief” (Isa. 53:3), who knows the pain and struggle of the universe, is more powerful than the man of joys only, and the death of the testator *alone only* is accepted as the effectual seal to the testimony of the testator.

Helplessness of man under broken law. Admittedly man, as the transgressor of law, is powerless to make satisfaction to the law. True it is conceivable that he might repent of his transgression, and through struggle may maintain himself in righteousness for the future, but that does not reach the past. If he should by struggle maintain himself in righteousness for the future, that is no more than he ought to do; man owes that duty every day in the present and in the future; and also he owed it as his duty in the past. It is the breach in the law that must be mended. Man is under the sentence of death for a past transgression of the law of God, keeping the law is his duty in the present, and will be his duty in the future, and will not make satisfaction for the past. Man is helpless in the presence of that broken law; no act of his can

⁴Oxenham, *Doctrine of the Atonement* (1869), 290–92, quoted by Baring-Gould in *Origin of Religious Beliefs* 2:307–8.

atone for his own individual sins, nor for the transgression of Adam, or stay the effects of the “Fall” upon the race, or redeem them from the penalty of death. Man has started something by his transgression and by begetting a race that is mortal. He cannot arrest the progress of it; the mischief is larger than his power to undo. Adam’s sin was against a divine law, and the “first judgment,” as one of the Nephite prophets expresses it—“the first judgment which came upon man ⟨the judgment of death, spiritual and physical⟩ must needs have remained to an endless duration. And if so, this flesh must have laid down to rot . . . to rise no more” (2 Ne. 9:7). Again: because of the Fall of Adam, “all mankind were fallen, and they were in the grasp of justice; yea, the justice of ⟨law⟩ [God], which consigned them forever to be cut off from ⟨God’s⟩ [his] presence” (Alma 42:14). And also they were subject to ~~the~~ physical death.

*The capacity to do, as well as willingness to do, **needful**.* To redeem man from this condition must be the work of one who has the power to do it. It is not only a matter of willingness, but a matter also of capacity to do it. The effects of the sin, unless some means of escape should be found, are eternal; and in this, “like must meet like, and measure answer measure.” As just suggested, it is a question of power, of capacity. Not only must there be made satisfaction to eternal justice, but there must be the power of deity exercised if man is to be saved from death; there must be a power of life so that that which was lost may be restored, both as to the spiritual life of man and the physical life. A restoration through union of the spirit to the body, on which, as we have seen in preceding chapters, the joy and progress that God has designed for man depends. Man, it should be always remembered, in the greater fact of him, is spirit, but it requires “spirit and element ⟨inseparately⟩ [inseparably] connected” in order to receive a fulness of joy (D&C 93:33–34). Hence the importance of man’s physical life, the union of his deathless spirit with a body that is to be made equally immortal; and since the Fall brought to man this physical death, as well as the spiritual death, his redemption to be complete must reestablish that physical life by reuniting the essential elements of the body of man and his spirit, through a resurrection from the dead, and the Atonement and the power of it must be as universal as the Fall; as in Adam all die, so through the Redeemer of men must all be made alive (1 Cor. 15:22). The Atonement must be sufficient for all this; and this, doubtless, is what our Nephite prophets mean when they say, in speaking of the Atonement, “it must needs be an infinite atonement” (2 Ne. 9:7; see also 2 Ne. 25:16; Alma 34:12). The Redeemer must be a Lord of Life,

hence deity. He must not only have the power of life within himself, but the power to impart it to others—a Godlike power! And to inspire faith in his possession of such power, the manner of the Atonement must be such as to include demonstration of that fact, else how shall man have faith in him? All these considerations left the Redeemer and the Atonement that must be made far above man and what man can do. Truly the redemption of man is to be the work of God—by his power—hence, truly, “the gospel . . . is the power of God unto salvation” (Rom. 1:16).

The Atonement a voluntary act. Scripture warrant for the above is abundant. “I lay down my life for the sheep ⟨men⟩. . . . Therefore doth my Father love me,” said the Christ, “because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father” (John 10:15–18).

“Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.” He spake of the temple of his body—“When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them” (John 2:19, 22).

“Thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day” (Luke 24:46).

“In him was life; and the life was the light of men” (John 1:4).

Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. (John 5:25–29)

Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. (John 5:19–21)

But to return now to the thought that “God” must make atonement for man’s transgression in order to have it adequate, it will be necessary to keep in mind that Jesus the Savior is God, the Son of God, and God as Atoner. There is that which smacks of justice in a god

making the atonement. A god proposed the whole plan. His plan for man's progress could only be accomplished by breaking the world's harmonies. There was no other way. It had to be. Necessity dominated in the case, and God so desired that man should have this opportunity for progress, and he so loved man that if man himself would take his part of the risk, God's covenant with him was that his Son, who also was God, would make the necessary atonement; and hence the covenant of eternal life was made, as Paul says, "before the world began" (Titus 1:2). We come back to that thought, namely, that a god must make the atonement, with increased conviction after considering the element of "power" or "capacity" to do the thing, to make the atonement; the ability to restore that which was lost, life spiritual and life physical. The work truly of deity, not of man; a Lord of Life—"God himself must redeem man." That, or justice must take its course and man be left to satisfy justice in endless misery under the sentence of law, without union with God, and without physical, immortal life, the thing necessary to his progress. Justice must not be left to take its course, else a greater injustice will be done to man who was promised eternal life if he would enter into the scheme of things proposed by God, for his progression.

Moreover, the atonement must be made by deity, living man's life, enduring man's temptations, yet remaining without sin, that the sacrifice might be without spot or blemish; just as the animals used in ancient times as the types indicating the sacrifices were not only to be the firstlings of the flock—firstborn of the flock—but without spot or blemish. He must give the world its illustration and demonstration of the one perfect life. A life in which "the will" shall be wholly subjected to the will of God, the Father (Mosiah 15:7). The atonement must be made by a deity who shall die man's death; but who shall not be holden of it; but break its bands, and demonstrate the power of the resurrection of which he will be the first fruits, and ever after the Lord of Life and the power of the resurrection (Alma 34:10).

In view of all that is here set forth, it must be clear that no other means than the Atonement of the Christ, as it was made, could have been devised for the salvation of man.

The severity of the Atonement considered. Here is doubtless the place where a further word may most appropriately be said in relation to the severity of the Atonement already mentioned in this chapter. And this with reference to what the Atonement purchased for man, and the effect it was doubtless designed to have in forever fixing in the minds of men the values upon certain great things.

Hereafter, and because of the Atonement, we must have exalted conceptions of the value of that stately fabric known as the moral government of the world, for it was for the preservation of its integrity that the Christ suffered and died.

When the plan of redemption is contemplated with reference to what it cost the Christ, then we must have exalted notions ever after of the majesty and justice of God, for it was to make ample satisfaction to that majesty and justice of God that the Christ suffered and died.

We must set a higher value even upon physical life hereafter, for it was in order to bring to pass the resurrection of man to physical life, and to make that life immortal, that the Christ suffered and died.

New glory must attach hereafter to spiritual life—perpetual union between soul of man and soul of God, for it was to bring to pass that spiritual life, that indissoluble union with God on which it depends for existence, that the Christ suffered and died.

We must henceforth have a higher regard for God's attribute of mercy, for it was that mercy might be brought into the earth-scheme of things, and claim her own, that *the* Christ suffered and died (Alma 42:15).

We must have a deeper reverence for the love of God and the love of Christ for man, and a higher regard for man himself since God so loved him—for it was to give a manifestation of that love, that the Christ suffered and died (John 3:16).

If it be true, and it is, that men value things in proportion to what they cost, then how dear to them must be the Atonement, since it cost the Christ so much in suffering that he may be said to have been baptized by blood-sweat in Gethsemane, before he reached the climax of his passion, on Calvary. "Behold, he suffereth the pains . . . of every living creature, both men, women, and children, who belong to the family of Adam" (2 Ne. 9:21).

Again, but in a modern revelation: "Surely every man must repent or suffer (i.e. the eternal consequences of sin). . . . For behold, I, God, have suffered these things for all, that they might not . . . suffer even as I; Which suffering caused myself, even God, the greatest of all, to tremble because of pain, and to bleed at every pore, and to suffer both body and spirit—and would that I might not drink the bitter cup" (D&C 19:4, 16–18).

Advantages to be realized in eternal life purchased at such a cost as this, should indeed be regarded by men as pearls of great price, to obtain which a man would be justified in selling all that he hath, that he might buy them.

But on the other hand, if the great and important things enumerated above—redemption of a world from death—spiritual and physical; and salvation of men as individuals from the consequences of their own sins—if all this could only be secured by the severity of suffering that attended upon the Atonement made by the Christ, then, we say, and we trust with becoming reverence, that it was worth all that the Christ by his suffering paid for them; and make bold to add: what an infinite pity it would be if in the moral and spiritual economy of the universe there had been no such means of salvation possible! And I further add, what a commentary it would be upon the strength, and courage, and sympathy, and altruism and love of the divine intelligences of the universe if none—no, not one—could have been found to come, under the conditions prescribed, to save a world—a race, his brethren!

The lesson taught by severity of the Atonement. Let the severity of the Atonement impress men with one very important truth, viz., that breaking up the harmony of the moral government of the world is a serious, adventurous, and dangerous business, even though when necessary to bring about conditions essential to the progress of intelligences; and more serious when man in his presumption and apostasy from God, of his own perverse will, to gratify his ambition, or pride or appetite or passions, violates the law of God and breaks the union between himself and deity. That is serious; and how difficult it is to re-establish that union, to purchase forgiveness for that sin! How hard it is to make amends to God, dishonored by man's individual transgression of divine law—let the severity of the Christ's Atonement for man's sin bear witness to that, for it required all that the Christ gave in suffering and agony of spirit and body to lay the grounds for man's forgiveness and reconciliation with God.

The severity of the Atonement should impress men with the fact that we live in a world of stern realities; that human actions draw with them tremendous consequences that may not be easily set aside if the actions in which they have their origin are wrong.

Moral laws have their penalties as physical laws have their consequences; there could be no moral laws without penalties; and the penalties of laws must be enforced, else laws are mere nullities. Violations of moral law are attended by shame and suffering; suffering is the consequence or the penalty of violating divine, moral law; and the penalty must be paid, either by the one sinning or by another who shall suffer vicariously for him, and make satisfaction to the law.

This brings us to one of the great questions inseparably connected with the Atonement. Can there be such a thing as vicarious suffering?

And can the vicarious suffering of an innocent victim pay the debt to justice due from one who is guilty of the transgression of moral and spiritual law?

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Roberts, *Seventy's Course in Theology*, 4th year; and "all four books of our scripture." Roberts commented:

Since this treatise of the Atonement is derived from the "New Knowledge" that is peculiar to the New Dispensation of the gospel, the treatises of Catholic and Protestant Christendom are of little use in development of the theme. In the *Seventy's Course of Theology*, however, fourth year, *The Atonement*, is an appendix in which is given "Other Views of the Atonement," Catholic, Protestant, and Liberal views and is valuable for comparison and contrast.

