WHAT ABOUT THE ADAM-GOD THEORY?

by Van Hale

At the age of twenty, as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, I first came in contact with the so-called Adam-God theory in an anti-Mormon tract. I had read it before and knew its twisted and misinterpreted LDS sources. Therefore, I felt certain that the purported quotation from Brigham Young's April 9, 1852 discourse—that Adam is our father and God, either was taken from context or was an outright fabrication.

After examining the evidence, however, I soon became convinced that at least two occasions Brigham Young had taught a concept which generally has not been accepted by Mormons—namely, that God the Father, the Father of our spirits and the Father of Jesus (of both his body and his spirit), came to this earth, took upon himself mortality, and was known as Adam, the progenitor of the human family. Simply stated, according to President Young, God the Father became Adam. (Journal of Discourses [JD] 1:50; Deseret News June 18, 1873). Later I found several other references in which President Young hinted at this belief. (JD 4:216-218, 271; 5:331; 6:274; 7:290; 11:41, 42).

Over the past fifteen years I have found many additional sources which confirm that this idea was taught for a period of time in the past century. They include sermon reports, private diary entries, minutes of meetings, letters, articles, and statements. Many of these are unpublished and have only come to light in the last several years. I have encountered strong and varied opinions on this subject among members of the Church, regardless of their interest in it. Two positions are most prevalent: (1) Non-Mormon Christians committed to evangelizing Mormons seek to establish that Brigham Young taught the Adam-God theory, that it is contrary to Biblical teaching, and that Brigham Young could therefore not have been a true prophet. (2) So-called fundamentalist Mormons seek to establish that Brigham Young taught it, that recent prophets have rejected it, and that some prophets since Brigham Young could therefore not be true prophets. Both groups have taken advantage of two facts: First, most Mormons are unaware that Brigham Young ever taught the Adam-God theory; and second, most Mormons are uncomfortable with the position that prophets may have differed in their concepts of God.

My purpose here is not to present evidence to show that Brigham Young taught the Adam-God theory. Rather, as one who is convinced that he did teach it, I wish to state briefly some of my reasons for rejecting the conclusions of these two groups of Mormonism's opponents.

The non-Mormon Christian Argument

I am not persuaded by the non-Mormon Christian argument for several reasons, two of which I will discuss. First, in their zeal to refute Mormonism they have misstated, ignored, or distorted many points of Mormon history. Second, and perhaps more important, they demand qualifications of a prophet which are both un-Biblical and unreasonable, I will present my response by answering four questions.

Was the Adam-God theory official Mormon doctrine?

My answer to this question is an emphatic "No!"

After presenting evidence that Brigham Young taught the Adam-God theory, I usually go on to claim: that it was official doctrine for 50 years; that it was widely taught and received; that Brigham Young claimed he had received it by revelation; that he interpreted it as the Inerrant Word of God because Brigham Young said his sermons were scripture; and that those rejecting it were excommunicated from the Church.

The effort to establish any of these points is evidence that they consider it important. Their purpose is to make Mormons feel uncomfortable with Mormonism. To present the Adam-God theory as a concept expressed by Brigham Young on several occasions but which was never accepted as doctrine does not serve their purpose nearly as well. They therefore resort to considerable distortion to maintain this erroneous position.

My reasons for rejecting this anti-Mormon caricature are based on the following six points:

1. The Adam-God theory has never been a part of the Mormon canon of scripture. The Church has always had an official canon. During Brigham Young's lifetime it was the Bible, Book of Mormon, and a somewhat smaller Doctrine and Covenants. President Young never attempted to incorporate any statement of the Adam-God theory into this canon.

Opponents frequently quote Brigham Young's statement that he had "never yet preached a sermon and sent it out to the children of men, that they may call it Scripture" (JD 13:35), or that his sermons "when they are copied and approved by [him] they are as good Scripture as is couched in this Bible," (JD 13:264). They contend that President Young in calling his sermons scripture and comparing them to scripture, was interpreting his sermons as scripture and not Brigham Young's, his definition of scripture, and thus the only one appropriately applied here, did not define the scriptures as being word for word the words of God. Rather, he said:

I have heard some make the broad assertion that every word within the limbs of the Bible was the word of God . . . I believe that the Bible contains the words of God and the words of good men and the words of bad men; the words of good angels and the words of bad angels; the words of the devil; the words of the good and the words of the evil; and also the words uttered by those among the dead. (JD 13:175-235)

Brigham Young did not claim inerrancy for his sermons. In fact quite the contrary, as will be seen.

2. The theory was never advocated in any official statement. In addition to the canon, official statements were occasionally issued by the First Presidency and by the Quorum of the Twelve. The only one in which Brigham Young ever referred to the Adam-God theory was a statement issued in 1860 entitled "Instructions to the Saints,"

Signed by the First Presidency and published in the Deseret News, it stated several conclusions held to consider some doctrinal differences between Apostle Orson Pratt and President Young. One of these was the Adam-God theory. But rather than declaring the theory to be Church doctrine, the statement says, "It is deemed wisest to let that subject remain without further explanation at present." (Messages of the First Presidency, 2:222).

3. No revelation was ever presented by Brigham Young on the Adam-God theory. Nor does it appear that he ever claimed to have received a direct revelation on the subject. Opponents would challenge my claim with this quotation from President Young:

How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to them, and which God revealed to me—namely that Adam is our father and God. (Deseret News, June 18, 1873).

It is not at all certain that Brigham Young intended this to be an announcement of a direct revelation, it was his belief that God is the source of all truth in every field. To him, every truth known to any man has come by revelation from God, sometimes directly but usually indirectly upon such natural principles as observation, study, inquiry, and meditation. Since he believed that the Adam-God theory was true, no matter how he arrived at that conclusion, to him it was revealed by God. (He presented this thought at some length in JD 3:298; see also 12:207; 12:44).

But even if this is to be accepted as a claim of direct revelation, the extent of it seems to be "namely that Adam is our father and God." The more specific idea that God the Father became Adam may be Brigham Young's own expansion or interpretation of the subject, another possible interpretation—that, as the Lord made Moses a god to Pharaoh (Exodus 7:1) and as Paul was "as Christ Jesus" to the Galatians (4:14), Adam, our great progenitor, will preside over the human family as "the Father of God and of Christ." This was the interpretation of Brigham Young's statement advocated in 1853 by Samuel W. Richards, who, as editor of the Millennial Star and President of the Church in the British Isles, first published President Young's initial sermon on the subject in the Millennial Star (October 10, 1853), Richards' successor, Apostle Franklin D. Richards, also advanced this interpretation (MS, March 31, 1855), as have most of Brigham Young's successors.

The fact remains that there is no revelation from Brigham Young specifically stating the idea that God the Father became Adam.

4. Brigham Young himself did not consider the Adam-God theory official Church doctrine. Again opponents would challenge my claim, and by quoting the bold language he used in his first mention of the subject: "Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and sinner! and, every man upon the earth, professing Christians, or non-professing, believe the words of the Bible are just what they are." (JD 13:175-235). From this they insist that President Young considered the Adam-God theory official Church doctrine. However, he expressed his attitude toward it on several other occasions making it very clear that he considered belief in the subject not essential. Opponents, in maintaining their argument, chose to ignore these quotations: [The subject . . . does not immediately concern yours or my welfare . . . . I do not pretend to say that the items of doctrine and ideas I shall advance]
are necessary for the people to know. (October 8, 1854, Historical Department of the Church [HDC]).

... it is one that should not trouble us at all ... I do not tell it because that I wish it to be established in the minds of others. (April 29, 1859, HDC)

Whether Adam is the personage that we should consider our heavenly Father, or not, is considerable of a mystery to a good many. I do not know for a moment how that is; it is no matter whether we are to consider Him our God, or whether His Father, or His Grandfather, for in either case we are of one species. (April 4:217; see also, JD 4:271; 7:236; 7:285; 11:43; 268.)

I cannot believe that President Young would speak this way of an official Church doctrine.

Opponents give the impression that for many years President Young frequently and forcefully advocated the Adam-God theory, but this is another distortion, I have not found a single sermon devoted to a full exposition of the theory. Rather, it must be pieced together from several of his sermons and comments. Also, he delivered some 1500 sermons as President, and not more than half a dozen, only two of which appeared in print, contain explicit statements of central Adam-God theory concepts.

5. The Adam-God theory was not considered Church doctrine by other General Authorities. Tens of thousands of hours of sermons by some twenty leading authorities of Brigham Young's era have been recorded and preserved. Yet we have only several brief comments on the subject by only one of them — Brigham Young's counselor Heber C. Kimball, and these can be read in less than two minutes. The same is true of their writings. Of thousands of pages by these authorities there are less than a dozen on the subject, and most of these argue that Adam, as patriarch, will be our God in a certain sense, not that God the Father became Adam. At least a hundred other topics were more frequently addressed in sermons and in print.

6. The Adam-God theory was not a test of faith. That is, acceptance of it was not required to become a member of the Church or to remain a member.

Opponents frequently assert that it was Church practice to excommunicate those who did not accept it. This is simply false. The only reference they present in support of their claim is from a conference talk in Great Britain by Apostle Lyman. However, this very reference if read in its entirety refutes their argument. Lyman said, "I have heard of a man who was cut off because he would not believe that Adam was our Father and God." They stop here, but Elder Lyman did not. He continued, disapproving strongly of excommunicating a man on those grounds. (MS 24:99, 100).

Those familiar with LDS history and practice are well aware that official doctrine must meet certain requirements which were not met by the Adam-God theory. The fact is, it was never a part of the LDS canon, never presented in an official statement, never the subject of any known revelation, and never declared Church doctrine by any recognized Church authority. The status of the Adam-God theory was summed up in 1897 by President Wilford Woodruff and written by Apostle Joseph F. Smith, Both had been Apostles under Brigham Young:

Prest. Young no doubt expressed his personal opinion or views upon the subject, but he said that was not given as revelation or commandment from the Lord. The doctrine was never submitted to the councils of the Priesthood nor to the church for approval or ratification, and was never formally or otherwise accepted by the Church. It is therefore in no sense binding upon the Church.

Brigham Young's "bare mention" was without indubitable evidence and authority being given of its truth. Only the scripture, the "accepted word of God," is the Church's standard, (Letter to A. Saxeey, January 7, 1897, HDC).

It seems appropriate at this point to state briefly what has been said about LDS belief. The idea most readily found in the LDS scriptures, the teachings of all of Brigham Young's successors is that Adam and all of the human family have a common Father and God, who is the Father of Jesus Christ. In fact, this very concept was stated in public sermons on several occasions by Brigham Young himself. An example is found in his April 17, 1870 sermon:

The world may in vain ask the question, "Who are we?" But the Gospel tells us that we are the sons and daughters of that God whom we serve. Some say, "We are the children of Adam and Eve." So we are, and they are the children of our Heavenly Father. We are all the children of Adam and Eve, and they are the offspring of Him who dwells in the heavens, the highest Intelligence that dwells anywhere that we have any knowledge of. (JD 13:311. See also, 1:28; 10:231; 13:309.)

So, with the exception of several sermons that fell far short of standard, Mormon belief has been infallible, at least in matters of faith and doctrine, and therefore there could be no doctrinal difference or disharmony among them. Indeed, the LDS Church, like the Church of Moses, Jesus, Joseph Smith, Spencer W. Kimball, and all the rest of mankind is the same being who is the Father and God of Adam. Although never official doctrine, some still wonder how President Young could have held such views. This leads to the next question.

Can prophets differ in their views?

As one who believes that God has called prophets at various times, I think that the only possible answer to this question is "Yes."

Most opponents who have made an issue of the Adam-God theory insist that true prophets have an infallible, at least in matters of faith and doctrine, and therefore there could be no doctrinal difference or disharmony among them. They demand that LDS prophets either maintain this standard or be denounced as false prophets. As a matter of fact, Biblical prophets were in such perfect union with God as to be free from all error and personal opinion and that their every word and thought were not their own, but God's, this claim has much appeal, but many devoted Christians who have examined this point are of the belief that the Bible in no way supports this assumption. Commentators who have studied the Bible in chronological order have found numerous differences when comparing earlier writings to later, and when comparing author to author. This basic idea has been widely demonstrated in such major Biblical works as the Interpreter's Bible, and the Interpreter's Bible Dictionary.

Several subjects on which the authors of the Bible disagree include: the nature of God, Jesus, and the Messias; salvation, resurrection, the second coming, and the observance of the law of Moses. Our opponents must be able to deny the differences demonstrated by Biblical scholars on these several important matters, and that is what they have not done. If we are to be fair, the Bible can be interpreted as they have done. Non-Mormons who acknowledge these differences within the Bible have not felt obligated to reject the Biblical prophets because of these matters. Rather, we have proposed what they feel are valid explanations of them. As far as I am concerned, the same explanations apply with equal validity to LDS prophets.

The two primary points of their explanations are:

a) Prophets were not infallible, and b) Their knowledge was fragmentary and incomplete. Rev. J.R. Dumelow, in his widely received work, stated:

We must not regard the Bible as an absolutely perfect book in which God is Himself the author using human hands and brain only as typewriters. God used men, not machines — men with like weakness and prejudice and passion as ourselves ... in the Bible we do not expect the authors to be real and natural. Because of our false theory of Verbal Inspiration we are puzzled when the divine is mingled with the human. We must learn that the divine, as well as the divine is mingled with the human. It is a mine of precious ore where the gold is mingled with the rock and clay — the ore is richer in one part than another, but all parts in some degree are glittering with gold. (loc. cit.)