The Atonement V— The Atonement of Broader Scope Than Making Satisfaction for Adam's Sin

Sins of the individual. The Atonement is of much broader scope than redemption from Adam's transgression for "original guilt." Not only was satisfaction to be made for the transgression of Adam, that the integrities of the moral government of the world might be preserved, but a redemption was also to be provided from the effects of the individual sins of man. Man, when he sins by breaking the laws of God, sins, of course, against divine law; commits a crime against the majesty of God, and thereby dishonors him. And man is just as helpless to make adequate satisfaction to God as Adam was for his sin in Eden; and is just as hopelessly in the grasp of inexorable law as Adam and his race were after the first transgression. For individual man from the beginning was as much in duty bound to keep the law of God as Adam was; and if now, in the present, and for the future he observes the law of God and remains righteous, he is doing no more than he ought to have done from the beginning; and doing his duty now and for the future cannot free him from the fact and the consequences of his past violations of God's law. The individual man, then, is in need of a satisfaction being made to the justice of God for his individual transgression of divine law.

Distinction between Adam's ~~sin~~ transgression and individual sins. The difference between the sin of Adam and the sin of the individual man is this:

First, Adam's sin, which the scriptures call the "Fall," was racial, in that it involved all the race of Adam in its consequences, bringing upon them both a spiritual and a physical death, the nature of which has already been explained. Man's individual sin is more limited in its consequences, though for a time his personal sin may involve the happiness of others in its consequences; yet ultimately they will be limited to

personal results, affecting the actual sinner's personal relationship to God, to righteousness, to truth, to progress, to sustained joy.

Second, Adam's sin was necessary to the creation of those conditions under which man could obtain the experiences of earth life necessary to the union of his spirit with earth elements; necessary to this progress as a divine intelligence; necessary to his knowledge of good and evil in actual conflict; joy and sorrow; pleasure and pain; life and death; in a word, necessary that man might become acquainted with these opposite existences (2 Ne. 2),¹ their nature, and their values; all which was essential to, and designed for man's progress, for his ultimate development in virtue and power and largeness and splendor of existence. But man's individual sins are not necessary to these general purposes of God. That is, the Fall of Adam was necessary to the accomplishment of the general purposes of God; but it was not necessary to those purposes that Cain should kill Abel, his brother; or "that every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart" should be "evil continually" (cf. Gen. 6:5).

The "Fall" of Adam, we say, was necessary to the attainment of these possibilities of progress for man, and hence the atonement made for Adam's sin is of universal effect and application without stipulations or conditions, or obedience, or any other act as a condition precedent to participation in the full benefits of release from the consequences of Adam's transgression. Hence it is written: "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men (to the) [unto] justification of life" (Rom. 5:18). Free redemption from the consequences of Adam's transgression, but not so with reference to man's individual sins. Salvation from the consequences of those sins is another story. All men sin: "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). "And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Rom. 5:12). "There is none righteous, no, not one. . . . They are all gone out of the way; . . . there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (Rom. 3:10-12). But while all sin—except those who die in infancy or early childhood—it is not necessary to any of the general purposes of God, or to the interests of the race, that men should sin; and hence they may be held fully accountable to the justice of God for their individual transgression of law, and are so held accountable.

The penalty for the individual sins of men is a second spiritual death, not a physical death, not a separation of the spirit and the body

¹Roberts, *New Witnesses for God* 3:219-27.

of man after the resurrection, for what is achieved for man's physical life by the resurrection remains. He will not again be subject to physical death. But for his own individual sins (and this constitutes the third distinction between Adam's "original sin" and the *personal* sins of ~~other~~ men) the individual is subject to a second spiritual death, to banishment from the presence of God; his spiritual union and communion with God is broken, and spiritual death ensues—his death to righteousness. The Lord, in speaking of Adam and his first transgression, says: "I, the Lord [God], caused that he should be cast out from the Garden of Eden, from my presence, because of his transgression, wherein he became spiritually dead, which is the first death, even that same death . . . which is spiritual, which shall be pronounced upon the wicked when I shall say: Depart, ye cursed" (D&C 29:41).

So, Alma, the Nephite prophet, explained the "fall" of man, and how God gave unto men commandments, after having made known unto them the plan of redemption, even in the days of Adam, says:

God conversed with men, and made known unto them the plan of redemption, which had been prepared from the foundation of the world; and this he made known unto them according to their faith and repentance and their holy works. Wherefore, he gave commandments unto men, they having first transgressed the first commandments as to things which were temporal, and becoming as Gods, knowing good from evil, placing themselves in a state to act, or being placed in a state to act according to their wills and pleasures, whether to do evil or to do good—Therefore God gave unto them commandments, after having made known unto them the plan of redemption, that they should not do evil, the penalty thereof being a second death, which was an everlasting death as to things pertaining unto righteousness; for on such the plan of redemption could have no power, for the works of justice could not be destroyed, according to the supreme goodness of God. But God did call on men, in the name of his Son, (this being the plan of redemption which was laid) saying: If ye will repent, and harden not your hearts, then will I have mercy upon you, through mine Only Begotten Son; Therefore, whosoever repenteth, and hardeneth not his heart, he shall have claim on mercy through mine Only Begotten Son, unto a remission of his sins; and these shall enter into my rest. And whosoever will harden his heart and will do iniquity, behold, I swear in my wrath that he shall not enter into my rest. (Alma 12:30–35)

Furthermore he says—speaking of the willfully impenitent: "They shall be as though there had been no redemption made; for they cannot be redeemed according to God's justice; and they cannot die, seeing there is no more corruption (i.e. physical decay or death of the resurrected body)" (Alma 12:18).

~~Individual~~ *Men dependent on the Atonement for salvation from individual sins.* As already remarked, men having transgressed the law of God by their own personal violations of it, are helpless of themselves to make satisfaction to the justice of God, or of the law; and are just as dependent upon a Redeemer to rescue them from the spiritual effects of their personal transgression of the divine law, as from the effects of Adam's "Fall." Also, under a reign of law, God may not pardon men for their individual sins by arbitrary act of sovereign will. He may no more set aside the claims of justice unsatisfied in the case of men's personal sins than in the case of Adam's first sin. In both cases a "necessary attribute of Deity" stands in the way of the non-infliction of the penalty due to sin, viz., the attribute of justice, which not even the attribute of mercy may displace or rob. God must act in harmony with his own attributes.

Identical principles operative in man's redemption from individual sins as in redemption from Adam's sin. In the case of man's individual violation of law, as in Adam's sin, the inexorableness of law holds good (Hel. 14:17-18). Thus satisfaction to justice in the case of man's individual sins, like the satisfaction to justice for Adam's "original sin," must be rendered by one competent to make such satisfaction. The same necessity for one not only willing but able to make the atonement, by suffering the penalty due to the sins of all men. He must suffer for them; for the ground work of their forgiveness and restoration to union with God must be that the penalty due to their sin has been paid. This, or justice goes unsatisfied—mercy robs justice. This—satisfaction must be rendered to justice by an atonement or else the law must take its course and punishment be actually inflicted upon the transgressors, which leaves man to a life of eternal misery, alienated from God, separated from the source of spiritual excellence. Man, under such circumstances, would indeed be spiritually dead, and dead eternally, since he is helpless to extricate himself from such conditions, as a sinner cannot justify his sin, nor a criminal pardon his own crime. But to leave the punishment to be actually inflicted upon man would thwart the purpose of God with reference to man's earth life; for God designed that man's earth life should eventuate in joy, in the union of man with God. "Men are, that they might have joy" (2 Ne. 2:25). By other Book of Mormon teachers the plan for man's redemption is called "the plan of happiness," "the great plan of happiness" (Alma 42:8, 16); and as this "happiness" depends upon union and communion with God, which is but another way of saying "in harmony with the true, the good and the beautiful," it is

proper to think of the gospel as contemplating the spiritual union of man with Deity.

We conclude then that for man's individual sins as for Adam's transgression, though differing in some respects, already noted, involve the same necessity of atonement. There is the same inexorableness of law; the same helplessness on the part of man to make satisfaction for his sin; hence man's dependence upon a vicarious atonement, if he is to find redemption at all. There is the same need for ability on the part of the one making the atonement to make full satisfaction to justice by paying the uttermost farthing of man's obligation to the law; the idea of satisfaction necessarily involves that of penal suffering. This couples together the two ideas, satisfaction through expiation, or satisfaction to justice through expiation. Whosoever redeems man from his individual sins must pay the penalty due to sin by suffering in man's stead. No merely human sacrifice will be adequate. As put by Alma, the Nephite prophet: "If a man murder, behold will our law, which is just, take the life of his brother? I say unto you, Nay. But the law requireth the life of the murderer; therefore there can be nothing which is short of an infinite atonement which will suffice for the sins of the world" (cf. Alma 34:11-12). What man is equal to the whole world's sin, and the suffering due to it? Who can bear it? The answer is obvious: no man. But there remains God. What man cannot do, what no human brother can do, it may be that God can do. And that is the basis of the gospel doctrine, the doctrine of the Atonement—God will atone for the sins of man. Man incapable of saving himself, may be saved of God. God may find and save that which was lost. As it was said in the matter of atoning for man's individual sins, it must be a supreme sacrifice of atoning for Adam's "original sin," so in atoning for man's individual sins, it must be a supreme sacrifice. It must be by the sacrifice of the Highest—God! And hence an infinite sacrifice. It must be all that can be given in sacrifice—there must be no more that can be given in sacrifice for sin. Hence it is the last, and is final. As we concluded in our reflections of the Atonement of the Son of God as applied to the sins of Adam, so here: The Atonement is made by the Son of God, "who was in the beginning with God, and who was God" (cf. John 1:1). It is, then, an atonement that was made by God, the highest atonement that can be made. A supreme sacrifice, indeed! And all that could be given in sacrifice it embraces, and meets the demands of justice. Men were bought with a price, but "not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from *<their>* [*your*] vain conversation received by tradition from *<their>* [*your*] fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as [*of*] a lamb without blemish and without

spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world” (1 Pet. 1:18–20).

Motive force in the Atonement. What shall prompt a deity to make such an atonement? The answer is: two attributes of the Deity now of a long time kept in the background, viz., love and mercy. They will supply motive for the Atonement. We have seen and considered at some length the helplessness of man in the midst of those earth conditions necessary to his progress, viz., knowledge of good and evil. **God saw** man’s helplessness from the beginning; and—

so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. (John 3:16–17)

This love prompts the Son of God to suffer for the individual sins of men as well as for the sin of Adam in Eden. He undertook to pay the penalty due to each man’s sin, that there might be ground for man’s justification under the law; that mercy might claim the sinner upon conditions that love may prescribe. And so—

“By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves,” says Paul, “it is the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8). “The law entered, that ⟨sin⟩ [the offence] might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did [much] more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 5:20–21). And in harmony with this a Book of Mormon prophet—the first Nephi, declares: “We know that it is by grace [that] we are saved, after all ⟨that⟩ we can do” (2 Ne. 25:23).

Man’s cooperation with God necessary to salvation. Notwithstanding this doctrine of being “saved by grace after all that men can do,” yet in securing redemption from the consequences of man’s individual sins, the cooperation of man is required; his acceptance, through faith, of God’s plan for his salvation; acceptance of Jesus Christ and his redemptive work—obedience to him manifested by baptism, or burial in water for the remission of sin. The baptism is the symbol of the death, burial, and the resurrection of the Christ, and also the sign of the convert’s acceptance of the Christ and the Atonement he has made for the sins of men. Then also the acceptance of confirmation into membership of the Church of Jesus Christ by the laying on of hands by which comes also the baptism of the Spirit—the Holy Ghost—bringing the convert into fellowship and union with God, by which he becomes

spiritually alive—"born of the spirit," by reason of which he has become united to the spirit life of God, and hence put in the way of eternal progress.

The gospel so far as the individual man is concerned is the "power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16) to everyone that believes it, and obeys its prescribed ordinances, and its covenant of thereafter continuing in righteousness. In the difference between the redemption from the transgression of Adam and redemption from man's personal sins, the one being free, unconditional, and universal; and the other being free, possible to all, but conditional, and therefore limited to those who comply with the conditions, there are to be observed nice discriminations in the justice of God. Free and universal redemption comes from the consequences of Adam's "Fall," because that "fall" is absolutely necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes of God with reference to man's progress; without it nothing may be done for his progress. He must know the distinctions between good and evil in order to *make progression*, though that knowledge may not be acquired but by a "fall" from a state of innocence. Therefore since that fall is necessary to these ends, justice demands that there be provided free and universal and complete and unconditional redemption from its consequences. But in the case of man's personal sins they are not absolutely necessary to the accomplishment of any general purposes of God. Of course the earth-environment of man, including the broken harmonies as he finds them, may be necessary to the individual experience of man; but all that will abundantly come once men are at the same time free to choose, and good and evil is set before them. But what is here meant is that it is not an absolute necessity that individual men should sin, or that they sin without limit. Men can refrain from sin if they will; the power is in them. They are brought into earth life able to stand, "yet free to fall."^a They have power to choose good and to follow that instead of evil if they so elect. Therefore, while it is eminently proper that the Atonement of the Christ should be made to include satisfaction to justice for the personal sins of men, and the debt of suffering due to them should be paid, and paid vicariously, since man is powerless to offer expiation for himself, and it is needful that ample provision be made for the justification of man's pardon; yet it is also in accordance with justice that man shall cooperate with God in bringing about the blessed result of his deliverance from the consequence of his personal sins; and that conditions shall be required as necessary to participation in the forgiveness provided, such conditions as belief in

^aJohn Milton, *Paradise Lost* 3.99.

and acceptance of the terms of atonement, repentance of sin, and a hearty cooperation with God in overcoming the evil, and its effects, in the human soul.

The work of salvation: A work of sanctification as well as of justification. Moreover, this salvation from the effects of personal sins is not only a matter of forgiveness of past sins; a matter of justification before God; a matter of reestablishing union with God, which is spiritual life; but it is a matter of sanctification of the soul; and of power to maintain the renewed spiritual life with God. It is a matter that involves human desires and human will. Surely it is unthinkable that God would hold man in union with himself against man's desire, or against his will. Such a condition would not be a "union" but "bondage." The cooperation of man then in this work of his personal salvation becomes an absolute necessity, and hence the conditions of individual salvation already noted, and which may be summed up in the fact of man's self-surrender unto God, manifested by his obedience to God under the divine law; and the declared intention of that obedience by receiving the symbols of the Atonement, to be found in the ordinances of the gospel, especially in baptism of both the water and the spirit, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Spiritual and moral growth. The attainment of the condition of Christian righteousness is a matter of character building under the favorable conditions provided by the gospel; and character building, even under favorable conditions, is a matter of slow, self-conquest. It means to follow the admonition of the chief Judean apostle, St. Peter:

Add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. (2 Pet. 1:5-8)

To be fruitful in that knowledge means to be growing in grace, in knowledge of the truth, in righteousness. It means development according to type of the Christian spiritual life, which type is Christ Jesus, our Lord. "If you wish to go where God is," said the Prophet of the New Dispensation, "you must be like God, or possess the principles God possesses."² All of which, of course, may not be possessed without

²Joseph Smith, April 10, 1842, in Smith, *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 216.

divine help, as well as by human effort. “He that lacketh these things”—the virtues above enumerated by St. Peter, and the disposition to build them up by his own effort, as well as by divine grace, “is blind, and cannot see afar off,” continues that apostle:

And hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. (2 Pet. 1:9–11)

Phases of the Atonement peculiar to the New Dispensation of the gospel:

(1) *Redemption from Adam’s sin unconditional; from individual sins conditional.* It may be remarked, in passing, that the distinction noted in the foregoing paragraphs of this chapter on applying the Christ’s Atonement to Adam’s sin and man’s personal sins—in the first case unconditional, and in the second conditional—is a doctrine, in modern times, peculiar to the New Dispensation of the gospel revealed to Joseph Smith; and is derived almost wholly from the teachings of the Book of Mormon (see 2 Ne. 2; 9; Alma 34; 42; Morm. 9). In that distinction the beauty and glory of the Atonement, the balanced claims of justice and mercy, shine forth as nowhere else, even in holy writ—much less in uninspired writings of men. It may be regarded as the New Dispensation’s contribution to views of the Atonement of Christ, for it is to be found nowhere else except in the New Dispensation literature. But there, in the chief summary of the things the Church of the New Dispensation believes, it is written: “We believe that ⟨all⟩ men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam’s transgression” (A of F 2).³

(2) *The free and complete redemption of little children.* From the foregoing distinction in the application of the Atonement of Christ, there arises another, viz., if redemption from the consequences of Adam’s “Fall” in Eden is to be absolutely unconditional, and universal, and that entirely through the Atonement of the Christ, and without any cooperation on the part of man, then it logically follows that if man himself remains absolutely without sin, he would stand in need of no satisfaction being made for his personal sin, and no forgiveness of **personal** sins would be necessary, since in that case sins would have no existence; and therefore the atonement of the Christ for the sin of Adam would be all-sufficient to redeem man from the power of death

³See summary in the Prophet Joseph Smith’s Letter to Mr. Wentworth. Smith *History of the Church* 4:540.

and restore him to union with God. It follows that if any part of the human race die in this state of personal innocence, then they are redeemed by virtue of the Atonement of Christ without any other consideration whatsoever. Children dying in infancy are in this status, and therefore the host of them so dying are saved by virtue of the Atonement of the Christ for Adam's transgression. In view of this splendid truth listen to the words of the Christ himself to one of the ancient American prophets:

Behold, I came into the world not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance; the whole need no physician, but they that are sick; wherefore, little children are whole, for they are not capable of committing sin; wherefore the curse of Adam is taken from them in me, that it hath no power over them. . . . Little children need no repentance, neither baptism. . . . Little children are alive in Christ, even from the foundation of the world. (Moro. 8:8, 11-12)

No less explicit is the word of the Lord through the Prophet Joseph Smith:

But behold, I say unto you, that little children are redeemed from the foundation of the world through mine Only Begotten; Wherefore, they cannot sin, for power is not given unto Satan to tempt little children, until they begin to become accountable before me. (D&C 29:46-47)

(3) *The redemption of those who die without law: "The heathen" nations and races.* Moreover it appears that mercy has especial claims upon the nations and the races of men who have not known the gospel, the so-called "heathen" races. The first Nephi [*sic*; Jacob is speaking] in speaking of the Atonement of Christ and its effects where ~~proclaimed and rejected~~, **no law exists**, says:

Wherefore, he (God) has given a law; and where there is no law given there is no punishment; and where there is no punishment there is no condemnation; and where there is no condemnation the mercies of the Holy One of Israel have claim upon them, because of the atonement; for they are delivered by the power of him (the Christ). For the atonement satisfieth the demands of his justice upon all those who have not the law given to them, that they are delivered from that awful monster, death and hell, and the devil, and the lake of fire and brimstone,⁴ which is endless torment; and they are restored to that God who gave them breath, which is the Holy One of Israel. (2 Ne. 9:25-26)

⁴The torments of the ungodly sinners are likened unto a lake of fire and brimstone by this writer, Nephi [*sic*]. Not that the sinners are plunged into a lake of fire and brimstone as so-called orthodox Christians teach. Indeed, in the above passage

And again: “For the power of redemption cometh on all them that have no law” (Moro. 8:22). To this also agree the teachings of St. Paul: “For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law” (Rom. 2:12). I venture the assertion, basing it upon the sense of the whole passage, that the above passage should read “shall be judged without law.”

In the adjustment of things connected with the placing of men and nations and races in and during the first resurrection, it is declared in modern revelation that it shall be tolerable, at that time, for the heathen, meaning those who lived and died without law or knowledge of the gospel: “Then shall the heathen nations be redeemed,” saith the Lord; “and they that knew no law shall have part in the first resurrection; and it shall be tolerable for them” (D&C 45:54). Not that these will rise at once to the full height and perfect glory of God’s celestial kingdom; but they shall be “heirs of salvation” (D&C 76:88). They are not irredeemably lost, as false teachers and their falsar creeds, though regarded as Christian and orthodox, hold. On the contrary they will come forth in the first resurrection as stated above, as also again declared in the great revelation on the various degrees of glory to which men shall attain in and through the resurrection from the dead,⁵ and to them will be accorded the advantages of “the everlasting gospel,” the gospel which endures through all the ages to bless with opportunity of progression, the children of God.

(4) *Salvation for the dead.* The principles of the immediately preceding paragraphs bring us to the fourth great distinctive feature of the Atonement peculiar in modern times to the New Dispensation of the gospel, viz., the application of the Atonement and the whole gospel scheme to all who may not have heard it, or even heard of it; or who having heard of it in their blindness or semi-blindness, or ignorance have rejected it. This in the New Dispensation literature is generalized as “salvation for the dead.” It has its inception first in the fact that the gospel is an “everlasting gospel”; one that endures through the ages,

there is a definition of what the lake of fire is—it is “endless torment,” which “endless torment” ever exists for the punishment of impenitent sinners—each one partaking of it to such a degree and for such time as is necessary to satisfy the demands of justice. In this very chapter above quoted Nephi says of the wicked: “And their torment is as a lake of fire and brimstone, whose flames ascend up forever, and have no end” (cf. 2 Ne. 9:16; see also Alma 12:17).

⁵This *is* one of the greatest revelations of the New Dispensation, and is one of the greatest monuments to the inspiration of the Prophet Joseph Smith; see Doctrine and Covenants 76.

and that to bless and save men, when they shall turn to it for its saving grace and power. Second, in the fact that the revelations of God give warrant for the belief that there is provided such a means of salvation for those who may have missed fair opportunity to understand and receive the gospel. Fuller development of this doctrine however, belongs to a place in a future chapter (chapter 47, below) where the discussion of it takes place.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church* 4:497–508; Roberts, *Seventy's Course in Theology* 4:134–60, esp. “Anselm’s Theory of Satisfaction”; and William Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine*, vol. 2, bk. 5, chs. 1–7. In preparation for this chapter, Roberts encouraged extensive scripture reading and noted that the references he gives “may be greatly extended by the student.” He also commented that Neander’s “great work” on the history of Christianity contains “a fine treatise on the Atonement,” and that the “seven chapters devoted to Soteriology” in a work by Shedd “are very illuminating in a general way on the Atonement, but do not deal with the topics of this chapter.”