The Apostle Paul said that that "which is perfect" would come in the future. For the present, he claimed that he only "knew in part and prophesied in part." He compared his present knowledge to the distorted, imperfect image reflected in the mirror of his mirror of his day. He did not consider his knowledge either complete or perfect. The renowned New Testament interpreter William Barclay has commented on this passage from 1 Corinthians 13:9-12:

The Corinthian mirror was made of highly polished metal and, even at its best, gave but an imperfect reflection ... In life Paul feels we see only the reflections of God and are left with much that is mystery and riddle ... Even if in Christ we have the perfect revelation, our seeking minds can grasp it only in part, for the finite can never grasp the infinite. Our knowledge is still like the knowledge of a child. But the way of love will lead us in the end to a day when the veil is drawn aside and we see face to face and know even as we are known. (The Letters to the Corinthians, p. 125.)

I believe the only reasonable position is that the Biblical prophets were a mixture of the divine and the human. They received revelation progressively and revealed Himself to them "line upon line." The prophets increased in their knowledge and understanding, as did those who followed them. The result is that in different ages different prophets have held some different views. Even the same prophet grew in insight and understanding.

From their writings and sermons it seems to me that both Joseph Smith and Brigham Young would have concurred with these conclusions of recent Bible commentators. Both maintained that God had not perfectly nor fully revealed Himself to past prophets nor to themselves. The were, like Paul, looking to the future for God's perfect revelation of Himself and for their own perfect understand-
ing of His revelations. Neither one claimed to be infallible, but rather frequently admitted to his own imperfections.

(D&C 42:51; 50:24, 40; 78:18; 88:49; 121:28; 124:41; 128:18; JD 2:314; 1:115), Brigham Young once stated as his opinion that:

even the best of the Latter-day Saints have but a faint idea of the attributes of the Deity.

Were the former and Latter-day Saints, with their Apostles, Prophets, Seers, and Revelators collected together to discuss this matter, I am led to believe that the result would be found a very great variety in their views and feelings upon this subject, without direct revelation from the Lord. It is as much my right to differ from other men, as it is theirs to differ from me, in points of doctrine and principle, when our minds cannot at once arrive at the same conclusion. (JD 2:123).

Many non-Mormon Christians, while admitting that differences exist in the prophetic writings, are not willing to reject the prophets. Neither am I. I am not willing to discard Paul’s claims because some of his imperfections and lack of harmony with other prophets and apostles have been pointed out. Neither am I willing to discard Mormonism because opponents can point to a difference between Brigham Young and a Bible prophet, or between him and a succeeding LDS prophet.

I believe those who insist that prophets must be infallible are either uninformed or unreasonable. Either they will find themselves disappointed, or will find themselves constantly refusing an obvious and necessary examination of the subject. I think it only fair that opponents of Mormonism either relinquish this point, or be prepared to refute the massive evidence of prophetic differences and variations presented by objective Christian Bible scholars.

It is common for Mormons who have examined the Adam-God issue to reject this concept of Brigham Young but not to reject him as a prophet believing that both the Bible and Mormon history have revealed that all who have been prophets have been fallible and susceptible to error. When the evidence against the infallibility of prophets is acknowledged, I believe this position is reasonable. However, there is something more which needs to be said. I also know some Mormons who believe the Adam-God theory is true, and others who, although they have not yet formed an opinion, in order to understand these other two positions two additional points need attention.

In their zeal to portray Mormonism as negatively as possible it is very common for opponents to charge that the Adam-God theory is absurd and blasphemous, but this greatly exaggerates the issue. This is a charge made in the spirit of ridicule rather than reasoned examination. The claim is frequently made that Brigham Young believed in a different God, that he did not believe in the God of the Bible. However, in his sermons, when he spoke of God, he clearly had reference to the God of the Bible, the Being who:

formed the earth (Discourses of Brigham Young, p.117),

made promises to Abraham (p.342),

delivered the children of Israel from Egypt (p.342),
gave the Law to Moses (p.104, 348),
and is the Father of Christ (p.26, 119).

He did not believe in a different God. He believed that the God of the Bible, He who performed these and

many other acts described therein, also came to this earth as Adam. If in error on this point, his error was in believing God performed an act which He did not perform. The point of difference is not who is God, but rather what has God done.

I have frequently heard our opponents respond to the claim that God the Father experienced mortality by crying absurd, or blasphemous. However, they believe, as do Mormons, that the ‘man, Christ Jesus’ (1 Tim. 2:5), who “grew and waxed strong” (Luke 2:40), “increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man” (Luke 2:52), “learned obedience by the things which he suffered” (Heb. 5:8), “was in all points tempted like as we are” (Heb. 4:15), who experienced birth, pain joy, sorrow, anger, and death,

that this man was in fact God the Son passing through mortality. By comparison, Brigham Young believed that:

God the Father took upon Himself mortality to begin the human race;

God the Son took upon Himself mortality to redeem the human race.

I can understand how someone who believes the second statement could disbelieve the first one, but I am surprised that those who believe the second one do not hesitate to declare the first one absurd and blasphemous. Why is it any more absurd or blasphemous to believe that God the Father experienced mortality than it is to believe that God the Son did? I suppose that ultimately whatever is false is also absurd. My point is that until the ultimate truth is revealed what seems absurd or blasphemous is usually that which contradicts a cherished religious tradition. For 2000 years many Jews, upon their understanding of the Old Testament, have condemned the Christian view of Jesus as absurd and blasphemous. I see this approach as an appeal to tradition, not as a worthwhile argument.

The primary argument of those who do not accept the Adam-God theory is that it is not scriptural. I concur with this; I do not believe that it can be supported from the Bible. To me the Bible’s message is that Adam’s God is our God; his Father is our Father. (Genesis 1:26; Adam like 3:38). This also seems to be the message of LDS scripture, (Moses 2:5, and D&C. 78:16-22).

However, it does not necessarily need to point out that this is false to show that it is not supported by previous scripture, or even that it apparently contradicts previous scripture. If, otherwise, then those who rejected the New Testament message were justified. Many rejected Jesus because he was not God’s message, but sometimes a different message. Several times in the Gospels, that he did not believe in the God of the Bible. However, in his sermons, when he spoke of God, he clearly had reference to the God of the Bible, the Being who:

formed the earth (Discourses of Brigham Young, p.117),

made promises to Abraham (p.342),

delivered the children of Israel from Egypt (p.342),
gave the Law to Moses (p.104, 348),
and is the Father of Christ (p.26, 119).

He did not believe in a different God. He believed that the God of the Bible, He who performed these and

completed in the New Testament. We believe that God will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God. (Article of Faith, 9). One Bible commentator has characterized the “true prophet” as “a progressive, who continually advances in knowledge and grace.” The false prophet “harped continually on the same old string, merely repeating what former prophets had said . . . instead of waiting upon Jehovah himself, and from his never-failing treasury bringing forth ‘things new and old.’” (Abingdon Commentary, 1951).

Neither the Bible nor Mormonism has ever claimed that truth is to be found only in the official canon. It must be remembered that every new revelation ever given has always been outside of the official canon initially. To reject any idea simply because it sounds new or different is to reject one of the most fundamental principles of the Judeo-Christian religion epitomized in the statement of Jesus, “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.” (Matthew 11:15, etc.). He clearly had a deeper message which those who remain on the surface will never grasp.

As a result of this, some Mormons believe the Adam-God theory even though it was never official doctrine, never canonized, and not supported from previous scripture. Personally, I do not find this conclusion unreasonable. There are, however, those who are extreme in their acceptance of the Adam-God theory, and are known as fundamentalist Mormons, just fundamentalists.

Fundamentalist Mormon Argument

On seven points the fundamentalist position is identical to that of the non-Mormon Christian — namely, that the Adam-God theory is absurd and blasphemous, and that prophets cannot disagree. Where they differ is in that they believe it is true and scriptural. Non-Mormon Christians believe Mormonism is false because early leaders taught the Adam-God theory. Fundamentalists believe current Mormonism is false because leaders once taught it.

They frequently resort to considering the scriptures and the teachings of Joseph Smith in order to force them to harmonize with the Adam-God theory. I have stated what I believe to be the doctrine of the scriptures. As for Joseph Smith, he clearly taught that Adam holds a position of authority superior to any of the prophets, that he stands at the head of his posterity, and prehends the spirits of mankind; that it is by Adam’s authority that the keys are given, that he will judge the saints. However, the most central issue of the Adam-God theory — that God the Father became Adam — has not been found among Joseph Smith’s teachings; it has not been shown that he ever believed that Adam was the Father of our spirits; and he clearly taught that no man with high position of authority is yet subordinate to that of Jesus Christ. (Words of Joseph Smith, p.9-12, 38-44).

Most of the points previously discussed also apply to the fundamentalist argument. There is one point I wish to discuss further. They claim to be disciplined by Brigham Young. Yet I believe they have misunderstood him to a greater degree than even the non-Mormon Christians have. I believe Brigham Young himself would denounce their position in the strongest of terms. By declaring that Church leaders are in apostasy they have created a division over a subject he said “does not immediately concern yours or my welfare;” one which he said “should not trouble us at
They have lost sight of what he believed was most important:

"We must be one. Our faith must be concentrated in one great work — the building up of the Kingdom of God on the earth, and our works must aim at the accomplishment of that great purpose." (JD 7:280).

Even when a leader is in error he emphasized maintaining unity:

"...it is not the place for anyone to correct any person who is superior to them but ask the Father in the name of Jesus to bind him up from speaking false principles, I have known many times I have preached wrong but I asked the Father in the name of Jesus to take it from the minds of the people and I believe he always did drop the veil over it. Let your faith be for that man but do not oppose and get up a division between them." (Thomas Bullock minutes, May 8, 1864, HDC).

On another occasion he stated:

"Let the kingdom alone, the Lord steadies the ark; and if it does jostle, and appear to need steadying, if the way is a little sideling sometimes, and to all appearance threatens its overthrow, be careful how you stretch forth your hands to steady it; let us not be too officious in meddling with that which does not concern us; let it alone, it is the Lord's work." (JD 11:252).

Since fundamentalists believe that Brigham Young was a true prophet, I do not feel they can justify hindering one of his major goals by their unbalanced preoccupation with one of his more obscure doctrinal beliefs.

There are three additional attitudes which I have heard expressed by Mormons which I wish to mention:

1. Some are totally disinterested in anything except the teachings of the present leaders. These are working in the present and looking to the future without ever looking back. There is no spark of concern for past issues. There are those most critical of this attitude. Although I am one who must look back, I find myself unable to criticize those not so inclined.

2. Some have insisted that Brigham Young never taught the Adam-God theory; that he has been misquoted, inaccurately reported, or misinterpreted. This was a reasonable view for many years when the entire argument was founded only upon Brigham Young's April 9, 1852 discourse. As additional sources have been discovered this position has become less and less tenable until now I believe it should be totally discarded.

3. Finally, some Mormons believe that after a fair examination of all relevant points several reasonable conclusions could be reached. Convinced that Mormonism does not stand or fall upon the issue of the Adam-God theory, they are satisfied to suspend final judgment on the matter until further light is shed.

Although many individuals have and will resolve the matter for themselves, I am certain that their conclusions will continue to be varied because of the several seemingly reasonable approaches to the issue.

In conclusion I include what I consider to be the most reasonably stated position on the issue. It is extracted from an unpublished letter of President Joseph F. Smith to Bishop Edward Bunker, February 27, 1902:

"While it is far from my purpose to stifle thought and free speech among the brethren, or to brand as "false doctrine" any and every mystery of the kingdom, it is never-the-less my wish and my advice, in which Presidents Winder and Lund, my counselors, heartily join, that the Elders should not make a practice of preaching upon these abstruse themes, these partly revealed principles, respecting which there are such wide differences of belief.

What is called the Adam God doctrine may properly be classed among the mysteries. The full truth concerning it has not been revealed to us; and until it is revealed all wild speculations, sweeping assertions and dogmatic declarations relative thereto, are out of place and improper. We disapprove of them and especially the public expression of such views... Let us be content with what is plainly revealed on this subject, namely: that those who may and Gods many as the Apostle Paul declares, yet to us there is but one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I have attempted to present as fairly as I could in so brief a work the various attitudes I have encountered on this interesting subject. Whatever conclusion others may reach, I am confident that Brigham Young, if he were here, would be dismayed that his few statements on this subject have prevented some people from giving a fair examination to the restored gospel and church that inspired and motivated him. A man of remarkable common sense, Brigham Young did not think that the existence of sun spots should lead one to turn away from the sun's warmth and light.

by Van Hale
BRIGHAM YOUNG'S FALSE TEACHING:

ADAM IS GOD

CHRIS ALEX VLACHOS

Of all the vices that entangle a man, perhaps none is as unholy as jealousy. Jealousy, the "green-eyed monster," dwells in the deeper regions of sin because the source of its existence is unbridled covetousness growing out of pride and insecurity. However, in the case of jealousy, what is a vice in human nature is a virtue in the divine nature of God. Though among men jealousy is a ravaging and soul-destroying cancer, in God it is a righteous zeal, based upon His covenant love for His own people, which seeks to protect a love-relationship and avenge it when broken. The godly zeal which the Lord has for those whom He has chosen is an attribute worthy of all praise and adoration.