The Atonement VI— The Efficacy of Vicarious Atonement

Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 Jn. 4:10).

The law of righteousness. All sin against moral law is followed by suffering. At first glance that statement may not be accepted without qualification; but it is true. "Sin is [the] transgression of the law," is [the] scripture definition of sin (1 Jn. 3:4; Rom. 4:15). No difficulty will arise from that definition, but there might arise difference of opinion as to what constitutes the "law," which to violate would be sin. Of course moral law, or the law of righteousness, varies among different races and nations; and indeed varies in the same race and nation in different periods of time; but no matter how variant the law may be among different races or nations; or how variant it may be among individuals, the principle announced that suffering follows sin will hold good. Of course between the Christian whose conscience is trained in the moral law of the doctrine of Christ, and the heathen, "who know not God," there is a wide difference. Many things which are sin to the Christian conscience are not sin to the heathen races, unenlightened by the ethics of the Christian religion; but, nevertheless, what I say is true; and if heathen peoples do not have the same moral standards that prevail in Christian lands, they have some moral standards; and whenever they violate what to them is the "rule of righteousness," it is followed by chagrin, by sorrow, by mental suffering for them; and so with the Christian people who are instructed in the high, moral principles of the Christian religion. When they fall below their ideals, when they consciously violate their "rule of righteousness," it is followed by suffering, by *a* sense of shame, by sorrow; and indeed, the great volume of the sorrows of this world springs from sin, the transgression of the moral law.

Possibility of the Spirit suffering. It is just as real, this suffering of the spirit for the violation of the moral law, as the suffering of physical pain. The mind no less than the body may be hurt, wounded as deeply as the body, and carry its scars as the evidence of its wounds as long. "And it often happens," says Guizot, "that the best men, that is, those who have best conformed their will to reason, have often been the most struck with their insufficiency, the most convinced of the inequality between the conduct of man and his task between liberty and law"; and therefore have they suffered most. It is possible, and men do suffer for their own sins.

Men suffer because of the sins of others. This we know, also, it is possible for men to suffer because of the sins of others, and they often do. You can scarcely conceive of a man being so far isolated, so far outside the sympathies of the world, that it can be said of him that he lives unto himself alone; that his sinning and his suffering concerns only himself. Men are so knit together in a network of sympathies—not seen, but *real* nevertheless—that they suffer *because* of each other. It is easily proven. Take the case of an honorable father and mother who have led, we will say—and there are such fathers and mothers—ideal lives. They have lived in honor; they have met their obligations to the world with reasonable fidelity; they have lived lives of righteousness; they have set good examples to their children and neighbors; they have taught the Christian truths at the fireside; they have surrounded their family with every advantage that would prepare them for honorable stations among men. They have taken pride as they have seen their children grow from infancy to manhood, and their souls have hoped that a sort of immortality would subsist in the perpetuation of their race through their children. Then out of this family group, over which the parents have watched with such anxious solicitude, there comes forth a reprobate youth, in whom there seems to be scarcely any moral sense. He violates all the conventions of society, and of moral living; he destroys all his prospects by his excesses, and he becomes a vagabond and outcast among men, a degenerate; perhaps finds his way through the sewers of sin, into the prison house, and at last, perchance, may go to the very gallows itself.

And what is the condition of that righteous father and mother the while, when they look upon this sad mischance in their household? Sorrow! The one who has led this shameful life, though he may suffer somewhat for his sins, has not suffered the one-thousandth part of the shame and humiliation and disgrace that has been experienced by this father and mother. They suffer because of the sins of this wayward son.

They illustrate in their experience the fact that men can suffer because of each other; the innocent are involved in the sins and crimes of the guilty.

From this confessedly extreme case all down the line of human experiences and relationships in constantly varying degrees men suffer because of each other.

Men suffer with each other on account of sin. Again: men suffer with each other on account of sin. An outsider, looking at this scene I have presented—I mean one not a member of the grief-stricken family—witnessing the sorrow in the father, and the inconsolable grief of the mother; the mental distress and shame experienced by brothers and sisters; the outsider, the near friend, or neighbor, witnessing all this is distressed with the sorrowing father and mother; he suffers *with* them through common, human sympathy.

Willingness of men to suffer for each other. There is still another phase of this suffering on account of sin, and one that draws very near to the point I am trying to establish. There is among men, and especially among men of highly sensitive natures, a willingness to suffer *for* others. Take the case, for instance, of David and Absalom. Absalom was the most worthless of all David's sons; he had planned rebellion against the old king; he would have clutched the crown from the hoary head of David and put it upon his own. In every way he had warred against the honor and the interests of his father. Yet when news was brought to the king that the worthless young man had been caught in the battle and slain, the old king was stricken with sorrow, and gave vent to the father-cry that rings through all the ages—"Oh Absalom, my son! Would to God I had died for thee!" (cf. 2 Sam. 18:33). In this experience of David's we see the willingness of one to suffer for another. Nor is this willingness confined to parents alone who would so often and so willingly take upon themselves the consequences of their children's sins, though those consequences involved death. The same willingness exists on the part of the children, but perhaps is less frequently manifested, to suffer for their parents. The same is true also as to brothers and sisters, and among friends, where no tie of consanguinity exists; and even among strangers, on the occasion of great, imminent danger, this impulse in man, this willingness to risk his own life for others is frequently manifested. Such experiences make up the history of heroism, which is the chief glory of our human race.

The pity of it, if—! Here let it be understood that I am not introducing the question as to whether men can suffer one for another in

breaches of the moral law. I am inclined to doubt that, as it might lead to the thwarting of ~~in~~justice rather than to the promotion of it in our human life; but I am discussing the evident willingness of men to suffer for the sins of others if they could, up to the point of laying down their lives for them; and with Browning I hold that, "Tis not what man does which exalts him, but what man would do."^a I am pointing out the existence of such an impulse, inclination or principle in men, in human nature, in order to argue from what we know of this well-attested fact, ~~(and the reader will observe that our old method of earlier chapters abides with us still)~~ that there being such a disposition in man, it may be reasonably concluded that such a disposition *but* more abundantly, and more perfectly, and more intensely, and quite effectively—~~the same willingness and innate disposition~~ will be found in the divine intelligences, or gods; and who at need, as in the case of redeeming man from the "Fall" through ~~an~~ Adam, and from the consequences of personal sins—would, through love, make the necessary sacrifice for the sins of a world, as did the Christ. For if this disposition exists more intensively in gods than in men, what an infinite pity it would be should there be no means in the moral economy of things for such expression of self-sacrificing love!

Vicarious suffering necessary to supreme love-manifestation.

"Vicarious suffering," says some now forgotten author, "seems supremely unjust, yet it is blessed and glorious; for in no other way can love so intensely be expressed—that one suffer for his friend through love." And I will add the suffering victim being himself innocent, would make his sacrifice all the more impressive. ~~and effective.~~

"Hereby perceive we the love of God," said the apostle, "because he laid down his life for us" (1 Jn. 3:16). And again: "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God ~~had~~ sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 Jn. 4:9-10).

It is through this means, self-sacrifice, that love gets expressed, and this leads to manifestations of mercy in the divine moral and spiritual economy; and in no other way can they become expressed—this love and mercy! But a divine moral and spiritual economy cannot exist without the manifestation of them. Therefore, to make the scheme of things perfect, there must be place and means of bringing in these two brightest and best elements of such economy, else both a reign of law

^aRobert Browning, "Saul," 13.9.

and the attributes of deity stand broken and inharmonious in our consciousness. From the very nature of things, then, there must be a means of expressing love, and of expressing it supremely, by sacrifice, else mercy shall not appear, for mercy springs from love as wisdom rises from knowledge.

It is from the above basis of thought that the poet Browning, worked out his conception of vicarious suffering in his "Saul." The poem is the story of David's love for the melancholy, obsessed king of Israel, and David's willingness out of this love, to suffer for the king, even to die for him if only that would restore Saul to his best and maintain him there.

"Could I help thee my father, inventing a bliss," says David, "I would add to that life of the past" (which he had just glorified in song), "both the future—and this; I would give thee new life altogether, as good ages hence as this moment, had love but the warrant, love's heart to dispense."

And then the thought: If he, David, being but a man would do this for the restoration of Saul, would not God do as much? Or, as the poet makes David say, do I find love so full in my nature that I doubt God's own love can compete with it? "Would I fain in my impotent yearning do all for this man, dare doubt he alone shall not help him, who yet alone can?" Would I suffer for him that I love? So would God he concludes—"so wilt thou! . . . See the Christ stand!"¹

Intimations of great possibilities. Does this fact of willingness to suffer for others, so abundantly attested in human experiences, bear witness to the existence of no great and eternal principle, that may be of incalculable benefit in the moral economy of the universe? Is it meaningless? I think not. On the contrary it suggests the existence of a great and effective truth, namely, that divine intelligences of the universe are so bound together in sympathetic relations that at need they can suffer for each other, as well as with each other, and because of each other. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down

¹I commend the whole poem to the reader. It is too long to insert here and less than the whole would do an injustice to a masterpiece of thought and composition. It will richly repay the half-score readings that will be required to master it. [Robert Browning's poem "Saul" is based upon the Old Testament story of Saul and David. David narrates the story of his returning to the tent of Saul to sing and play his harp in an attempt to alleviate Saul's fits of madness. His songs have the desired effect, but David realizes that although he loves Saul with his whole soul, he cannot give Saul permanent rest and salvation. At this dramatic moment, David receives a vision of the Christ, recognizing that salvation is only through him.]

his life for his friends" (John 15:13). The same would doubtless be true of God. Shall those intelligences we must needs think of as divine, as making up David's "congregation of the mighty," the gods among whom God, the greatest of intelligences, stands and judges (Ps. 82:1)—shall these be denied the privilege of love-manifestation which goes with this giving of all? And shall this suffering for others in such cases have no benefitting effect upon those others for whom the suffering is endured? Shall this love-force of divine intelligences be mere waste of the highest and most refined of all forces—spiritual love-force? Not so, if reason answers the question. Certainly not so if the scriptures answer it. The scriptures abundantly confirm the declaration made that divine intelligences are not denied the power of giving the highest love manifestation for others by suffering for them; and in that love manifestation giving all they can give, even to taking upon themselves the consequences of the sins of others and making effective atonement for them; suffering that others might have placed within their reach the means of eternal progression, and escape the eternal consequences of sin if only they would accept such means as are provided for such escape. Otherwise, of course, the sinners themselves must suffer all the consequences due to their sins; for nothing is clearer in the revealed word of God, developed in this treatise, than that satisfaction must be made to justice whenever the domain of law and justice is trespassed upon, else all is confusion in the moral government of the world; so that if men will not avail themselves of means which love provides for their redemption, then they themselves must meet the inexorable demands of justice.

Vicarious suffering: Its reality and its effectiveness the doctrine of the gospel. This, then, is the especial doctrine of the gospel on which the earth-life mission of the Christ is based. One divine intelligence at need can suffer for others, and ~~for such an one to stand responsible for another, and~~ vicariously endure suffering for another's sins; make a satisfaction to justice, and bring the quality of love, and mercy its consequent, into the moral economy of the world, and give it legitimate standing under a reign of law, softening somewhat the otherwise harsh aspect of things in this God's world.

The reign of law and love. To this then our inquiry and discussions lead us; to recognize in the gospel of Jesus Christ, the central truth of which is the Atonement, a reign of law and love; and that to preserve this law, and to manifest this love was the purpose of the earth-life mission of the Christ. To teach and to demonstrate, first of all, God-love for man, by a sacrifice that tasks God that man might be saved; and

second, to inspire man-love for God, by the demonstration that God first loved man, and how deeply God loved him; and third, to teach man-love for man. “(For) Beloved,” says the apostle, ~~whom Jesus loved pre-eminently~~—“if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another” (1 Jn. 4:11). In this love for one another the children of God are manifest, he contends.

Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. . . . We know that we have passed from death (into) [unto] life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. . . . Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. (1 Jn. 3:10-11, 14, 16)

It is not to be marveled at that this same apostle declared that “he that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love” (1 Jn. 4:8) or that Paul, accepting the same principle, should say, “he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. . . . Therefore love is the fulfilling of the law” (Rom. 13:8-10).

Jesus, however, teaches the matter most perfectly. Accepting the love of God for man as assured, then the great commandment for man is:

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. (Matt. 22:37-40)

“Love is the fulfilling of the law.” Love exists in the earth-scheme of things, in the moral government of the world, in harmony with the universal reign of law. It is not born of some caprice, or mere impulse, howsoever beneficent; but interwoven it is into the very web and woof of things. It is immanent in them, an indestructible presence. It is because love reigns in harmony with law that we mortals can be so sure of it; and rest so secure in it. For as it was not born of caprice, so, too, it will not depart from the world, nor from individuals on caprice; but will endure as space itself endures—from the very nature of it; as truth abides; as law itself subsists; as God lives; for it is of the eternal things—the things that do not pass away.

[Except for pages 451-52, this chapter is nearly identical to *Seventy's Course in Theology* 4:129-33.]

Departure from “The Way”

Breaking of the covenant; changing of the ordinances. In part we have already shown how men who had accepted the revelations of God—the Jew and the Christian—left the Christ as the revelation of God, and went after the vain philosophies of the Greek and Roman and the Egyptian Gentiles, denying even the Lord that bought them. Now that a surer knowledge is given of the whole Christian plan of things, it becomes necessary to point out how there was a departure, not only from a true conception of God, from the right idea of creation, from the knowledge of the origin of man, and right apprehension of the purpose of God in the earth life of man—but they have departed from the Way of life as revealed in and through the everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ. Things became, as Isaiah predicted they would, viz., that it would be the same with master and servant, the buyer and seller, the priest and the people (cf. Isa. 24:2); the earth would mourn and fade away as to spiritual knowledge and spiritual power, until the earth itself would become

defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance(s), broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate: therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left. (Isa. 24:4–6)^a

It should be observed that this prophecy of the great Isaiah could have no reference to the law of Moses that had been given to Israel. It is an “everlasting covenant” that the prophet refers to as being broken and the ordinances thereof changed. The blood of the Christ is spoken of as “the blood of the everlasting covenant” (Heb. 13:20). Hence it is the “covenant” sealed by the blood of the Christ that men would break. It is the ordinances of the “everlasting covenant”—or the “everlasting gospel,” that they would change; and this the Christians, even in apostolic times, began to do.

^aIn Hebrew, the word for “ordinance” is singular.

Disagreement among the leading officers of the primitive church.

It is a mistake to suppose that the primitive **Christian** church was removed from such a possibility as this by reason of any sanctity that obtained in its membership. On the contrary, they supplied the elements for such a departure from the faith of the "everlasting covenant" predicted by Isaiah. Even the apostles were early engaged in controversies. The question which arose as to the relationship of the gospel to the Jews, who regarded themselves [as] still under obligations to keep the law of Moses, received authoritative and amicable settlement to the effect that observance of the law of Moses should not be required of the new converts from among the Gentiles, and such was the drawing together under the spirit of that council's decision that St. Peter went down to Antioch and at first mingled unreservedly with both gentile and Jewish converts without distinction; but when certain ones came down from James, who resided at Jerusalem, then Peter suddenly withdrew his social fellowship from the gentile converts; other Jewish brethren did the same, Barnabas, a friend of Paul was among the number. Whereupon Paul withstood Peter to the face directly charging him before all the brethren with "dissimulation;" saying, "If thou, *being* a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews" (Gal. 2:14). Yet this same Paul, notwithstanding his loyalty to the gentile converts on that occasion, his zeal for the decision which had been rendered by the council at the church at Jerusalem, and notwithstanding his usually strong moral courage, subsequently showed by his conduct that he, too, was not beyond the weakness of "becoming all things to all men"; for a short time after the incident with Peter at Antioch, when in the Province of Galatia, and desiring Timothy to be his companion in the ministry, Paul took him and circumcised him; for it was well known that while his mother was a Jewess his father was a Greek; and all this for fear of the Jews (Acts 16:1-4).

Law and gospel controversy. This question continued to be a cause of contention even after this sharp disputation at Antioch, for though the discussion of the council at Jerusalem was against the contention of the Judaizing party, yet they continued to agitate the question, and in Galatia, at least, succeeded in turning the saints of that province from "the grace of Christ unto another gospel . . . perverting the gospel of Christ" (cf. Gal. 1:6-7). This question in fact continued to agitate the church throughout the apostolic age and was finally settled through overwhelming numbers of Gentiles being converted and taking possession of the church, rather than from any respect for the decision of the council at Jerusalem.

The withdrawal of John Mark from the ministry while accompanying Paul and Barnabas on their first mission in Asia Minor, and which withdrawal grew out of a faltering of his zeal or a misunderstanding with his companions,[†] will be well remembered (Acts 13:13). Subsequently when Paul proposed to Barnabas that they go again and “visit the brethren in every city where they had preached” (cf. Acts 15:36 [36–39]), while on their first mission, a sharp contention arose between them about this same John Mark. Barnabas desired to take him again into the ministry, but Paul seriously objected; and so pronounced was the quarrel between them that these two friends and fellow yokemen in the ministry parted company. It is just possible also that in addition to this misunderstanding about John Mark, the severe reproof which Paul administered to Barnabas in the affair of dissimulation at Antioch had somehow strained their friendship.

Status *Character of church membership in apostolic times.* Turning from these misunderstandings and criminations among the leading officers of the church, let us inquire how it stood with the members. The epistles of Paul to the church at Corinth disclose the fact that there were serious schisms among them; some boasting that they were of Paul, others that they were of Apollos, others of Cephas, and still others of Christ; which led Paul to ask sharply, “Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you?” (1 Cor. 1:13). There were endless strifes as well as divisions among them, which caused Paul to denounce them as “carnally minded” (cf. 1 Cor. 3:3–4). Among them also was such fornication as was not named among the Gentiles, “that one should have his father’s wife”! (1 Cor. 5:1). And this shameful sin had not humbled the church at Corinth, for Paul denounced them for being puffed up in the presence of such a crime, rather than having mourned over it (1 Cor. 5:1–3). They were in the habit of going to law one with another, and that before the world, in violation of the teachings of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 6:1–20). They desecrated the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper by their drunkenness, for which they were sharply reproofed by the apostle. They ate and drank unworthily, “not discerning the Lord’s body,” for which cause many were sickly among them, and many slept (that is, died) (1 Cor. 11:20–22, 29–30). There were heresies also among them (1 Cor. 11:18–19), some denying the resurrection of the dead, while others possessed not the knowledge of

[†]The committee of the Quorum of the Twelve cautioned: “The cause of John Mark leaving the ministry, questioned.” Reporting to President Clawson on October 10, 1929, George Albert Smith added: “This statement also, is not necessary to the argument.”

God, which the Apostle declared was *to* their shame (1 Cor. 15:12-34). It is true, this sharp letter of reproof made the Corinthian saints sorry, and sorry, too, after a godly fashion, in that it brought them to a partial repentance; but even in the second epistle, from which we learn of their partial repentance, the apostle could still charge that there were many in the church who had not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they had committed (2 Cor. 12:21). From this second letter, also, we learn that there were many in the church at large who corrupted the word of God (2 Cor. 2:17); that there were those, even in the ministry, who were "false prophets, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ" (2 Cor. 11:12-14).

Of the churches throughout the province of Galatia it is scarcely necessary to say more than we have already said concerning the invasion of that province by Judaizing Christian ministers who were turning away the saints from the grace of Christ back to the beggarly elements of the law of carnal commandments; a circumstance which led Paul to exclaim: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that *had* called you *unto* [into] the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ" (Gal. 1:6-7).

Two parties in the church of the first century. That there were two distinct parties in the church at this time (Apostolic age) between whom bitter contentions arose, from thirty A.D. to the close of the first Christian century, is further evidenced by the letter of Paul to the Philippians. Some preached Christ even of envy and strife, and some of good will. "The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely," says Paul, "supposing to add affliction to my bonds: But the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel" (Philip. 1:15-17). "Beware of dogs," said he again to the same people, "beware of evil workers, beware of the concision" (Philip. 3:2). "Brethren, be followers . . . of me," he admonished them,

and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample. (For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is [in] their shame, who mind earthly things.) (Philip. 3:17-19)

To the Colossians, Paul found it necessary to say:

Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. . . . Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility

and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind. (Col. 2:8, 18)

Evidence of early dissensions among primitive Christians. But it is in Paul's pastoral letters that we get a deeper insight into the corruptions threatening the early church, and even beginning to lay the foundation for the subsequent apostasy which overwhelmed it. The apostle sent Timothy to the saints at Ephesus to represent him, that he might charge some to teach no other doctrines than those which he had delivered to them; "neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith," for some had turned aside from the commandment of charity, out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, unto "⟨vile⟩ [vain] jangling, desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm" (cf. 1 Tim. 1:3-7). Others concerning faith had made shipwreck, of whom were Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom Paul had delivered unto Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme (1 Tim. 1:19-20). Others had "erred concerning the faith" and had "given heed to babbling, and opposition of science falsely so called" (cf. 1 Tim. 6:20). In his second letter to Timothy, Paul informs him that all the saints in Asia had turned away from him, of whom were Phygellus and Hermogenes (2 Tim. 1:15). He admonished Timothy again to shun "profane and vain babblings: for," said he, "they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some" (2 Tim. 2:16-18). Demas, once a fellow laborer with Paul, had forsaken him, "having loved this present world" (2 Tim. 4:10). At Paul's first answer, that is, when arraigned before the court at Rome, no man stood with him, but all men forsook him; he prays that God will not lay this to their charge (2 Tim. 4:16). Paul admonished Titus to hold fast to the faith, for there were many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, especially those of the circumcision; who subverted whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake; and were giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men and turning from the truth (Titus 1:9-14).