The fact that He is a jealous God was one of the first characteristics that the Lord made known to Israel after He had redeemed her out of the slave market of Egypt. She became His love and possession, and He demanded from her a love and devotion that would extend to no other.¹

I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me . . . for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God (Ex. 20:1, 3, 5).

Thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God (Ex. 34:14).

Throughout Old Testament history the Lord taught Israel that He was the only God. For her to worship and serve another would be sheer adultery and whoredom:

1. Calvin, in his exposition of the second commandment, explains this beautifully:

   The Lord very frequently addresses us in the character of a husband. . . . As he performs all the offices of a true and faithful husband, so he requires love and chastity from us; that is, that we do not prostitute our souls to Satan. . . . As the purer and chaster a husband is, the more grievously he is offended when he sees his wife inclining to a rival; so the Lord, who has betrothed us to Himself in truth, declares that he burns with the hottest jealousy whenever, neglecting the purity of His holy marriage, we defile ourselves with abominable lusts and especially when the worship of His deity, which ought to have been most carefully kept unimpaired, is transferred to another . . . since in this way we not only violate our plighted troth, but defile the nuptial couch, by giving access to adulterers [Institutes, II, viii, 18].
And yet they would not hearken unto their judges, but they went a whoring after other gods, and bowed themselves unto them (Judges 2:17).

In the New Testament we find the same teaching. The New Testament writers shared the Lord's jealousy over His covenant people:

For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ (II Cor. 11:2).

While throughout the flow of Bible history we see God proclaiming that He alone is to be worshiped, at the same time we find prophets who were not of God taught the contrary. True prophets would never be found teaching the people to worship another god—whether it was a stone idol, an imaginary god dwelling in heaven, or a defiled man. They knew that it was Jehovah who had redeemed Israel out of Egypt and that He alone is God. Inspired by God's Spirit, they knew the mind of the Lord: that He would give His glory to no other. Therefore, when these living oracles of God spoke as prophets, they were moved to proclaim, "Thou shalt worship the LORD thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

In light of this insistence upon the exclusiveness of the true God, we can understand the test of a prophet that Moses taught the children of Israel. By applying this timeless test, people throughout all ages may detect the false ones:

If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass, whereby he spaketh unto thee, saying, let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the LORD proveth thee, to know whether thou lovest the LORD your God with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the LORD your God, and fear Him, and keep His commandments, and obey His voice, and ye shall serve Him, and cleave unto Him. And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death; because he has spoken to turn you away from the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, to thrust thee out of the way which the LORD thy God commanded thee to walk in. So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee (Deut. 13:1-5).

These words tell us that though a man might exercise miraculous powers, he could not be a prophet of the Lord if he sought to lead the people away to a strange god. Any prophet who advocates the service and worship of another god is not a mouthpiece of the Lord, is false, and, under the theocratic nation of Israel, was to be slain.

Holding fast to these truths let us turn now to Brigham Young, a man who claimed for himself the station and office of prophet of God. Recent history records the lives of few men who have possessed the leadership qualities that Young exhibited. For thirty years he preached as Prophet, Seer, and Revelator over the Mormon Church, a people claiming to be led by prophets of God as in the days of ancient Israel. On the basis of this claim the Mormons have always regarded themselves as the only true Church on earth today. Their priesthood claims sole possession of the authority or power needed to act on behalf of God, and they consider all other "Christian churches" to be in a state of apostasy, who at best teach a partial truth about the gospel of Christ. Now if Brigham Young, Mormon prophet from 1847 to 1877, were a false prophet all along, then the claims of those who have sought to derive their priesthood authority through him are empty and void. If Brigham taught false doctrine, that cuts the ground from under Mormonism's claim of latter-day prophetic revelation and the Mormon Church is not divinely led. Acknowledging this to be true, LDS Apostle Orson Hyde stated:

To acknowledge that this is the Kingdom of God, and that there is a presiding power, and to admit that he [Brigham Young] can advance incorrect doctrine is to lay the axe at the root of the tree. Will he suffer his mouthpiece to go into error? No. Any boast of prophetic guidance would be worthless if that guidance were...
false. J. Taylor, Mormon Apostle and later President, admitted also this to be the case: “If that mouthpiece [Brigham Young] has not the power to dictate I would throw all Mormonism away.”

The Mormon Church must base the truth of her claims on the authenticity of Brigham’s calling. Yet, we shall see that Brigham Young, who presided over the Mormon Church longer than any other man, did indeed advance false doctrine that focused worship on a god other than the Lord God of Israel.

Adam-God First Proclaimed.

It stormed heavily on April 9, 1852, but the people turned out for the sessions of the Spring LDS Conference that were held that day. Each session of the six-day church conference was filled to capacity. Those desiring the best seats lined up outside the doors hours before they opened. At times, because the crowds were so large, many male members would leave the tabernacle to allow more room for the women to attend.

At 6:00 on the evening of the ninth, all LDS male members gathered together in the Salt Lake Tabernacle for another session. The house was full. After the usual introductory exercises, Mormon Prophet and President Brigham Young began to address his brethren upon various subjects. He instructed them concerning the place recreation and amusements should occupy in their lives and concerning the principle of tithing.

Then, after a moment’s pause, the Mormon Prophet took up his next topic. The question was, Who begot Jesus Christ in the flesh? This was a hot issue. There had been no little dispute about it among the LDS Elders, and there were opposing views. As a Prophet and mouthpiece of God, Brigham Young stepped forward to silence all erroneous opinions and to declare with finality the true answer to the inquiry.

First, he repeated the fundamental Mormon doctrine that the Father and Son each has a physical body of flesh and bones. Next, he set forth Mormonism’s belief that God the Father in a pre-existent period begot every spirit that would come to this earth. Then Brigham looked out over the vast audience and boldly commanded all of his hearers, whether near or far, Mormon or non-Mormon, to take heed to his next statements:

Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael, the Archangel, the Ancient of Days! about whom holy men have written and spoken — He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians or non-professing, must hear it, and will know it sooner or later.

After declaring that Adam was the God of this world and the Father of its inhabitants, Brigham then addressed the original inquiry concerning the Saviour’s birth:

When the Virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the Father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the Father? He is the first of the human family; and when he took a tabernacle, it was begotten by his father in heaven, after the same manner as the tabernacles of Cain, Abel, and the rest of the sons and daughters of Adam and Eve; ... I could tell you much more about this; but were I to tell you the whole truth, blasphemy would be nothing to it, in the estimation of the superstitious and over-righteous of mankind. However, I have told you the whole truth as far as I have gone. ... What a learned idea! Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the garden of Eden, and who is our Father in heaven. Now, let all who may hear the doctrines, pause before they make light of them, or treat them with indifference, for they will prove their salvation or damnation. I have given you a few leading items upon this subject, but a great deal more remains to be told. Now, remember from this time forth, and forever, that Jesus Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. I will repeat a little anecdote. I was in conversation with a certain learned professor upon this subject, when I replied, to this idea—"if the Son was begotten by the Holy Ghost, it would be very dangerous to baptize and confirm females, and give the Holy Ghost to them, lest he should beget children, to be palmed upon the Elders by the people, bringing the Elders into great difficulties." Treasure up these things in your hearts. In the Bible, you have read the things I told you tonight; but you have not known what you did read.

Having made this response, Young concluded his comments with another reference to tithing. The Mormon choir then sang a hymn and Elder H. G. Sherwood gave the closing benediction.

Few of the Latter-day Saint Elders who filed out of the Tabernacle that night missed the meaning of what their prophet had just announced. Upon returning home that evening, Hosea Stout, the prominent Mormon pioneer, recorded the following in his daily journal:

Friday 9th April 1852.—Stormy morning, attended conference House

7. Ibid., pp. 6-7.
8. Believing himself to be a prophet of God, Young declared that it was his gift and calling to teach true doctrine and to guard the members against heresy: What man or woman on the earth, what spirit in the spirit-world can say truthfully that I ever gave a wrong word of counsel, or a word of advice that could not be sanctioned by the heavens? (Journal of Discourses: 12:127).
10. Ibid., pp. 50-51.
much crowded, did not stay in House long, after noon was not in because of the crowd.—Another meeting this evening. President B. Young taught that Adam was the father of Jesus Christ and the only God to us. That he came to this world in a resurrected body &c more hereafter.\footnote{11}

Samuel Rogers, who also was present that night, similarly noted the content of Brigham Young’s discourse:

April 16 1852, Conference commenced on the 6 and continued until the 11, it was heled in the new tabernacle, adjourned until the 6 of next October We had the best Conference that I ever attended during the time of the Conference President Brigham Young said that our spirits were begotten before that Adam came to the Earth, and that Adam helped to make the Earth, that he had a Celestial body when he came to the Earth, and that he brought his wife or one of his wives with him, and that Eve was also a Celestial being, that they eat of the fruit of the ground until they begat children from the Earth, he said that Adam was the only God that we would have, and that Christ was not begotten of the Holy Ghost, but of the Father Adam. . . .\footnote{12}

\textbf{Denial Adam-God Was Taught}

As we consider Brigham Young’s claim that Adam is God, it becomes clear that he was a false, uninspired prophet. This teaching not only runs counter to what has been revealed in the Bible, but it is also branded as false doctrine in modern Mormonism. LDS Apostle Mark E. Petersen, one of Mormonism’s doctrinal authorities, stated:

Some dissidents would have us believe that Adam is our God and that we have nothing to do with any other God, which, on the face of it, is ridiculous. To say that Adam is God is, of course, opposed utterly and completely to the scriptures as well as to our Articles of faith. . . .\footnote{13}

Spencer W. Kimball, current Mormon Prophet, also denounced the teaching that Adam is God:

We warn you against the dissemination of doctrines which are not according to the scriptures and which are alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities. . . . Such, for instance is the Adam-God theory. We denounce that theory and hope that everyone will be cautioned against this and other kinds of false doctrine.\footnote{14}

\footnote{11} Diary of Hosea Stout. Copied from typed transcript. B.Y.U. Library, Special Collections, Provo, Utah. The spelling, grammar, and punctuation in this quotation as well as in all others cited herein have not been changed from the originals.
\footnote{12} Journal of Samuel H. Rogers, vol. 1, p. 179. Copied from the original located at B.Y.U. Library, Special Collections, Provo, Utah.
\footnote{14} Spencer W. Kimball, \textit{Deseret News}, October 9, 1976, Church News Section, p. 11.

These and most other Mormon General Authorities, while denouncing the doctrine that Adam is God, avoid or deny the fact that Brigham Young himself was the major exponent of this doctrine. In his book, \textit{Adam Who Is He?}, Mark E. Petersen tries to rescue Mormonism’s second prophet from teaching false doctrine by maintaining that Brigham Young was misquoted in the address in question. On pages 16-17 of his book, Petersen sets forth as evidence for his defense a reference in which C. C. Rich supposedly stated that Brigham was misquoted in this sermon. Petersen claims that Rich was present on the ninth of April and was therefore in a position to note the misquotation which later crept into the published account of the discourse:

Elder Charles C. Rich, of the Council of the Twelve, was present on a day when President Young gave an address that was wrongly reported as saying that Adam was God. In the copy of the \textit{Journal of Discourses} that he had, Elder Rich referred to the misquotation as it appears in the \textit{Journal of Discourses}, and in his own hand he wrote the following as the correct statement made by President Young: “Jesus our elder Brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character who talked with Adam in the Garden of Eden, and who is our heavenly Father.” (This signed statement is in the hands of the Church Historian.) Some of the reporters at the Tabernacle in those days were not as skill as others, and admittedly made mistakes, such as the misquotation of President Young as above, which was corrected by Brother Rich and which has caused some persons in the Church to go astray. The erroneously reported statement has been mistakenly made to read: “Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the Garden of Eden, and who is our Father in Heaven.” (JD, 1:51) On the face of it the mistake is obvious and was quickly noted by Elder Rich, who was present and heard the sermon. Hence the correction that he made.

What seems to be a good case made by Mr. Petersen crumbles, however, upon cross-examination. C. C. Rich, who Petersen claims “was present and heard the sermon,” was in reality not even in Salt Lake City on that day! Rich left San Bernardino, California, on March 24, 1852, for the Great Salt Lake.\footnote{15} He did not reach his destination until April 21. Under this date, the LDS Journal History records:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{April 21, 1852:}
\item Elder Chas. C. Rich and thirteen others arrived today in G.S.L from California.\footnote{16}
\end{itemize}

In the May 1, 1852, issue of the Mormon \textit{Deseret Weekly} the following announcement was made:

\begin{itemize}
\item 15. Copied from microfilm of original. B.Y.U. Library, Special Collections, Provo, Utah.
\end{itemize}
Elder C. C. Rich arrived on Wednesday, the 21 of April, in company with 13 others ... direct from San Bernardino. 17

Hosca Stout, in his journal, also noted the event:

Wednesday 21st April 1852 Engaged as yesterday. Gen. Rich and some 15 others arrived today from California by the South rout all well.