St. Peter's prophecies on apostasy. Peter also had something to say with reference to the danger of heresies and false teachers which menaced the church. He declared that there would be false teachers

among the saints, “who privily . . . 〈would〉 bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many,” said he,

shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the *way of* truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now 〈for〉 [of] a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not. For . . . God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment. (2 Pet. 2:1-4)

He argued that the Lord would not spare these corrupters of the gospel of Christ, who, like the dog had turned again to his own vomit, and the sow who was washed to her wallowing in the mire (2 Pet. 2:1-22). He charged also that some were wresting the epistles of Paul, as they were some of the “other scriptures, unto their own destruction” (2 Pet. 3:16).

Testimony of St. John on apostasy. John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, also bears testimony to the existence of anti-Christ, false prophets, and the depravity of many in the early church. “It is the last time,” said he, “and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us . . . that they might be [made] manifest that they were not all of us” (1 Jn. 2:18-19). “Try the spirits,” said he, in the same epistle, “whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world” (1 Jn. 4:1). Again: “Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver [and] an antichrist” (2 Jn. 1:7).

Jude also is a witness against this class of deceivers. He admonished the saints to “earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For,” said he, “there are certain men crept in unawares, . . . ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ” (Jude 1:3-4). The rest of the epistle he devotes to a description of their wickedness, comparing it with the conduct of Satan, and the vileness of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Purpose of this review. We have given this review of the condition of the church of Christ in the apostolic age not with the intention of establishing the idea that the church at that time was in a complete state of apostasy; nor have we dwelt upon the weaknesses and sins of the early saints for the purpose of holding them up for contempt. Our only purpose has been to dispel, first of all, the extravagant ideas that obtain in many minds concerning the absolute sanctity of the early Christians; and secondly, and mainly, to show that there were elements

and tendencies existing in the early church, even in the days of the apostles, that would, when unrestrained by apostolic authority and power, lead to its entire overthrow.

We have no good reason to believe that there occurred any change for the better in the affairs of the church after the demise of the apostles, no reason to believe that there were fewer heresies or fewer false teachers, or false prophets to lead away the people with their vain philosophies, their foolish babblings, and opposition of science falsely so called. On the contrary, one is forced to believe the prediction of Paul, viz., that “evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived” (2 Tim. 3:13). For who, after the apostles were fallen asleep, would stand up and correct the heresies that were brought in to the church, rebuke the schismatics, the false teachers and false prophets that arose to draw away disciples after them? If false teachers insinuated themselves into the church, brought in damnable heresies “by reason of \langle which \rangle [whom] the way of truth was evil spoken of” (cf. 2 Pet. 2:2), and the pure religion of Jesus Christ corrupted even while inspired apostles were still in the church, it is not unreasonable to conclude that all these evils would increase and revel unchecked after the death of the apostles.

The effect of early persecutions on the church. Running parallel with this rise of false teachers and multiplication of heresies was running the effects of persecution of the church during the first three centuries of its existence. Let no one attempt to minimize that effect of successive persecutions upon the Christians.^b True they endured much and many died faithful in their devotions to what they regarded as the true religion of Jesus Christ, but heretics as well as true Christians suffered in these persecutions and some of the heretics with equal heroism to those who were true martyrs to the Christian faith. Suffering martyrdom in a cause does not always mean that the cause itself is true; a fact of which the history of all persecutions abundantly attests. Meantime, the effect of these early persecutions of the Christians by the Jews, and later by the Roman emperors, had the result of breaking down the faith and constancy of many, until it can be truly said that the saints were worn out (cf. **Daniel 7:25**), or so nearly so that only weak and timorous men were left to ineffectually resist the paganization of Christianity and the destruction of the real church of Christ. That the

^bFor a general survey of early Christian history, see William H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); on early persecutions, see William H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964). See also *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* 2:671–74.

Roman emperors considered the destruction of the Christian **church** completed by the Diocletian persecution (beginning 303 A.D. and lasting through ten years) is witnessed by the inscriptions upon monuments and medals. Two pillars in Spain erected to commemorate the reign of Diocletian bore the following inscriptions:

Dioclesian, Jovian, Maximian Hercules, Caesares Augusti, for having extended the Roman empire in the East and West, and for having extinguished the name of Christians, who brought the Republic to ruin. . . .

Dioclesian, etc., for having adopted Galerius in the East, for having everywhere abolished the superstition of Christ, for having extended the worship of the gods.

And on the medal of Diocletian this: "The name of Christians being extinguished."¹

We know it will be said that this supposed triumph over Christianity announced on these monuments was almost immediately followed by the triumph of Christianity under Constantine, called "the Great," and then the Christian religion became practically the state religion of the empire; but was it the Christian religion that thus triumphed, or a merely paganized form of religion bearing that name? We are sure that prophetic history and the truth of history will sustain the view that the Christianity of the early decades of the fourth century and through all the centuries following the fourth was no longer the gospel of Jesus Christ; nor the churches that survived—Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic and the Protestant sections of Christendom, with all its subdivisions, were not, and are not the church of Jesus Christ. A sweeping declaration we know, but an extensive inquiry into the subject, running through many years of study and writing upon that branch of history, has led to the conclusion so positively drawn,² namely: that there was a universal turning away or apostasy from the religion of Jesus Christ as established in the dispensation of the meridian of times. It has also been noted in this writing that a dispensation posterior to the meridian dispensation—"The Dispensation of the Fulness of Times" would follow the age of the Christ and his apostles (Eph. 1:10).

¹See Milner, *Church History* 2:6-7.

²See the writer's account of the "Apostasy" from the gospel, and also the "Destruction of the Christian Church" in his *Outlines of Ecclesiastical History* (1893), that is ~~now (1924)~~ in its fourth edition (1924); also his introduction to Smith, *History of the Church*, vol. 1. Also a treatise on the same theme in his *New Witnesses for God*, 1:45-136. [Another draft of this footnote was appended to the end of this chapter 46.]

Paul's great prophecy on universal apostasy. We shall only pause here to introduce one great testimony concerning this **universal** apostasy which, however, while brief, is complete and conclusive on the subject. It is found in the second epistle of Paul to the Thesalonians and consists of a prophecy which, if the apostasy of so-called Christendom has not been complete and universal, proves beyond all question that the great apostle of the Gentiles was a false prophet. On the other hand if fulfilled, then it proves that the church of Christ, so far as its existence in the earth is concerned, was to be destroyed; that another church, one founded by men, was to usurp the place of the church of Christ; a worldly church, dominated by the very spirit of Lucifer, who, under its rule, would oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God; and sit in the temple of God; showing himself—so far as this world is concerned—that he is God. Moreover Paul declared in this very prophecy we are about to quote, that the forces which would ultimately bring to pass this universal apostasy from the Christian religion—"the mystery of iniquity"—was already at work even in his day. With this introduction, which is also to be considered as our comment upon, and interpretation of the prophecy, we quote Paul's great prediction on the universal apostasy from the true Christian religion:

Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth (hindereth) will let (hinder), until he be taken out of the way. (i.e. the true servants of God, the apostles of the Church—the true priesthood of God resisting the encroachments of the evil power—until they should be taken out of its way by persecution and death.) And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. (2 Thes. 2:1-12)

If prophecy be regarded as history reversed, then here is an important historical as well as prophetic document, all which tends to prove what is contended for in this chapter.

The sum of the matter contended for: The sum of the matter stands thus: When the appointed time was come, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, came and made the appointed atonement for the transgression of Adam and the sins of the world, and brought men under the dominion of love and its consequent, his mercy. He taught the gospel; he brought life and immortality to light; he brought into existence a church, and then ascended on high to his Father.

For a time the gospel in its simplicity was preached in the world by the chosen apostles, though even in their day men began to mar it with their vain philosophies, their doctrines of science falsely so-called; and when the apostles passed away in death—then corruptions ran riot in the church; doctrines of men were taught for the commandments of God; a church made by men was substituted for the church of Christ; a church full of pride and worldliness; a church, which, while it clung to the forms of godliness, ran riot in excesses and abominations—until spiritual darkness fell like a pall over the nations; and thus they lay for ages—called the “Dark Ages.”

In vain men sought to bring about “Reformations,” and through them bring back the religion of Jesus Christ, and the church of Christ. To do that, however, was beyond the power of these men, however good their intentions. The gospel taken from the earth, divine authority lost, the church of Christ destroyed, there was but one way in which all this could be restored, namely: by reopening the heavens and dispensing again a knowledge of the gospel; by once more conferring divine authority upon men, together with a commission to teach all the world, and reestablish the church of Christ on earth. In a word, to bring in the promised “Dispensation of the Fulness of Times,” which shall unite into one all former dispensations and “gather together in one all things in Christ, . . . even in him” (Eph. 1:10).

~~The account of bringing in such a dispensation is to be the subject of our next chapter.~~

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Hopkins, *“The End of Controversy Controverted,”* esp. vol. 1, ch. 5; Milman, *History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ*; Milner, *End of Religious Controversy*; Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, chs. on “Adverse Events” and “Schisms and Heresies”; Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*; Priestly, *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (“a most scholarly and masterful treatise”); Talmage, *Great Apostasy*.

Renewal of “The Way”

The testimony of prophecy on renewal of “the Way.” (a) St. Peter—the time of restitution of all things. St. Peter to a multitude of Jews in Jerusalem excited by the healing of the impotent man at the gate of the city, testified that the healing was a manifestation of the power of God through Jesus Christ, and then went on to say that the God of their fathers had glorified Jesus whom they had delivered up to a false judgment and denied the Holy One, and the Just, and had killed the Prince of Life, whom God had now raised from the dead, whereof he and his brethren were witnesses. “Repent ye therefore,” were his words to the multitude,

and be ⟨ye⟩ converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. (Acts 3:19–21)

We emphasize by repeating in substance, namely: there is to be, subsequent to the days of Peter and his associate apostles, a “time for the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouths of the holy prophets since the world began.” A “time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord,” when there may be hope for Judah’s eyes to be opened to the fact that their Messiah was Jesus of Nazareth, whom they and their rulers had crucified. A time when God would “again send Jesus Christ who before had been preached unto them”; but whom, meanwhile, the heaven must retain until this time of the “restitution of all things.”

(b) St. Paul—*The coming of the Dispensation of the Fullness of Times.* And so St. Paul, evidently on the same subject says: God

hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: That in the dispensation of

the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and . . . {in} [on] earth; even in him. (Eph. 1:8-10)

It has already been set forth in these pages that a dispensation pertaining to the gospel is a giving out by revelation of the things of God; giving out knowledge concerning this plan of salvation; bestowing divine authority upon man to act in the name of the Lord, both in teaching and administering the ordinances of the gospel; and it has also been shown that there have been many such dispensations from the days of Adam until the days of the Christ. And now in this prophecy we have a promise that there shall be a “dispensation of the fulness of times” which can only mean a dispensation of which all others we have considered so far are but parts. And now comes this “dispensation of the fulness of times” which shall include them all in one, and that dispensation is undoubtedly the “time of the restitution of all things spoken of by the prophets”; a dispensation in which God will again send Jesus Christ to the earth, fulfilling the predictions concerning him; fulfilling the words of the angels who appeared to that group of friends watching the receding form of the Christ from the earth, and who put the question to that group: “Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner” (Acts 1:11).

And again St. Paul,

The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe. (2 Thes. 1:7-10)

Surely the voice of prophecy requires us to believe in the incoming of this dispensation subsequent to the meridian dispensation.

(c) *St. John: Vision of a restoration of the gospel in the hour of God's judgement.* Among many visions given to St. John on Patmos was this masterful one:

I saw another angel fly(ing) in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgement is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. (Rev. 14:6-7)

This vision is to be realized in the hour of God's judgement. A period that connotes with St. Peter's “times of the restitution of all

things,” when Jesus Christ, whom the heavens are retaining now, will be sent again to the earth and in judgement; also it connotes with St. Paul’s “dispensation of the fulness of times,” in the which all things shall be gathered together in one in Christ, things both in heaven and in earth. And let it be observed that the emphasis in this message given to St. John on Patmos comes on the part where the men of all nations, kindred, tongues, and people are called back to the worship of the true God, he “that made heaven and earth and the sea and the fountains of water,” implying most strongly that the whole world in the hour of God’s judgment would not be worshipping the true and the living God, Creator of heaven and earth. Also since this gospel restored to the earth by the ministering of an angel in the hour of God’s judgment is to be preached to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, *it* strongly implies that all nations, kindred, tongues and people would be without the gospel, hence it is restored to the earth to be universally proclaimed. None are to escape the warning voice of it. It shall be preached as the Christ himself declared,

for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come. . . . And he shall send his angels with ⟨the⟩ [a] great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. . . . Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. (Matt. 24:14, 31, 35-37)

What a unity there is in all this voice of prophecy upon the incoming of this “time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord,” these “times of the restitution of all things,” the incoming of a “dispensation of the fulness of times,” the restoration by angelic ministration of “the everlasting gospel” to be universally preached as a witness and then the end to come with the glorious appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ unto judgment!

The opening of the New Dispensation. The opening of this “dispensation of the fulness of times” came by the opening of the heavens to the prophet appointed of God to stand at the head of it. This prophet was Joseph Smith. He was born in Sharon, Windsor County, state of Vermont, U.S.A., in the year of our Lord 1805, on the 23rd of December. His childhood and early youth knew but poverty and hardships. At the age of ten his family moved and settled in Palmyra, in what is now known as Wayne County, state of New York. When about fourteen years

of age, a religious excitement arose in the vicinity of his home and his mind became intensely engaged upon the question of religion. A neighborhood revival participated in by several churches disclosed how much at variance the different sects were in relation to questions of religion. And these dissensions, together with manifest jealousy and ill will towards each other, excited the wonderment of the youth, Joseph Smith, and led him in the midst of the war of the words and tumult of opinions to frequently ask himself the question: "What is to be done? Who of all these parties is right?" At this juncture his attention was called to the golden text in the Epistle of St. James:

If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, *<who>* [that] giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like *<the>* [a] wave of the sea driven by the wind and tossed. [For] let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. (James 1:5-7)

The first vision of the New Dispensation. Upon this scripture he pondered frequently until ~~at last~~ it became as the voice of God in his soul, and at last he resolved on putting this inspired message from St. James to the test. Having selected a place in a grove upon his father's farm, he retired to it and endeavored to pray for the wisdom that he felt of all persons he most needed. It was while engaged in this prayer that the heavens were opened to him, a glorious light, surpassing the brightness of the sun at noonday surrounded him, and in the midst of that intense light appeared two glorious personages, glorious beyond any power he possessed to describe them. They were alike, for although Father and Son, age writes no wrinkles upon the ever youthful face of immortals. They were alike, but one said, [pointing] to the other, "(Joseph,) This is My Beloved Son, Hear Him!" (cf. JS-H 1:17).

And then to this second person the youth addressed in substance his question: which of all these contending sects is true, which is thy church; and which shall I join?

It speaks well for the steadiness of the temperament of this youth that in such a presence he could clearly hold in mind the object that had brought him to his first verbal prayer. He gives the message he received from this second personage, the Son of God, to whom he was directed by the Father, in the following language:

I was answered that I must join none of them, for they were all wrong, and the personage who addressed me said that all their creeds were an abomination in His sight: that those professors were all corrupt; that "they draw near to me with their lips, but their hearts

are far from me; they teach for doctrines the commandments of men: having a form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof." He again forbade me to join with any of them: and many other things did he say unto me, which I cannot write at this time.¹

In a subsequent statement the Prophet added the following as part of what had been said to him *in addition to the direct message above*: "I was informed that I was chosen to be an instrument in the hands of God to bring about some of His purposes in this glorious dispensation."²

The second vision of the New Dispensation: The Book of Mormon revealed. Three years after this *first* revelation an angel of God named Moroni was sent to the Prophet to reveal the existence of an ancient volume of scripture known as the Book of Mormon, a book which gives an account of the hand-dealings of God with the people whom he brought to the continents of America from what we now call the "Old World."

(a) *The Jaredites.* The first colony came from the tower of Babel at the time of the dispersion of the people from the Euphrates Valley; they were called Jaredites, after their leader, named Jared. They occupied the land located in the southern part of Central America and founded a nation which existed for about sixteen centuries, and then were overwhelmed at last in a series of wars which ended in their complete destruction, on account of their great wickedness. This about 600 B.C.

(b) *The Nephite colony.* It was about the time of the destruction of the Jaredites that a small colony was led from Jerusalem, under divine guidance, to the western continents, where they too developed into a great people and into national life. This colony was made up of Israelites of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, and later augmented by a second small colony *made up* of Jews. They continued in occupancy of the land—chiefly in North America—until about 400 A.D. Then came their destruction because of their rebellion and wickedness against God. They lost touch with faith and righteousness until their civilization was overthrown, and they survived only in the tribal relations such as existed at the advent of the Europeans.

(c) *Summary of the book and its translation.* This record discloses the hand-dealings of God with these ancient people through the prophets and teachers God sent unto them, and also gives the

¹Smith, *History of the Church* 1:6; see also JS-H 1:19-20. [In the Roberts typescript, this quote was entirely in capital letters.]

²Smith, *History of the Church* 4:537, from a letter to John Wentworth.

account of the visits of the risen Christ to them, the introduction of the fulness of the gospel by his ministry, which established a true church of Christ in the western world, with all the principles and the ordinances of the gospel necessary to salvation. Therefore it contains the fulness of the gospel.

In this record God has brought forth a new witness to the truth of the things whereof the Hebrew scriptures, the Old Testament and the New also bear witness. Thus an angel came bringing the everlasting gospel which is to be preached to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people. This American volume of scripture, God's new witness to the old truths of the everlasting gospel, Joseph Smith was commanded to translate, and was given the power and means by which he could translate the unknown language of these ancient American peoples. The "means" provided was a "Urim and Thummim." This consisted of two transparent stones set in the rim of a bow, a divine instrument used in ancient times for obtaining knowledge from God. This instrument for translation was found with the gold plates on which the above record was engraven. Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon, and through a century now, it has been published to the world. ***It is translated into*** fifteen of the world's languages.

Third vision: The restoration of the Aaronic priesthood. While engaged in the work of translating the Book of Mormon, and in answer to earnest prayer for light—and this time upon the subject of baptism—Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery were visited by a messenger of God, no other than John, the Baptist, now raised from the dead, who in addition to giving them the needed instruction on baptism laid his hands upon their heads and said unto them:

Upon you my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah I confer the Priesthood of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; and this shall never be taken again from the earth, until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness. (D&C 13)³

This occurred on the 15th of May, 1829.

Having given to these men the authority from God to baptize, they at once baptized each other in the clear water of the beautiful Susquehanna river at the point where the visitation had taken place, the angel—John, the Baptist—standing upon the banks supervising it. Surely the manner of it, and the purpose of it, would be correct when introduced under such supervision.

³Compare Smith, *History of the Church* 1:39–43 and footnote.

Fourth vision: The restoration of the Melchizedek priesthood.

Later, most likely in the month of June following, and in fulfillment of a promise made by John the Baptist, when conferring upon these young men the Aaronic Priesthood, viz., that a higher authority than he conferred would later be given to them. In fulfillment of this promise, Peter, James and John, three apostles of the meridian dispensation, came to Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery and conferred upon them the Melchizedek Priesthood, a priesthood after the order of the Son of God—even the apostleship;⁴ and bestowed upon them the keys of the kingdom under which plenary power they were authorized to proceed with the preaching of the gospel, organizing the Church, and doing whatsoever might be necessary to bring it in and establish the New Dispensation of the gospel, and prepare the world for the glorious coming of the Lord Jesus, and the founding of his kingdom on earth as it is in heaven.

The development of the New Dispensation. This fulness of the priesthood restored, Joseph Smith guided by further and almost continuous revelation organized the church of Christ to be known finally as the Church of Jesus Christ and to distinguish it from the church of Christ in more ancient times, the phrase was added “of Latter-day Saints,” “The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.” The church of God and the church of the people. A compound title representing a most beautiful possession of this institution, the church of God and the church of the people.

~~Gradually~~, Under the direction of revelations from God, bishops were chosen, with priests, teachers and deacons, grouped into quorums bearing these names, and constituting a complete organization of what is known as the “Lesser” or “Aaronic Priesthood” of God’s church. This division of the organization is charged chiefly ~~in~~ **with** administering in the temporal things of the church—the outward ordinances of the gospel and the administration of the details of the financial affairs of the church, in gathering tithes, and accounting for them and distributing the charities of the church. All this, however, under the supervision of the presidency of the other division of the priesthood, namely the Melchizedek Priesthood, which presidency presides over the whole church and all its affairs.

The higher or Melchizedek priesthood consists of ~~the~~ high priests, apostles, seventies, and elders, clothed with authority to act for God,

⁴The exact date of the restoration of this order of the priesthood is not definitely known, but the approximate date can be fixed as of this time named in the text. The matter is considered at length in Smith, *History of the Church* 1:40–42.

more especially in the spiritual activities of the church: preaching the gospel and administering in all its ordinances ***including the ordinances in the holy temples***; in teaching and expounding its truths; warning the nations of judgments to come, and of the approaching time when the Son of Man shall again appear on the earth and open up the promised reign of righteousness and peace.

The spirit of priesthood government. All this administrative work, both in the Aaronic and Melchizedek priesthoods, is to be in the spirit of unfeigned love for, and interest in, the people of the world. It is part of the law given unto this Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints that no power or influence can or ought to be maintained by virtue of the priesthood—authority derived from God—only by persuasion, long-suffering, gentleness, by meekness and by love unfeigned, by kindness and pure knowledge, which shall greatly enlarge the soul, without hypocrisy and without guile, reproving betimes with sharpness when moved upon by the Holy Ghost to do so, and then showing forth afterwards an increase of love towards those who have been reproved that they might know that the faithfulness of God's priesthood is stronger than the cords of death (cf. D&C 121:41–44). In this spirit the Church government, which is purely moral government, is to be administered.

The Church so organized brings back the same organization though somewhat amplified, as that which was established by the ministry of Christ and his apostles in the great meridian dispensation. It has two great functions to perform, this Church: viz., To teach God's revealed truth to all the people; to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people. And second, to perfect the lives of those who accept this proclamation of God's message, the everlasting gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ—the Truth.