Furthermore, not only was C. C. Rich absent on the ninth, but the reference which Peterson claims was written by C. C. Rich “in his own hand” was in reality written and signed by his son, Ben E. Rich, many years after the sermon was delivered! 18

Whether Mr. Petersen was deliberately seeking to suppress the facts or not, the truth is that there is no evidence whatsoever that Brigham Young was misquoted. As we shall see, Young came under much criticism from outside and from within the Mormon Church for teaching that Adam was God the Father. If he had merely been misquoted, Brigham simply could have corrected his hearers and accusers. Instead, however, Young continued to affirm and preach this doctrine against all opposition. 19

These facts have forced other Mormon writers to maintain that Brigham was quoted correctly, but that he has been misinterpreted by his hearers and readers. Realizing the implications of one of their prophets teaching false doctrine on such an essential matter as who God is, these LDS apologists insist that Brigham Young did not mean to say that Adam was deity. Characteristic of this argument are the following statements made by the tenth Mormon President, Joseph Fielding Smith:

In discussing the statement by President Brigham Young that the Father of Jesus Christ is the same character who was in the garden of Eden, I maintain that President Young was not referring to Adam, but to God the Father, who created Adam, for he was in the garden of Eden, and according to Mormon doctrine Adam was in his presence constantly. It is assumed by some that there is a reference to the Book of Mormon, which states that Adam was the Father of Jesus Christ. This is not the case. The reference is to the Garden of Eden, where Adam was created by God the Father. The statement is not a reference to the Garden of Eden as a physical place, but rather as a symbol of the spiritual realm in which God created Adam.

18. Copy of the original Journal of Discourses volume on which statement was made is located in the Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City. For photo reproduction, see Bob Witte, Where Does It Say That?, p. 77.
19. Faced with the fact that Brigham Young made no attempt to correct his statements, Mormon scholar, Rodney Turner, was forced to admit that Brigham was quoted correctly:

Was Brigham Young misquoted? It is the writer's opinion that the answer to this question is a categorical no. There is not the slightest evidence from Brigham Young, or any other source, that either his original remarks on April 9, 1852, or any of his subsequent statements were ever misquoted in the official publications of the Church. ... In light of Brigham Young's attitude toward the errors of others, and in view of the division created by his remarks concerning Adam, it would be stretching one's credulity to the breaking point to believe that he would have remained silent had he been misquoted. The Position of Adam in Latter-day Saint Scripture and Theology, M.A. thesis, B.Y.U., pp. 45-46; thesis is presently restricted from viewing or reading).
the flesh. Some contended it was the H Ghost, and some that it was Eliahian. When I spoke upon it in this stand before a conference of Elders, I cautioned them when they laid their hands upon the people for the gift of the H Ghost, according to the instructions of the Savior, to be very careful how they laid hands upon young women for if it begat a child in the days of the virgin Mary it is just as liable to beget children in these last days.  

While Brigham in his discourse of 1852 may have been unclear, in this 1854 address there is no question about his meaning. Here Brigham distinctly names Adam as God the Father. Wilford Woodruff, Mormon Apostle and later Church President, had no doubt about what Brigham meant.Referring to this discourse under the date of February 19, 1854, in his journal, Woodruff recorded:

He [Brigham Young] said that our God was Father Adam. He was the Father of the Savior Jesus Christ—Our God was no more or less than ADAM, Michael the Arkangel.  

It should also be noted that Brigham identifies Adam as the “Father of our spirits.” One of Mormonism’s fundamental doctrines is the belief that God the Father was married and that he and his celestial wife in a pre-existent period had begotten every spirit that would come to this earth. These spirits then enter into individual infants who are born physically upon the earth. By referring to Adam as the Father of our spirits, Brigham was clearly identifying him as the being whom Mormons address as “Heavenly Father.”  

On June 26-28, 1854, a special General Council of the authorities of the LDS British Mission convened in London, England. The council minutes show that Brigham’s doctrine of Adam being God was not readily received by some of the members there. After the introductory exercises, Mormon Elder Thomas Caffall rose to state the affairs of the Southern LDS conference. Among other things he reported the following:

...some of the officers have not met in council for three years. They are lacking faith on one principle—the last ‘cat’ that was let out of the bag.” Polygamy has been got over pretty well, that cloud has vanished away, but they are troubled about Adam being our Father and God. There is a very intelligent person investigating our principles, and who has been a great help to the Saints; he has all the works and can get along very well with everything else but the last ‘cat’, and as soon as he can see that clearly, he will become a ‘Mormon’. I instructed him to write Liverpool upon it.  

Elder Joseph Hall followed with a report of his district’s progress. Despite the non-biblical nature of the Adam-God doctrine, those in his area were willing to receive it as truth:

Relative to the principles recently revealed, we have not the least difficulty. If Adam’s being our Father and God cannot be proved by the Bible, it is alright.  

On the final day of the council Elder James A. Little rose and made the following remarks:

I believe in the principle of obedience; and if I am told that Adam is our Father and our God, I just believe it.  

Mission President Samuel W. Richards followed with a concluding exhortation concerning the Adam-God doctrine:

Concerning the item of doctrine alluded to by Elder Caffall and others, viz., that Adam is our Father and God, I have to say do not trouble yourselves, neither let the Saints be troubled about that matter. If, as Elder Caffall remarked, there are those who are waiting at the door of the Church for this objection to be removed, tell such, the prophet and Apostle Brigham has declared it, and that is the word of the Lord.  

Apostle Pratt Opposes Young’s Adam-God

Though Richards and most of the other Church authorities accepted their prophet's declaration as the word of God, there was one member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles who openly opposed Brigham in his views. That man was Orson Pratt. Under the date of September 17, 1854, LDS Apostle Wilford Woodruff recorded in his journal the details of a confrontation between Young and Pratt. Pratt had been writing and publishing a monthly periodical which contained doctrine contrary to the Mormon President. When Young declared some of Orson's doctrines to be false, Pratt retaliated against the prophet by voicing his disbelief in the Adam-God doctrine:

Brother Pratt also thought that Adam was made of the dust of the Earth. Could not believe that Adam was our God or the Father of Jesus Christ President Young said that He was that He came from another world & made this brought Eve with him partook of the fruits of the Earth begat children & they were Earthly & had mortal bodies & if we were faithful we should become Gods as He was. He told Brother Pratt to lay aside his Philosophical reasoning & get revelation from God to govern him & enlighten his mind more.  

This dispute between the Mormon Prophet and his Apostle continued
for seven years. Because of his disbelief in the Adam-God teaching and in other doctrines of Young, Pratt was for years upon the point of being severed from the Church.\textsuperscript{31}

In October of 1854, the Mormon Church held its semi-annual Conference. The session of October 8 was held out of doors in the open air. The congregation, which numbered in the thousands, heard Brigham Young deliver what was perhaps the most colorful discourse ever presented in the history of the Mormon Church. Addressing this immense gathering upon the subject of the identity of God, Young made the following statements:

... my text is in the Bible and reads as follows: “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” I will now put another text with this and then offer a few remarks. It is one of the sayings of the Apostle Paul: “For though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or on earth (as there be Gods many and Lords many) but to us there is but one God, the Father of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.” This God is the father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the father of our spirits. 

Now if you believe what you have heard me say you will believe there are Lords many, and Gods many; and you will believe that unto us, the inhabitants of the earth there is but one God with whom we have to do.

You and I have only one God to whom we are accountable, so we will let the rest alone, and search after the one we have to do with; let us seek after him, the very being who commenced this creation.

But let us turn our attention to the God with which we have to do. I tell you simply, he is our father; the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the father of our spirits.

I tell you more, Adam is the father of our spirits. He had lived upon an earth; he did abide his creation, and did honor to his calling and priesthood, and obeyed his master or Lord, and probably many of his wives did the same and they lived, and died upon an earth and then were resurrected again to immortality and eternal life.

I reckon that Father Adam was a resurrected being, with his wives and posterity, and in the Celestial kingdom they were crowned with glory, immortality, and eternal lives, with thrones, principalities and powers; and it was said to him it is your right to organize the elements; and to your creations and posterity there shall be no end.

Our spirits and the spirits of all the human family were begotten by Adam and born of Eve.\textsuperscript{32}

At no previous time had Brigham gone into as much detail concerning Adam as he did during this discourse. While the Mormon prophet had formerly taught that Adam was the God and Father of Jesus Christ and the Father of men’s spirits, he had never expounded upon Adam’s pre-earthly course of life as he did during this 1854 conference.

To fully comprehend the implications of Brigham’s statements concerning Adam’s pre-earthly development and advancement from stage to stage, it is necessary to understand the Mormon doctrine of “eternal progression.” Mormonism’s fifth President, Lorenzo Snow, summarized this doctrine with his aphorism:

As man is, God once was;
As God is, man may become.

The doctrine of eternal progression states that God the Father was once a man who lived, died, and was resurrected upon an earth similar to ours. By his faithfulness to the commandments of his God he progressed and advanced from degree to degree until he was crowned with exaltation, or Godhood. Having become God, he was then given the privilege of creating this world and being the Lord over it. He and his wife then begot the spirits which would later enter into the fleshly tabernacles which he would form for them. In a discourse in September of 1856, Brigham Young described this progression to exaltation which God the Father had passed through:

... our father in heaven is exalted and glorified. He has received His thrones, His principalities and powers, and He sits as a governor, as a monarch, and overrules kingdoms, thrones, and dominions that have been bequeathed to Him, and such as we anticipate receiving. While He was in the flesh, as we are, He was as we are. But it is now written of Him that our God is as a consuming fire, that He dwells in everlasting burnings. ... God is the Father of our spirits; He begat them, and has sent them here to receive tabernacles. ...\textsuperscript{33}

This same doctrine of eternal progression teaches that men today, if faithful as their God was, will continue on the road of progression until they too are exalted and crowned with Godhood. They will then not only receive eternal life, but they will as Gods be given “eternal lives” or the power of eternal increase. They will then have the ability to organize a world and to be the progenitors of the spirits of its inhabitants. In a discourse delivered during a special conference in August of 1852, Brigham Young described this process:

After men have got their exaltations and their crowns—have become Gods, even the sons of God—are made Kings of kings and Lords of lords, they have the power then of propagating their species in spirit; and that is the first of their operations with regard to organizing a


\textsuperscript{32} Brigham Young Papers, Oct. 8, 1854, call number Ms. d 1234, Church Historian’s Office, Salt Lake City.

\textsuperscript{33} Brigham Young, Journal of Discourses, 4:54.
work. Power is then given to them to organize the elements, and then commence the organization of tabernacles. 34

Having an understanding of the Mormon concept of eternal progression, we can now clearly see the implications of Brigham Young's statements in his 1854 General Conference discourse. When he stated that Adam "was a resurrected being," he meant that Adam had lived, died, and had been resurrected upon another earth. By stating that Adam "in the celestial kingdom . . . was crowned with glory, immortality, and eternal lives," he was saying that Adam had attained to exaltation and was therefore a God. In his statement that "our spirits and the spirits of all the human family were begotten by Adam," he was claiming, in no uncertain terms, that Adam was Heavenly Father. In short, by applying these statements to Adam, Brigham meant that prior to the organization of this world Adam had advanced along the road of eternal progression and was exalted to Godhood. He would therefore be our Father and our God and the only God with whom we have to do.

Throughout the lengthy address which was delivered in the open air that day, according to the Deseret News Brigham "held the vast audience as it were spellbound." 35 Wilford Woodruff believed Brigham's address to be "the greatest sermon ever delivered to the Latter-day Saints since they were a people." 36 The Journal of the Southern Indian Mission also noted Brigham Young's address, stating that it was a "discourse equalled by none." 37

Though many were favorably impressed with Brigham's statements that afternoon, there were nevertheless some who opposed. Joseph Lee Robinson, who attended the conference, noted that Orson Pratt was among them.

Attended conference, a very interesting conference, for at this meeting President Brigham Young said thus, that Adam and Eve were the names of the first man and woman of every earth that was ever organized and that Adam and Eve were the natural father and mother of every spirit that comes to this planet, or that receives tabernacles on this planet, consequently we are brothers and sisters and that Adam was God, our Eternal Father. This as Brother Heber remarked, was letting the cat out of the bag, . . . but behold ye there were some that did not believe these sayings of the Prophet Brigham, even our beloved Brother Orson Pratt told me he did not believe it. He said he could prove by the scriptures it was not correct. I felt very sorry to hear Professor Orson Pratt say that. I feared lest he should apostatize. 38

34. Ibid, 6:275.
36. Journal of Wilford Woodruff, October 6-8, 1854.

While Pratt was publicly denying the doctrine of the Church President, others who trusted their prophet's counsel and doctrine were adopting his revelations into their own writings. On January 9, 1855, during a social party in the Great Salt Lake City, Eliza R. Snow 39 recited the following from a poem she had written:

Father Adam, our God, let all Israel extol, and Jesus, our Brother, who died for us all: . . . 40

Shortly after this a new edition of the LDS Church hymnbook was printed. Among the hymns contained in the book was one which expressed Adam's condition with the other two members of the Godhead:

We believe in our God, the great Prince of his race,
The Archangel Michael, the Ancient of Days,
Our own Father Adam, earth's Lord as is plain,
Who'll counsel and fight for his children again.

We believe in His Son, Jesus Christ, who in love,
To his brethren and sisters, came down from above,
To die to redeem them from death, and to teach
To mortals and spirits the Gospel we preach.

We believe in the Spirit most holy, that's given
From God our great Father, who dwells high in heaven,
To instruct and enlighten, to comfort and cheer—
Tongues, dreams, visions, healings proclaim it is here. 41

In the spring of 1856 another confrontation erupted between Young and Pratt over the position of Adam. Under the date of March 11, 1856, Samuel Richards recorded in his journal the events which transpired between the two that evening:

Evening with the Regency in the Upper Room of the President's office, . . . A very serious conversation took place between Prest. B. Young and Orson Pratt upon doctrine. O.P. was directly apposed to the Prest. views and very freely expressed his entire disbelief in them after being told by the President that things were so and so in the name of the Lord. He was firm in the Position that the President's word was to be obeyed and he did not believe that Orson would ever be Adam, to learn by experience the facts discussed, but every other person in the room would if they lived faithful. 42

39. Eliza R. Snow was a plural wife of Joseph Smith and was later married to Brigham Young.
41. Sacred Hymns for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1856, 11th ed., p. 375. This hymn has been deleted from later LDS hymnals. In the 20th ed. there appeared a hymn titled, "Sons of Michael, He approaches." In the second line Michael was described as the "eternal" Father. In today's edition this has been changed to read the "ancient" Father.
42. Diary of Samuel Whitney Richards, copied from typed transcript at B.Y.U. Library, Special Collections, Provo, Utah, p. 113.
A statement, that Pratt would never be “Adam,” suggests that the two were again disputing over the subject of the first man. Wilford Woodruff, who was also present that night, noted this indeed was the issue discussed.

I spent part of the day in the committee room and met with the regency in the evening... the subject was brought up concerning Adam being made of the dust of the earth and elder Orson Pratt pursued a course of stubbornness and unbelief in what President Young said that will destroy him if he does not repent and turn from his evil way. For when any man crosses the track of a leader in Israel and tries to lead the prophet... he is no longer led by him but is in danger of falling.

A few months after this event, Brigham Young’s first Counselor, Heber C. Kimball, publicly sustained the Church President as the Prophet of God whose doctrines were inspired:

Just think of your position; you have heard the teachings and instructions of President Young, and his instructions are the word of God to us, and I know that every man and woman in this Church who rejects his testimony, and the testimony of those that he sends, rejects the testimony of God his Father. I know that, just as well as I know that I see your faces today.43

Because rejecting Brigham’s word was rejecting God, Orson Pratt was walking on thin ice. According to Wilford Woodruff, Pratt’s Church membership was on the line:

President Young made some remarks about Orson Pratt and said if he did not take a different course in his philosophy... he would not stay long in this Church.44

Opposition to Adam-God Intensifies

Brigham’s opposition did not consist of Orson Pratt alone. Apparently there were a number of Mormons who were muttering their disbelief. It was to this group that the prophet addressed the following remarks during a discourse delivered on October 7, 1857:

Some have grumbled because I believe our God to be so near to us as Father Adam. There are many who know that doctrine to be true. Now, if it should happen that we have to pay tribute to Father Adam, what a humiliating circumstance it would be! Just wait till you pass Joseph Smith; and after Joseph lets you pass him, you will find Peter; and after you pass the Apostles and many of the Prophets, you will find Abraham, and he will say, “I have the keys, and except you do thus and so, you cannot pass;” and after a while you come to Jesus; and when you at length meet Father Adam, how strange it will appear to your present notions.45

Nevertheless, it was the Mormon Apostle Orson Pratt who was the real thorn in Brigham’s side, and it was inevitable that the President would seek its removal. In 1860 Young gathered his Apostles to consider the case of Orson Pratt’s remarks.

After the Mormon General Authorities assembled in the President’s office on the evening of January 27, Brigham read to them various doctrinal statements written by Pratt. He followed by expressing his disbelief in these doctrines. Wilford Woodruff then confessed his trust in Young:

... it has ever been a key with me that when the Prophet who leads presents a doctrine or principle or says thus saith the Lord I make it a point to receive it even if it comes in contact with my tradition or views being well satisfied that the Lord would reveal the truth unto His Prophet whom he has called to lead the Church before he would unto me, and the word of the Lord through the prophet is the End of the Law unto me.46

One by one the Apostles expressed their faith in their prophet and sought to lead Pratt to a confession and repentance. The stubborn Apostle did not budge, however. Having no confidence in the prophet’s declaration, Pratt refused to confess what he believed to be false:

I must have something more than a declaration of President Young to convince me. I must have evidence. I am willing to take President Young as a guide in most things but not in all... President Young said I ought to make a Confession But Orson Pratt is not a man to make a Confession that I do not believe. I am not going to crawl to Brigham Young and act the hypocrite and confess what I do not believe... President Young condemns my doctrine to be false. I do not believe them to be false... I will not act the hypocrite. It may cost me my fellowship But I will stick to it. If I die tonight I would say O Lord God Almighty I believe what I say.47

The Apostles stood amazed. After a moment’s pause Apostle John Taylor tried to convince Orson of his error. Wilford Woodruff followed:

Brother Orson Pratt, I wish to ask you one or two questions. You see that the spirit and doctrine which you possess is entirely in opposition to the First Presidency, the Quorum of the Twelve, and all who are present this evening and it chills the blood in our veins to hear your words and feel your spirit. Should not this be a Guidance to you that you are wrong... Every man in this room who has a particle of the Spirit of God knows that President Young is a Prophet of God and that God sustains him and He has the Holy Spirit and his doctrines are true.48

Various other Apostles testified that Orson was in error. President Young then closed by stating the importance of following God’s Prophet. The meeting was dismissed; Pratt made no concession.

44. Wilford Woodruff Journal, December 29, 1856. Typed from microfilm of original.
46. The minutes of this session are found in the Wilford Woodruff Journal, under the date of January 27, 1860.
It must have been a sleepless night for Orson, however; the following day saw a change in the disposition of the Apostle. Wilford Woodruff noted this in his journal:

I spent the day in the office. I met with the Twelve in the prayer circle. Orson Pratt met with us. He did not dress but said he wanted to be in the society of the Twelve. He seemed much more soft in his spirit then he had been.

Quite unexpectedly, Orson Pratt on the next day confessed from the Tabernacle stand that he was in error. Woodruff informs us of the event:

Sunday I met at the Tabernacle. Orson Pratt was in the stand and quite unexpected to his brethren he arose before his brethren and made a very humble full confession before the whole assembly for his opposition to President Young and his brethren and he said he wished all the Church was present to hear it. He quoted Joseph Smith's revelation to prove that President Young was right and that all was under obligation to follow the Leader of the Church. I never heard Orson Pratt speak better or more to the satisfaction to the People, than on this occasion.

At Issue: Is Young Teaching False Doctrine?

Strange and fickle as it might seem, however, within a few months Pratt was again openly opposing Brigham! On April 4 and 5 the Church Authorities again convened to discuss Pratt. Though the subject of Adam was not the major issue during the January 27 meeting, it was brought up often.

On April 4 in the Church Historians' Office Pratt told the quorum members that he did not find the Adam-God doctrine to be supported by Joseph's revelation:

I would like to enumerate items first preached and published that Adam is the Father of our spirits. ... When I read the revelation given Joseph I read directly the opposite.

Brigham later responded to Orson's attack by appealing to his own prophetic calling:

It is my duty to see that correct doctrine is taught and to guard the Church from error, it is my calling.

Orson spurned this statement, still believing that the Mormon prophet could err in doctrine even when he was acting as a prophet. With Brigham absent on the following day, Mormon Apostle Orson Hyde answered Pratt by affirming that to charge the prophet with advancing false doctrine was in reality undermining the entire truth and foundation of their religion. God's prophets cannot advance false doctrine. Therefore, to acknowledge that the prophet Brigham was indeed advancing false doctrine would be to acknowledge that he was not divinely led. This would destroy their claim to be the Kingdom of God. Hyde insisted on this implication:

To acknowledge that this is the Kingdom of God, and that there is a presiding power, and to admit that he can advance incorrect doctrine is to lay the axe at the root of the tree. Will he suffer his mouthpiece to go into error? No. He would remove him and place another there. Brother Brigham may err in the price of a horse, ... but in the revelations from God, where is the man that has given thus saith the Lord when it was not so? I cannot find one instance.

Pratt expressed his total disbelief in Brigham's doctrine regarding Adam:

In regard to Adam being our Father and God ... I frankly say, I have no confidence in it, altho advanced by Brother Kimball in the stand, and afterwards approved by Brigham. ... I have heard Brigham say that Adam is the Father of our spirits and he came here with a resurrected body, to fall for his own children, and I said to him it leads to an endless number of falls which leads to sorrow and death; that is revolting to my feelings, even if it were sustained by revelation.

Orson Pratt's central argument was that Young's doctrine contradicted the Scriptures. Joseph Smith claimed to have restored the pure version of the Genesis creation narrative in his inspired revision of the early chapters of the Bible. The "inspired" revision later became a part of Mormon scripture, entitled the Book of Moses. In the following verses Joseph's account of Genesis distinctly implies that Adam was not the God and Father of Jesus Christ:

And he called upon our father Adam by his own voice saying: I am God; I made the world, and men before they were in the flesh. And he also said unto him: 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, ... 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 6:51f., 62).

These and other passages in Joseph's Book of Moses teach that the Father of the only begotten son, Jesus Christ, spoke to Adam in the Garden. That clearly indicates that Adam was not God the Father. It was to this fact that Orson Pratt appealed:

One [revelation] says that Adam was formed out of the earth, and the Lord put in his spirit, and another that he came with his body, flesh and bones, there are two contradictory revelations. In the garden it is said that a voice said to Adam, in the meridian of time, I will send my only begotten son Jesus Christ, then how can that man and Adam both be the Father of Jesus Christ? 

---

47. The council minutes are located in the Brigham Young Collection, Miscellaneous Papers, Church Historian's Office.
It was the Father of Jesus Christ that was talking to Adam in the garden. Young says that Adam was the Father of Jesus Christ both of his spirit and body in his teaching from the stand. 

The apostles answered Pratt by reasserting Brigham's divine calling; he was God's mouthpiece. The thought that a prophet of God could advance false doctrine chilled their blood. It was the duty of all to set aside any personal opinions and to be subject to the pronouncements of their divinely led leader. Wilford Woodruff angrily retorted:

As our leaders are inspired to talk, they are inspired oracles, and we should be as limber as a dish cloth.

Hyde, the President of the quorum of the Twelve Apostles, later in the session asked his brethren what should be required of Orson Pratt. George A. Smith, Church Historian, responded by suggesting that Orson acknowledge Brigham as a prophet and inspired man. Smith asserted that if Brigham was indeed the Church president, he would be an inspired man. On the other hand, if Orson Pratt were correct in his doctrines, which were declared to be false by Brigham, then all would have to conclude that the man whom they had thought was God's prophet was in fact not divinely led. Smith told Hyde that Pratt should,

...acknowledge Brigham Young as the President of the Church in the exercise of his calling. But he only acknowledges him as a poor drizzling fool, he preaches doctrines opposed to Joseph, and all other revelations. If Brigham Young is the President of the Church he is an inspired man. If we have not an inspired man, then Orson Pratt is right.

Pratt's January confession sermon was then revised for publication. Shortly after this the meeting came to a close. It was agreed that the proceedings of the sessions would be kept silent. Brigham and Pratt assured each other that no more would be said concerning their disagreement, and though Orson still disagreed with the prophet's teachings, it seemed that Brigham would not take any drastic action. In a few months, however, Orson received a mission call which would remove him from the Salt Lake area to the eastern United States.48

Young's Adam-God Meets Continued Opposition

All opposition did not cease with Orson Pratt's removal. This time, though, the attack came from a group outside the LDS fold—the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.49 Believing the original teachings of Joseph Smith to be true, the Reorganized Church immediately spotted the contradiction in Brigham's doctrine of Adam being God. In the November and December issues of their True Latter-Day Saint Herald the RLDS Church printed a lengthy refutation of Brigham's Adam-God doctrine. This article uses the same arguments and quotes the same scriptures as Orson Pratt did earlier that year when he contended with the Utah prophet. The Herald sought to overthrow the words of the living prophet by appealing to the written word.

The True Latter-Day Saint Herald saw clearly that Brigham Young was teaching false doctrine though he claimed to be acting as a prophet. They also clearly realized the implications. The man whom many looked to as being the successor of their martyred prophet was in reality a false prophet who taught as the word of God the imaginations of his own heart. Seeing by this that the Utah faction was not of God, they urged Utah Mormons to return to the true God.

The article in the Herald caused no small stir when it reached Utah. In his diary under the date of February 3, 1861, John D. Lee, adopted son of Brigham Young, recorded the following:

Eving attended Prayer meeting & instructed the Saints on the points of Doctrine refered to by the true Latterday Saints Herald & their Bombarding Pres. B. Young for Saying that Adam is all the God that we have to do with & to those that know no better, it is quite a stumbling Block. 

The Utah authorities held to the revelations revealed by their prophet. Some even claimed to have received for themselves a revelation that confirmed what the Living oracle had spoken. In a notebook that contained several personal revelations which he believed God had personally revealed to Him, Heber C. Kimball, counselor to Brigham Young, recorded the following:

April 30, 1862, the Lord told me that Adam was my father and that he was the God and father of all the inhabitants of this earth.51 was advancing false doctrine, then he would be a false prophet. Only a false prophet advances false doctrine. To charge Mormonism's prophet with teaching false doctrine would be to undermine Mormonism's claim to be a divinely led people.