The organization of the Church. This organization in its humble first forms,[†] began its existence on the sixth day of April, 1830, in Fayette township, Seneca county in the state of New York, and thence has passed through its century of existence until now knowledge of it

[†]On Roberts's statement about the "humble first forms of the Church," the committee of the Quorum of the Twelve wished to avoid any implication that the early Church was not fully organized by the Savior himself: "We think that this expression may be misunderstood and the thought may be conveyed that the forms of the Church have been changed, rather than developed." Of this concern Roberts handwrote **non-sense!** Reporting to President Clawson, George Albert Smith suggested: "Some other word [than "humble first forms"] could be used."

has spread over all the earth, and through it is restored to the world the Way, meaning by that a full and complete restoration of the everlasting gospel, uniting in one all the previous dispensations of it, and expanding toward that fulness of knowledge through the revelations of God yet future until it shall indeed gather together all things in Christ both things which are in heaven and in earth, “even in Him.”

Enlargement of the New Dispensation over others: Visions in the Kirtland Temple. As showing the enlargement of the New Dispensation over all other dispensations that have preceded it, attention is called to several important administrations that took place in the Kirtland Temple in 1836.

(a) *Vision of the Savior.* First, following the solemn dedication of the temple on the third of April, the Savior appeared to Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery in the temple proclaiming the acceptance of the house, and of the people who had erected it; the latter as his church, then struggling into existence, and blessed them. The description of our Lord’s appearance was worthy of the occasion:

We saw the Lord standing upon the breastwork of the pulpit, before us; and under his feet was a paved work of pure gold, in color like amber. His eyes were as a flame of fire; the hair of his head was white like the pure snow; his countenance shone above the brightness of the sun; and his voice was as the sound of the rushing of ~~many~~ **great** waters, even the voice of Jehovah, saying: I am the first and the last; I am he who liveth, I am he who was slain; I am your advocate with the Father. Behold, your sins are forgiven you; you are clean before me; therefore, lift up your heads and rejoice. Let the hearts of your brethren rejoice, and let the hearts of all my people rejoice, who have, with their might, built this house to my name. For behold, I have accepted this house, and my name shall be here; and I will manifest myself to my people in mercy in this house. . . . And the fame of this house shall spread to foreign lands; and this is the beginning of the blessing which shall be poured out upon the heads of my people. Even so. Amen. (D&C 110:2-7, 10; see also Rev. 1:12-18)

(b) *Of Moses.* After this vision closed, the heavens were again opened and Moses appeared before them and committed unto them the keys of the gathering of Israel from the four parts of the earth, and of the leading of the ten tribes from the land of the north (D&C 110:11). Thus the way was opened for the restoration of Israel to his proper place in God’s plan of things. For the restoration of Israel to their lands and to the favor of God are among the things to be achieved in the New Dispensation.

(c) *Of Elias.* This vision closed, one Elias appeared, and committed “the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham,” saying that in these

brethren and their seed all the generations after them should be blessed (D&C 110:12). This personage was one it appears who had been associated with Abraham, and he came to deliver the keys of the dispensation held in the earth in the days of Abraham, and since he was the one chosen to deliver such keys, he undoubtedly stood at the head of that dispensation; and most probably was Melchizedek, the great High Priest of Abraham's time, who even blessed Abraham, and to whom Abraham paid his tithes; and as St. Paul suggests, undoubtedly the lesser is blessed of the greater (Heb. 7:7). Also it is to be noted that he restored something of patriarchal power and blessing since he said unto the brethren that in them and their seed all generations after them should be blessed and this is of patriarchal character, that would be fittingly delivered by a patriarch, whom we have already identified tentatively with the patriarch Shem, the son of Noah.

(d) Of *Elijah*. Following this vision of *Elias* came one which is characterized by those who received it as "great and glorious," for Elijah, the prophet, who was taken to heaven without tasting death stood before them and said:

Behold, the time has fully come, which *(is)* [was] spoken of by the mouth of Malachi—testifying that he (Elijah) should be sent, before the great and dreadful day of the Lord come—To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers, lest the whole earth be smitten with a curse—Therefore, the keys of this dispensation are committed into your hands; and by this ye may know that the great and dreadful day of the Lord is near, even at the doors. (D&C 110:14-16)

From the keys of knowledge which Elijah restored great light is thrown upon the plan of salvation showing it to be of more extensive application to the human race than was ever dreamed of in the conceptions of men previous to this visitation of Elijah.

Brief allusion to this extension of the application of the Atonement, and of the whole plan of the gospel, to those who had not had opportunity to learn of it in this life, or who having heard it, failed to avail themselves of its sovereign grace—as in the case of those who lived in the days of Noah (1 Pet. 3:18-20; 4:6)—has already been made in chapter forty; but the importance of the subject requires that further details be added here.

It is learned from the keys of knowledge which Elijah restored that the hundreds of millions who have died without a knowledge of Christ or of his gospel, including all the so-called heathen races, together with those who have been misled by the teachings of pseudoministers of Christ, are not eternally lost, but that, since the spirit of man when

separated from the body retains all the faculties of mind, the gospel is preached in the spirit world to the disembodied spirits, and that on condition of their accepting the gospel, and living according to the laws of God in the spirit, they may be saved on condition of the outward ordinances of the gospel being administered vicariously for them upon the earth by their agents—their relatives, or chosen friends.

The message of Elijah—salvation for the dead. That the gospel is preached to departed spirits is evident from the scriptures:

For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. (1 Pet. 3:18–20)

The plain, simple statement here is that the spirit of Christ, while his body lay in the tomb, went and preached to the spirits which were disobedient in the days of Noah. Turning again to the subject in the chapter following the one just quoted, the apostle says:

For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit. (1 Pet. 4:6).

That the ancient saints also knew something about performing ordinances vicariously for the dead is evident from this remark of the apostle Paul: “Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?” (1 Cor. 15:29).

And we ask, if there was no such thing among the ancient saints as baptism for the dead, why, then does Paul refer to it in such positive terms?

Other ordinances for the dead. If baptism may be performed vicariously for the dead, it stands to reason also that other ordinances associated with securing salvation for man may also be vicariously administered on behalf of the dead: confirmation into the Church of Christ, and to baptism of the Spirit; ordination to the priesthood; marriage, eternal marriage—by which the parties to the marriage covenant are married as men and women are married who are in the flesh, who are alive: married in the bonds of an eternal covenant of marriage, not merely “until death do us part,” but married for always, “for time and for eternity!” For such is the nature of the marriage

covenant under the authority of the holy priesthood, the power which binds on earth and it is bound in heaven; which looses on earth, and it is loosed in heaven. This the power Jesus bestowed upon St. Peter when he gave unto him “the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” saying: “And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (Matt. 16:19). So that while it may be true, as saith Christ it is, that in the resurrection they “neither marry, nor are given in marriage” (Luke 20:34-37); that means no more than that earth-life and the earth are the time and place of marriage, as it is also the place and time of baptisms, and confirmations, and ordinations, and all ordinances and ceremonies pertaining to the earth-life of man and his salvation; and not that the marriage status does not obtain in the eternal worlds—in our world when it shall become a sanctified and glorified sphere—a celestial world—a heaven, inhabited by the redeemed of this world and shall be their heaven.⁵

The gospel of Christ is not limited, then, in its power to save to this earth-life, or this world alone. Its powers enter into the spirit world. And by its proclamation in the world of spirits the fathers will learn that they are dependent upon their posterity still in this world for the performance of the outward ordinances of the gospel; hence, their hearts will be turned to the children. The children on earth will learn that it is within their power to attend to ordinances of the gospel for their progenitors; hence, the children will be turned to the fathers and the two worlds will be linked together in sympathetic relations. It is because of this, because of the knowledge restored by Elijah, that the Latter-day Saints, wherever they have planted their feet, have sought, even in the days of their greatest poverty, to build a temple, the proper place in which to attend to these ordinances for the dead; and they thus witness to the world that the hearts of the children are turned to the fathers and “that the great and dreadful day of the Lord is near, even at the doors”! (D&C 110:16).

Thus has been brought to pass the renewal of the Way—the restoration to earth of the everlasting gospel in the New Dispensation of it—the Dispensation of the Fulness of Times, in which all things will be gathered together in one—*even* in Christ—and consummated; completed by the coming, at last of the kingdom of God on earth, and the doing of the will of God on earth even as it is done in heaven. ~~Even so, O God, the Eternal Father, may it come, and come quickly!~~

⁵See chapter 55 of this work for further treatment of marriage in the New Dispensation.

If the successive events stated in this chapter be considered, the volume of them, and the glory of them, they will of their own force carry a weight of conviction to the open mind that will go far in establishing their truth. This method of considering them will be a fine illustration of a mind-principle much relied upon by the prophet of the dispensation who brought them forth. “Every word that proceedeth forth from the mouth of ⟨God,⟩ Jehovah,” he said, “has such an influence over the human mind—*the logical mind*—that it is convincing without other testimony. Faith cometh by hearing.” His trust in the absoluteness of truth is further illustrated by his continuing remarks on the above occasion: “If ten thousand men testify to a truth you *know* would it add anything to your faith? No. Or will ten thousand testimonies destroy your knowledge of a fact? No.” Then concluding his remarks he said: “I don’t want any one to tell I am a prophet or attempt to prove my word.”⁶ Which is to say that he relied upon the innate power of the truth in that word he spoke—that message he delivered—to be the convincing power of it. He had been taught of God to regard the mind of man as native to the truth and possessed of power to cognize it. “Man was in the beginning with God,” is his doctrine, revealed to him of God.

Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be. . . . Behold, here is the agency of man, and here is the condemnation of man; because that which was from the beginning is plainly manifested unto them, and they receive not the light. And every man ⟨who⟩ [whose spirit] receiveth not the light is under condemnation. For man is spirit. (D&C 93:29–33)

And being spirit, in the chief fact of him, he has power by reason of that fact to cognize the things of the spirit, for his spirit is native to the things of the spirit, and he is under condemnation when he does not receive them. Hence our Prophet, shortening up Paul’s phrase, and making it more direct, frequently cried aloud in his discourses: “Faith cometh by hearing the word of God” (cf. Rom. 10:17). And upon that “hearing of the word of God,” the Prophet of the New Dispensation relied for the convincing power of its truth. And in that same spirit and confidence of its innate power of convincing men of the truth, we submit this brief account of the restoration of the Way of eternal life to the children of men.

⁶Remarks at Nauvoo, August 6th, 1843, Smith, *History of the Church* 5:526; italics in original.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: “Epistle of Kallikrates”; Roberts, *Deseret News*, April 28, 1928; Roberts, *Outlines of Ecclesiastical History*, pt. 4, 295–450; Huidekoper, *Christ’s Mission to the Underworld*, esp. p. 49; Pratt, *Remarkable Visions*; Smith, *History of the Church* 1:40–42 and notes; L. Smith, *Joseph Smith*; Widtsoe, *Restoration of the Gospel*; and D&C 1; 20; 110; 127; and 128:20.