48. The entire Orson Pratt-Brigham Young affair cannot be underestimated. The controversy which raged between the two shows that Brigham was teaching that Adam was God. From the charges that Pratt made it is clear what Brigham was teaching. Furthermore, it is significant that Young made no attempt to correct a misquotation or misinterpretation. On the contrary, he defended his doctrine, and continued to assert it. Importance should also be placed upon the remarks of the other Apostles who rallied to their Prophet's defense. They replied to Orson that a prophet of God cannot advance false doctrine, therefore all should accept the President's statements. They rightly understood the biblical emphasis that a prophet of God cannot advance false doctrine about God and that he would be inspired to teach the truth. They also realized the implications of Orson Pratt's statement. If Brigham

49. The Reorganized Church at this time was known as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Later they attached to themselves the title of being the "Reorganized" Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. This Mormon faction has its headquarters in Independence, Missouri.


51. Sacred History, Solomon F. Kimball Papers, Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City.
Though assailed from outside and from within the ranks of his own people, Brigham Young continued to set forth his belief in the doctrine. Speaking in the Tabernacle on the morning of October 8, 1861, Young remarked:

I will give you a few words of doctrine, upon which there has been much inquiry, and with regard to which considerable ignorance exists. Br. Watt will write it, but it is not my intention to have it published, therefore pay good attention, and store it up in your memories. Some years ago, I advanced a doctrine with regard to Adam being our father and God, that will be a shock to many of the Elders of Israel because of their folly. With regard to it they yet grovel in darkness and will. It is one of the most glorious realizations of the economy of heaven, yet the world holds it [in] dirrision. Had I revealed the doctrine of baptism from the dead instead of Joseph Smith there are men around me who would have ridiculed the idea dooms day. But they are ignorant and stupid like the dumb ass.

A year prior to this statement Brigham stated that the only thing of which he was guilty was that he had revealed too much truth to the people.

... if guilt before my God and my brethren rests upon me in the least, it is in this one thing—that I have revealed too much concerning God and his Kingdom, and the designs of our Father in heaven. If my skirts are stained in the least with wrong, it is because I have been too free in telling what God is, how he lives, the nature of his providences and designs in creating the world, in bringing forth the human family on the earth, his designs concerning them, etc. If I had, like Paul, said—&quot;But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant,&quot; perhaps it would have been better for the people.

Nevertheless, as the years passed Young was still emphatically claiming that Adam was the Father of God. In fact, he asserted this revelation in terms stronger than he ever had before. On June 8, 1873, Brigham again addressed his audience concerning Adam, and the week following he had his discourse published in the Deseret News:

How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to them, and which God revealed to me—namely that Adam is our Father and God. The Christian world read of, and think about, St. Paul, also St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles. These men were faithful to and magnified the priesthood while on the earth. Now, where will be the mystery, after they have passed through all the ordeals, and have been crowned and exalted, and received their inheritances in the eternal worlds of glory, for them to be sent forth, as the Gods have been for ever and ever, with the command—&quot;Make yourselves an earth, and people it with your own children?&quot; Oh fools, and slow of heart to believe the great things that God has purposed in his own mind. Adam came here and got it up in a shape that would suit him to commence business. What is the great mystery about it? None, that I have seen. The mystery in this, as with miracles, or anything else, is only to those who are ignorant. Father Adam came here, and then they brought his wife. &quot;Well,&quot; says one, &quot;Why was Adam called Adam?&quot; He was the first man on the earth, its framer and maker. He with the help of his brethren, brought it into existence. Then he said, &quot;I want my children who are in the spirit world to come and live here. I once dwelt upon an earth something like this, in a mortal state. I was faithful. I received my crown and exaltation. I have the privilege of extending my work, and to its increase there will be no end. I want my children who were born to me in the spirit world to come here and take tabernacles of flesh.&quot;

The opposition was still present, and there were still those who disbelieved in the sayings of their leader. It is interesting to note in this sermon that Brigham does not grieve over any misquotations or misunderstandings of his previous statements concerning Adam, but rather he laments over the disbelief which existed among his brethren. During all the years Young never claimed to be misquoted or misinterpreted. Instead, he appealed to his divine calling as proof of the truth of his statements.

Young also did not shy away from claiming that his teachings were the Word of God. He did not believe his doctrine to be just his personal opinion, which could be wrong. On the contrary, believing himself to be a prophet of God, he declared all of his sermons to be revelation, directly from the Lord:

I know just as well what to teach this people and just what to say to them and what to do in order to bring them into the celestial kingdom, as I know the road to my office. It is just as plain and easy. The Lord is in our midst. He teaches the people continually. I have never yet preached a sermon and sent it out to the children of men, that they might not call Scripture. Let me have the privilege of correcting a sermon, and it is as good Scripture as they deserve. The people have the oracles of God continually.

Brother Orson Hyde referred to a few who complained about not getting revelations. I will make a statement here that has been brought against me as a crime, perhaps as a fault in my life. Not here, I do not allude to anything of the kind in this place, but in the councils of the nations—that Brigham Young has said &quot;when he sends forth his discourses to the world they may call them Scripture.&quot; I say now when they are copied and approved by me they are as good Scripture as is couched in this Bible, and if you want to read revelation read the sayings of him who knows the mind of God.

There is no room for thinking that Brigham was expressing what he be-

52. Manuscript Sermon, &quot;A few words of Doctrine,&quot; Brigham Young Collection, Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City.
53. Journal of Discourses, 8:58.
54. Ibid., 13:95.
55. Ibid., 13:264.
believed to be many of his own opinions. No. He rightly believed that when a prophet of God acts as a prophet, he speaks truth.

**Young Firm to the End on Adam-God**

As we come to 1877, the last year of Brigham Young’s life, we find him still teaching what he had first taught 25 years before. The setting for this discourse is in the home of Brigham Young. There appears to be evidence that part of this address was to be used as the lecture before the veil in all future endowment ceremonies:

... after supper went to Prest Young’s ... Prest Young was filled with the spirit of God and revelation and said ... ‘In the creation the gods entered into an agreement about forming this world & putting Michael or Adam upon it. These things of which I have been speaking are what are termed the mysteries of godliness but they will enable you to understand the expression Jesus made while in Jerusalem. This is life eternal that they might know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. We were once acquainted with the Gods & lived with them but we had the privilege of taking upon us flesh that the spirit might have a house to dwell in. We did so and forgot all and came into the world not recollecting anything of which we had previously learned.

We have heard a great deal about Adam and Eve, how they were formed & some think he was made like an adobe and the Lord breathed into him the breath of life, for we read ‘from dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return.’ Well he was made of the dust of the earth but not of this earth, he was made just the same way you and I am made but on another earth. Adam was an immortal being when he came on this earth. He had lived on an earth similar to ours, he had received the Priesthood and the Keys thereof and had been faithful in all things and gained his resurrection and his exaltation and was crowned with glory immortality and eternal lives and was numbered with the Gods for such he became through his faithfulness, and had begotten all the spirits that were born to this earth, and live our common Mother. She is the mother of all living creatures spirits in the celestial world, and when Adam was so organized by Elohim Elohim & Michael who is Adam our common Father. Adam then had the privilege to continue the work of progression consequently came to this earth and commenced the great work of forming tabernacles of his own spirit & dwell in, and when Adam and those that assisted him had completed this kingdom our earth he came to it and slept and forgot all and became like an infant child. It is said by Moses, the historian, that the Lord caused a deep sleep to come upon Adam and took from his side a rib and formed the woman that Adam called Eve—this should be interpreted that the man Adam like all other men had the seed within him to propagate his species, but not the woman, she conceives the seed but does not produce it, consequently she was taken from the side or bowels of her father. This explains the mystery of Moses’ dark sayings in regard to Adam and Eve. Adam & Eve when they were placed on this earth were immortal beings with flesh bones,
and sinues, and upon partaking of the fruit of the earth while in the garden and cultivating the ground their bodies became changed from immortal to mortal beings with the blood coursing through their veins as the action of life. . . . Father Adam's oldest son (Jesus the Savior) who is the heir of the family is Father Adam's first begotten in the spirit world, who according to the flesh is the only begotten as it is written. (In his divinity he having gone back into the spirit world and come in the spirit to Mary and she conceived for when Adam and Eve had through their work on this earth they did not lay their bodies down in the dust, but returned to the spirit world from whence they came.)

I felt myself much blessed in being permitted to associate with such men and hear such instructions as they savored of life to me.56

At one minute past 4:00 P.M., on August 29, 1877, Brigham Young died. He presided over the Mormon Church longer than any other man—30 years. Though many continued to believe in Adam as their God, the doctrine was largely buried along with Brigham. Rather than publicly preaching this doctrine, the Church authorities sought to avoid controversy by remaining silent. - HOW DO THEY KNOW WHY?

The Present Dilemma and the True Way Out

As time went on, not only did the Adam doctrine cease to be preached, but it began to be denied. Most LDS General Authorities even denied that Brigham had ever taught it. Being far removed from the time in which the second Mormon President expounded the teaching, these apologists were safe in dismissing his remarks as being misquoted or misinterpreted. Those who continued to believe the Adam-God teaching were soon to be excommunicated from the Church for believing it. Books and articles were written to denounce the Adam-God theory. These books quoted against the false doctrine the precise verses that Orson Pratt and the Reorganized Church had employed against Brigham a hundred years before.57 There were no admissions that Brigham had taught it. Instead, there were denials.

An examination of the evidence, however, will admit to no other conclusion than that Brigham Young did teach that Adam was the Heavenly Father, the Father of men's spirits as well as the Father of Jesus Christ in the flesh. Brigham Young, one of recent history's most prominent religious leaders, did indeed advance a doctrine that was to focus worship on a strange god. The doctrine that he taught for over 25 years was false doctrine and the LDS Church admits this today. It has, in effect, sided with Orson Pratt and has adopted his arguments and views as being right.

However, in doing this it has unknowingly admitted that Brigham was not an inspired prophet of God. It is caught in the words of one of its own Apostles, George A. Smith:

If Brigham Young is the President of the Church he is an inspired man. If we have not an inspired man, then Orson Pratt is right.

The implications certainly are obvious. The claims of the Utah LDS Church utterly collapse when they claim to be the only true church and the sole possessor of God's authority.

The Mormon, furthermore, faces the dilemma of being unable to be certain that his present prophet is advancing true doctrine. Perhaps the present teachings of the living prophet will be tomorrow's false teachings of a dead prophet. Perhaps the present revelations which the modern President claims to have received will be swept under the carpet as was the revelation concerning Adam that Brigham Young claimed to have received from God.

Today's Mormon cannot hide behind a testimony that the living prophet is advancing correct doctrine. His testimony holds no more weight than the strong testimonies which past members had concerning the truth of Brigham's Adam-God teaching. In reality, no Mormon can rest assured and have confidence that his prophet is not uttering the imaginations of his own heart. Even when he speaks as a prophet and is sustained and defended by his fellow Apostles, he still cannot be fully trusted.

This frightening dilemma in which the Mormon finds himself is not peculiar to him or to his people, but is the snare in which all men find themselves when they put their trust in men. To trust in the arm of flesh is really to have no hope at all. One's faith can be only as firm as the object upon which he places his trust. To place one's confidence upon erring flesh is to lack firm footing and roots:

Thus says the Lord, Cursed is the man who trusts in mankind and makes flesh his strength, and whose heart turns away from the LORD. For he will be like a bush in the desert and will not see when prosperity comes, but will live in stony wastes in the wilderness; a land of salt without inhabitant (Jer. 17:5, 6).

God invites all men today to place their trust in Him directly through His Son, Jesus Christ. Unlike a false prophet who teaches the people to follow a strange god, Jesus can be fully trusted to lead us to His Father. By His death, Christ has secured a place in the presence of God for all who place their trust in Him. Those who trust Him can be absolutely sure that He will never fail.

---

57. See Mark E. Petersen, Adam Who Is He?

Chris Alex Vlachos
Utah Christian Mission
Box 511
Orem, Utah, 84057
Other Resources Available

Listed below are additional materials available from Ex-Mormons for Jesus that pertain to the teaching of Brigham Young that Adam is God. That is with the exception of the first tape shown below which is an introduction as to why Mormonism is not Christian. All EMFU tapes are $2.50 each. When ordering any of these materials please add 5% of the cost for postage and handling. Please send check with order to the address shown on the back cover.

TAPES

WHY MORMONISM IS NOT CHRISTIAN — This is a detailed discussion of 20 scriptural reasons why Mormonism is not a Christian communion. (R-51, Bob Witte)

WHAT ABOUT ADAM-GOD? — An examination of Brigham’s doctrine that it was Adam who is “our Father and God.” Included are several very important unpublished sermons by Young which remove all doubt about his opinion of who God is. (R-71, Bob Witte)

THE MORMON GODS — This is a new teaching by a former LDS missionary which covers much of the same material in the previous version done by John Youn, but with more information added. A very helpful study of the evolution of the theology on the nature of God. Includes a question and answer session. (RG-73)

TESTIMONY OF A FORMER MISSIONARY — This is an apt title inasmuch as this Mormon missionary was actually saved while on his mission! Includes some very interesting insights and a good question and answer session. (RG-100)

BOOKS

WHERE DOES IT SAY THAT? (Bob Witte) — Contains almost 300 pages of photo-reprints from rare or hard to find LDS publications. There is also an 8-page section of questions (150 in all) to ask Mormons about the Mormon “gospel.” (B-1, $3.50; 10 or more copies, $1.75 each)

WITNESSING TO MORMONS (Bob Witte) — This is the “how to use” manual for the “Where Does It Say That?” It includes a section on witnessing, suggestions on how to better use “WDSIT?”, Mormon terms defined, and speaker source background. (B-2, $1.25; 10 or more copies, $.63 each)

MORMONISM, SHADOW OR REALITY? (Jerald & Sandra Tanner) — without a doubt, the most complete and fully documented refutation ever published by anyone. A MUST for anyone really serious about understanding Mormonism. (B-4, $11.95)

I PRAY THAT EYES OF YOUR HEART MAY BE ENLIGHTENED (Melanie Layton) — An intensely personal refutation of Mormon doctrines. Melanie put this book together with her very large LDS family in mind as her private witness to them. There is some really, super research concerning Mormons and the Negro in the last chapter. (B-11, $3.00)

MORMONISM, MAMA AND ME (Thelma Geer) — This is the testimony of Thelma and her story of being raised in Mormonism, released from Mormonism, and a review of the doctrines of Mormonism which separate it from Christianity. You will enjoy her special “home-spun” style of writing! (B-12, $3.95, 10 or more copies, $1.98 each)

MICHAEL OUR FATHER AND GOD (Joseph Musser) This might better be titled, “Everything You Want To Know About Adam-god.” The author, a Mormon “fundamentalist” actually believes that Adam is God the Father. The excellent documentation helps you understand where this false doctrine came from in Mormon history. (B-17, $1.95)

WITNESSING TO MORMONS — (Jerry & Marian Bodine) An excellent resource tool which includes a number of photo-reprints and suggestions. This is the book used in the Bodine’s witnessing seminars. (B-23, $3.00)
his calling, but he [Orson] only acknowledges him as a poor
drivelng fool, he [Orson] preaches doctrines opposed to
Joseph, and all other revelations.

Present at the above meeting were Orson Hyde,
Orson Pratt, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, George A.
Smith, Charles C. Rich, Franklin D. Richards and
Erastus Snow. This meeting documents the 1860
Quorum of the Twelve (with the exception of Orson
Pratt) as sustaining Brigham as a true prophet of God and
accepting the Adam-God doctrine as taught by Brigham
to be revelation of divine truth.

To accept that Brigham could make such an error is
to suppose that Brigham knew not whereof he spoke.

Do you suppose that he is so unwise to say a thing which he
does not know to be true? He understands what he speaks, and
he looks before he jumps, and God Almighty will lead him
straight, and he will never stumble — no, never . . . (Heber C.
Kimball, J.D. 5:32).

To accept that Brigham was wrong is to admit that
Joseph Smith erred in revelation when he received the
promise that Brigham would do what is right. Brigham
tells us:

I had the promise, years ago, that I never should apostatize
and bring an evil upon this people. God revealed that through
Joseph, long before he died; and if I am not doing right, you
may calculate that the Lord is going to take me home (J.D.
9:142).

The choice that was before Orson Pratt is before the
people today. One either acknowledges Brigham to have
been a prophet of God or a “poor drivelng fool.” To
accept the latter, that the presiding power can advance
false doctrine, is to lay an axe at the root of the tree.

CHAPTER 11
WHENCE COMEMTH THE
ADAM-GOD DOCTRINE IN
THIS DISPENSATION?

At this point, there is no question as to what
Brigham taught relative to Adam being our spiritual and
temporal progenitor. For some, the words of a prophet
are conclusive evidence of truth. Indeed, the words of a
prophet should carry credibility beyond intuitive values;
however, in this case Brigham Young’s teachings must be
pressed to their source. His teachings are obviously more
credible if they can be traced to Joseph Smith or another
authoritative source than they otherwise would be as a
product of his own deduction. In all his teachings (on
Adam-God) Brigham never intimated that the credibility
lay with him. This is derived from two primary sources —
Joseph Smith and God.

From the first time I saw the Prophet Joseph, I never lost a
word that came from him concerning the kingdom. And this is
the key of knowledge that I have to-day, that I did hearken to the
words of Joseph, and treasured them up in my heart, laid them
away, asking my Father in the name of his Son Jesus to bring
them to my mind when needed. I treasured up the things of
God, and this is the key that I hold today. I was anxious to learn
from Joseph and the Spirit of God. (Deseret News, June 6, 1877,
p. 274; emphasis added).

Supportive evidence that Joseph introduced and
taught the Adam-God doctrine, which must be con-
sidered in toto, comes from the following:

1. That Joseph holds the keys to the doctrinal mys-
teries in this dispensation
2. The testimony of Brigham Young
3. The testimony of other close associates of Joseph Smith
4. Joseph’s plural wives
5. Joseph’s own teachings

**Joseph, the Doctrinal Source of this Dispensation**

It would be inconsistent for Brigham Young to receive the primary revelations concerning the Adam-God doctrine, for if it is true knowledge, it should be part of the restoration and, as such, should be restored through him who has been appointed and who has the keys for that specific work. That person was Joseph Smith. He was the medium through whom the Lord has sent forth the fullness of the gospel. The word *fullness* certainly includes true doctrinal concepts. Joseph’s very mission was to restore the gospel of Jesus Christ with its accompanying knowledge of God, for, according to Joseph Smith, “It is the first principle of the Gospel to know for a certainty the Character of God, and to know that we may converse with him as one man converses with another, and that he was once a man like us” (T.P.J.S., pp. 345-46).

We must assume that this knowledge, the first principle of the gospel, as a part of the kingdom, was restored through Joseph Smith, for it was he who received the keys to the kingdom in these last days.

I have sent forth the fullness of my Gospel by the hand of my servant Joseph; and in weakness have I blessed him; and I have given unto him the keys of the mystery of those things which have been sealed, even things which were from the foundation of the world, and the things which shall come from this time until the time of my coming (D&C 35:17-18). . . . [T]he keys of this kingdom shall never be taken from you [Joseph], while thou art in the world, neither in the world to come (D&C 90:3).

From the foregoing, we see that the keys to the fullness of the gospel have been entrusted to Joseph, and that these keys will remain with him. The Adam-God doctrine, as true doctrine, had to be restored as part of the restoration of the fullness of the gospel. The keys to the mysteries and their restoration of this dispensation lie with Joseph and are with him to this day.

Joseph’s keys depict him as architect and master mason in laying the foundation of this dispensation, whereas Brigham’s calling oversaw the construction upon Joseph’s foundation.

Brigham Young was first a great disciple and student of Joseph Smith and only secondly a great leader in his own right. He saw himself as the master-builder — not the architect — of the Kingdom and of Zion. And while he taught the necessity of revelation to carry out the program, and claimed revelation himself, he felt it was Joseph Smith’s special calling to have given the patterns and to have taught all the necessary principles of priesthood and government. The responsibility of Brigham Young and the Twelve, then, was to erect, on the foundation of Joseph, the building Joseph had envisioned. This was stressed time and again by President Young and his associates. For example, in 1866 he explained that “on the things of God, on the building up of His Kingdom, or the doctrines Joseph taught, or on anything that pertains to the priesthood,” his memory of what he had learned at Joseph’s feet was of primary importance (B.Y.U. Studies, vol. 19, p. 396).

Testimony was repeatedly given that, as the Lord lives, “the work that has been carried out by President Young and his brethren has been in accordance with the plans, and designs, and Spirit, and instructions of Joseph Smith . . .” (George A. Smith, M.A.B.Y., October 8, 1866).

From our historical perspective, Brigham was Joseph’s most faithful disciple. Of all the early apostles, none were more dedicated to Joseph’s teachings, nor were there any who enjoyed the privilege of Joseph’s confidence more than Brigham. As such, Brigham enjoyed the most intimate access to Joseph’s teachings. These Brigham received not only as a member of the Quorum of the Twelve, Council of Fifty, and the Holy
Order, but also in private as Joseph’s most trusted friend. Brigham’s work testifies of his dedication to the principles and teachings of Joseph Smith. Said Brigham:

An angel never watched him [Joseph] closer than I did, and that is what has given me the knowledge I have today. I treasure it up, and ask the Father, in the name of Jesus, to help my memory when information is wanted and I have never been at a loss to know what to do concerning the kingdom of God (M.A.B.Y., October 8, 1866).

Considering Brigham’s intimacy and dedication to Joseph’s teachings, it is unlikely that Brigham advanced any new doctrinal concept of major importance.

Many of the teachings and practices formalized during Brigham Young’s administration can be traced to private councils where Joseph Smith taught the Twelve in detail about the affairs of the Kingdom. In fact, it seems far more compelling to accept that possibility, one in harmony with what we know of Brigham Young, and of Joseph Smith in Nauvoo, than to continue to believe — in the absence of documentation — that Brigham Young made a fundamental innovation of his own during those tumultuous years of succession . . . especially in view of the fact that the private meetings where Joseph Smith taught the full pattern of temple ordinances (and related doctrines) would have provided the ideal forum (B. Y. U. Studies, vol. 19, pp. 398-99).

Thus, it is consistent that Brigham’s Adam-God teachings derive from Joseph Smith. However, it has been argued that absolute evidence which unequivocally demonstrates Joseph as having taught Adam-God concepts has not yet been brought to the fore. This, however, depends on what one considers unequivocal evidence. Furthermore, this argument does not exclude the possibility that Joseph did in fact teach such doctrines. It is based on negative evidence and the assumption that all of Joseph’s important doctrinal teachings were recorded. This, however, is not true. “Only a small portion of his [Joseph’s] public teachings and very little of his extensive private teachings were recorded.”

Whence Cometh the Adam-God Doctrine?

Dean Jessee, research historian with the LDS Historical Department, has shown that of approximately 250 public sermons mentioned in diaries and minutes (and surely Joseph gave others), we have a fairly adequate account (notes, not verbatim reports) of only 54 of them, not to mention the numerous private sessions held with the Twelve and others, especially during 1843-1844. The latter were not recorded nor meant to be recorded. Rather, they were the proper forum for the teaching of the “mysteries of the kingdom,” those temple-related teachings that were not to be taught abroad and could not go to the broader membership of the Church until after completion of the Temple and the removal of the Church to the relative isolation of the West (B. Y. U. Studies, vol. 19, pp. 397-98).

These private teachings began to emerge as the development of a superstructure on Joseph’s foundation.

Brigham Young’s Testimony

Because Brigham was both a prophet of God and Joseph’s closest confidant, he must be taken seriously when he said that he learned a doctrine from Joseph. He, on many occasions, stated that his knowledge and understanding of Adam-God came directly from Joseph Smith. The implication, from Brigham’s statements, is that he was taught the Adam-God doctrine from Joseph. The point in contention, here, is not Brigham’s veracity but rather his intended meaning.

The Adam-God doctrine is composed of many fundamental concepts which are integrally interwoven with the doctrine of eternal progression. Could it be that Brigham merely expanded Joseph’s teachings beyond the scope of their immediate meaning? Did Brigham really mean to say that it was from Joseph that he learned the fundamental concepts from which he then concluded that Adam was God? Was it Brigham’s extrapolation that Adam as our God was also the father of our spirits and the father of Christ?

One of the difficulties here is that we have no personal account in the hand of Brigham Young setting
forth exactly what it was that Joseph taught relative to 
Adam being our God. We are left to draw conclusions 
from those who recorded Brigham’s statements. The 
nature of such accounts makes them subject to some 
interpretation. Thus, what Brigham really meant cannot 
be inferred from a single quotation but must be extracted 
from as many statements as possible.

In 1876 L. John Nuttall, then secretary to Brigham 
Young, recorded the church president as saying:

Is there in the heaven of heavens a leader? Yes, and we 
cannot do without one and that being the case, whoever he is 
may be called God. Joseph said that Adam was our Father and 
God (Brigham Young, Journal History of the Church, May 14, 
1876; also L. John Nuttall Papers, B.Y.U. Library).

In this statement, Brigham appears to be fairly 
specific as to what Joseph said, which is that Adam is not 
only our father but our God as well. We naturally 
understand our father and God to be our spiritual 
progenitor. Is this, however, what Joseph meant?

In his 1873 Adam-God discourse (published in the 
Deseret News), Brigham said:

How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day 
Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to 
them, and which God revealed to me — namely that Adam is 
our father and God . . . I could not find any man on the earth 
who could tell me this, although it is one of the simplest things 
in the world, until I met and talked with Joseph Smith (Deseret News, 
June 18, 1873; emphasis added).

This statement correlates well with the previous 
statement implying that Joseph taught “that Adam is our 
Father and God” but does not conclusively state that 
Adam either fathered the Savior or was our spiritual 
procreator as was understood by Brigham.

An 1876 recording by Wilford Woodruff strikes 
closer to the mark:

At meeting of school of the prophets, President Young said 
Adam was Michael, the Archangel and he was the Father of 
Jesus Christ and is our God & that Joseph taught this principle 
(Wilford Woodruff Journal, Dec. 16, 1867).

While the above may not be a literal quotation, the 
substance is that Joseph in principle taught that Adam 
was the father of Christ. Is this an inherent extrapolation 
of a more restricted teaching, or did Joseph literally teach 
this concept?

In 1860 Brigham directly inferred that Joseph taught 
the fine subtleties such as Michael being our spiritual 
procreator as well as fathering Christ. On April 4, 1860, 
in a meeting which had been convened to discuss Orson 
Pratt’s refused acquiescence to Brigham’s teachings, 
Brigham was directly challenged by Orson Pratt as 
teaching these concepts in opposition to Joseph’s 
revelations. Said Orson:

I would like to enumerate items. Firstly — preached and 
published that Adam is the father of our spirits, and father of 
our bodies. When I read the revelations given to Joseph, I read 
directly the opposite (minutes of Quorum meeting held in the 
Historian’s Office April 4, 1860, Brigham Young Papers, 
Church Archives).

Orson is here directly challenging Brigham’s teaching 
that Adam is the father of our spirits. It is worth noting 
that Brigham’s teaching runs contrary to Orson’s 
interpretation of Joseph’s revelations. Orson did not say 
that he heard Joseph say anything contrary. Brigham 
responded by saying that his teaching was Joseph’s 
doctrine.

It was Joseph’s doctrine that Adam was God . . . God 
comes to the earth and eats and partakes of fruit. Joseph could 
not reveal what was revealed to him, or if people had it revealed, 
it was not told (Quorum meeting minutes cited above).

Brigham here responds to a charge against a specific 
teaching that Adam is both the father of our bodies and 
spirits by saying that it was Joseph’s doctrine. He went on 
to explain what Joseph’s doctrine apparently was: “God 
comes to the earth and eats and partakes of the fruit.”

Since this is a direct reply to Orson’s allegation about 
Adam being the father of our spirits, it follows that the 
father of our spirits and bodies is referenced as the God
who comes to the earth and partakes of the fruit. Within this exchange, God, the father of our spirits, comes to this earth as Adam to partake of the fruit. This doctrine, said Brigham, was Joseph’s.

In verification of this, one might ask what it was that Joseph could not reveal to the people. Brigham had reference to teachings that were never made public during the life of Joseph. Just what was so sensitive that could only be taught in private and never repeated? Was it that God had once been a man like us? Was it that we possess the potential of becoming Gods? Was it that there are innumerable Gods one above the other? No, for these concepts were publicly revealed by 1842. What was it that Joseph could not reveal? From Brigham’s remarks, that which Joseph could not reveal pertained to Adam as our Father and God. Was it that Adam is our God by virtue of his patriarchal standing over us? Not only was this concept also publicly revealed by Joseph but it antedated the restoration — certainly not a sensitive issue.

Could it be that Joseph’s secret teachings went beyond Adam’s standing as the patriarch to the human race? Could it be that Joseph taught, as Brigham implied, that Adam is our God because he fathered our spirits as well as Jesus in the flesh? This, now, is a sensitive doctrine worthy of being repeated only in the most trusted circles. As Joseph explained to Brigham, there were many such doctrines that he could not reveal: “Brother Brigham, if I was to reveal to this people what the Lord has revealed to me, there is not a man or a woman [that] would stay with me” (J.D. 9:249).

Heber C. Kimball recalled Joseph as saying that when he came before the people

... he felt as though he were enclosed in an iron cage, his mind was closed by the influences that were around him... hence, he could not make use of the revelations of God as he would have done; there was no room in the hearts of the people to receive the glorious truths of the gospel that God revealed to him (J.D. 10:233-34).

Other Testimonies That Joseph Taught the Adam-God Doctrine

Brigham’s testimony that Joseph taught Adam-God concepts does not stand alone but is corroborated by other witnesses of equally unimpeachable character. In every instance they include the most intimate and trusted associates of Joseph Smith — those who were privy to his more secret and sacred teachings. Such a witness was John Taylor who, as president of the church, said that he heard Joseph say that “Adam is the father of our bodies. Who is to say he is not the father of our spirits?”

I heard Joseph say that Adam was the ancient of Days spoken of by Daniel... When we get to God our Father we are told to approach him in the name of Jesus. Adam is the father of our bodies. Who is to say he is not the father of our spirits (L. John Nuttall Papers, Jan. 13, 1880, B.Y.U. Archives)?

Here, President Taylor heard Joseph ask the provocative question, “Who is to say that Adam is not the father of our spirits?” The answer by implication, is that He (Adam) is the father of our spirits; otherwise, why would Joseph raise the question? This mild Adam-God assertion was probably made as a stimulus to prepare men’s minds to draw the obvious conclusions. It clearly documents Joseph as proposing Adam-God concepts.

Another such Adam-God assertion was given directly by Joseph when he explained to William Law, “The keys by which he may ask [in prayer] and receive blessings” (D&C 124:97). That key, according to Joseph, lay in the identity of a person “like Adam.”

The Great God has a Name By which he will be Called which is Ahman — also in asking have reference to a personage like Adam for God made Adam Just in his own Image. Now this [is] a key for you to know how to ask & obtain (B.Y.U. Studies, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 83).

It can be argued that Ahman is here tacitly equated to Adam.

Zebedee Coltrin reported having been with Joseph
and Oliver Cowdery when they "saw the heavens open and in it a great golden throne and on it a man and woman with hair as white as snow." They were told by Joseph that "the man and woman was father Adam and [Mother] Eve" (Diary of Oliver B. Huntington, 1847-1900, part 2, pp. 207 and 244, B.Y.U. Special Collections; also Zebedee Coltrin papers, Church Historian's Office).

Benjamin F. Johnson was also a member of Joseph's inner circle of trusted friends. He testified as having been instructed of Joseph in the Adam-God doctrine.

He [Joseph Smith] taught us that God was the great head of human procreation — was really and truly the father of both our spirits and our bodies (Letter from Benjamin F. Johnson to G. S. Gibbs, B.Y.U. Special Collections).

Concerning Anson Call's testimony, Elder Whitaker wrote:

I now quote from a certain statement by the Prophet Joseph Smith to certain brethren who promised to cut his wood, if he would answer their questions. This statement was recorded at the time by Anson Call: recopied by Patriarch John M. Whitaker of Nauvoo, also, years later by B. H. Roberts, L.D.S. Historian, in S.L.C. A number of copies were also made by John M. Whitaker, the son, and distributed at the B.Y. University by proper consent, in connection with his seminary work. These two copies by Patriarch Whitaker and Roberts are verbatim:

"I quote Joseph Smith: 'Now regarding Adam: He came here from another planet, an immortalized Being, and brought his wife Eve with him.' (Therefore they were immortal) "and by eating of the fruit of this earth, became subject to death and decay . . . made mortal and subject to death" (Church Historian's Office).

Further testimony that Joseph introduced the doctrine is given by his plural wives. Eliza R. Snow, whose Adam-God beliefs are found in Women of Mormonism and The Ultimatum of Human Life, has been quoted in a preceding chapter. Helen Mar Whitney, daughter of Heber C. Kimball and plural wife of Joseph Smith, said that Brigham Young "did not happen to be the author of these doctrines, and to prove the truth of my assertion, I will produce some of the Prophet's teachings given May 16, 1841" (Helen Mar Whitney, Plural Marriage, pp. 31-32). Sister Whitney then proceeds to give Joseph's Adam-God teachings as found in T.P.J.S., page 157. Thus it becomes apparent that those closest to Joseph knew the doctrine to be of him.

Did Joseph's teachings, one might ask, go beyond the circle of his most trusted friends? The absence of any significant anti-Mormon treatment of Adam-God suggests that it did not. Doctrinal dissemination beyond the trusted would surely have aroused anti-Mormon indignation.

A review of anti-Mormon literature contemporary with Joseph Smith reveals no significant preoccupation with Adam-God. At the writing of this book, the author is aware of only two anti-Mormon references contemporary with Joseph Smith which can be interpreted as reflecting on Adam-God.

The Warsaw Message on February 4, 1844, printed "Buckeye's Lamentation for Want of More Wives" as an exposé of secret Mormon doctrines. Verse 5 can be interpreted as exposing the Adam-God secret. Gods are here depicted as creating worlds, each serving as a habitat for the creator and one of his wives.

A tenfold glory — that's the prize!
Without it you're undone!
But with it you will shine as bright
As the bright shining sun.
There you may reign like mighty Gods,
Creating worlds so fair;
At least a world for every wife
That you take with you there.

This verse can be interpreted as God creating a celestial world for each wife. However, the fact that God takes one of his wives there suggests relegation to a physical abode. Such relegation imposes a limitation in space through confinement to a world such as seen in mortality. God, however, is not confined by the
limitation of a world. Nor do we understand that God has a world for each wife. The gospel teaches us that God and his wives are one — a perfect unity — not bounded or relegated to a physical world.

Another interpretation of the above verse is that God creates a world and then takes one of his wives there where, relegated to mortal limitations, they procreate their physical species.

The second anti-Mormon source is the *Nauvoo Expositor* which was printed by those who had fallen from some of the highest positions in the church. These men had been in some of the most trusted church circles and, as such, may have been privy to Joseph's secret teachings. Their exposé was so explosive that it caused Joseph to formulate a plan to lay seige and destroy their press. This act was the precipitating factor in Joseph's ultimate martyrdom. In effect, Joseph died over this incident to protect his secret teachings.

Resolution 2 of the *Nauvoo Expositor* may be exposing Adam-God as being one of Joseph's "false and damnable doctrines."

Inasmuch as we have for years borne with the individual follies and iniquities of Joseph Smith, Hyrum Smith, and many of the official characters in the Church of Jesus Christ . . . and having laboured with them repeatedly with all Christian love, meekness, and humility, yet to no effect, [we] feel as if forbearance has ceased to be a virtue and hope reformation vain; and inasmuch as they have introduced false and damnable doctrines into the Church such as: a plurality to Gods above the God of this universe; and his liability to fall with all of His creations; the plurality of wives . . . (*Nauvoo Expositor* 1:1, Resolution 2; emphasis added).

It is here claimed that Joseph taught that there were many Gods, each of whom has "the liability to fall with all of his creations." Like almost everything else, this phrase has spawned a difference of interpretation. Some have proposed this to mean that a being once having attained godhood status still remains subject to law which carries the inherent "liability" or possibility of transgression. Such a transgression of law would then result in a fall. Scott Isaac reported Joseph as having taught this concept.

Joseph says there are Gods above the God of this Universe as far as he is above us, and if he should transgress the law given to Him by those above Him, He would be hurled from his throne to hell (*B. Y. U. Studies*, vol. 18, p. 218).

A closer reading of the *Nauvoo Expositor* reveals the intended meaning of the second resolution to be an extension of the doctrine reported by Scott Isaac, for it states:

It is contended that there are innumerable Gods as much above the God that presides over this universe, as he is above us, and if he varies from the law unto which he is subjected, he, with all his creatures, will be cast down as was Lucifer.

It may well be true that a God can transgress laws and fall from his esteemed position of deity; however, this concept does not fully explain Joseph's teachings as outlined in the *Expositor* to the effect that a God has the liability to fall with all of his creations.

One wonders if this is really what Joseph taught or is it just an interpretation of an ill-understood doctrine? Did Joseph really teach that God's creations would be cast down to hell if God were to sin, whereas, the gospel teaches us that the responsibility and punishment for transgression do not extend beyond the transgressor? It would be unmerciful to thrust down to hell all of one's creations because of one's transgressions. Did Joseph teach such a doctrine of injustice and retribution, or was he talking about a "fall" of a different nature where as a result of God's transgression all his creations are cast down — to earth?

A god's capability for transgression and the casting down to earth of all of his creations because of his transgression are clearly elements of the Adam-God doctrine. Furthermore, a god's liability to fall with all his creations need not be taken in the negative context. Other meanings for the word liability include "that for which
one is responsible.” In this context, God’s liability is the responsibility to fall with all of his creations. How? Brigham explained:

When this earth was organized by Elohim, Jehovah and Michael who is Adam our common father, Adam and Eve had the privilege to continue the work of progression. Consequently came to this earth and commenced the great work of forming tabernacles for those spirits to dwell in (L. John Nuttall Journal, Feb. 7, 1877).

He commenced the work of creating earthly tabernacles, precisely as he had been created in this flesh himself, by partaking of the course material that was organized and composed this earth, until His system was charged with it (J.D. 4:214-19).

Adam assisted in forming this earth and agreed to fall when he came and fell that man might be (Wilford Woodruff Journal, May 6, 1855).

Adam’s transgression affected all his creations. The world and all life therein fell to a mortal state of existence. These anti-Mormon sources suggest that Adam-God concepts were contemporary with Joseph himself. They give credence to the foregoing testimonies that Joseph was indeed the doctrinal source for the Adam-God doctrine. Mormon historian B. H. Roberts came to the same conclusion:

It is generally supposed that Brigham Young was the author of the doctrine which places Adam as the patriarchal head of the human race, and ascribes to him the dignity of future presidency over this earth and its inhabitants, when the work of redemption shall have been completed. Those who read the Prophet’s treatise on the Priesthood in the text above will have their opinions corrected upon this subject; for clearly it is the word of the Lord through the Prophet Joseph Smith which established that doctrine. The utterances of President Brigham Young but repeat and expound the doctrine which the Prophet here sets forth (B. H. Roberts, D.H.C., 3:388, footnote).

With those who regard Joseph Smith as the restorer of the doctrine, there is little question as to what he meant when he said:

The Priesthood 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, before the world was formed, as in Genesis 1:26, 27, 28. He had dominion given him over every living creature.

The Priesthood is an everlasting principle, and existed with God from eternity, and will to eternity, without beginning of days or end of years. The keys have to be brought from heaven whenever the Gospel is sent. When they are revealed from heaven, it is by Adam’s authority.

Daniel in his seventh chapter speaks of the Ancient of Days; he means the oldest man, our Father Adam, Michael. He will call his children together and hold a council with them to prepare them for the coming of the Son of Man. He is the father of the human family, and presides over the spirits of all men, and all that have had the keys must stand before him in this grand council... The Son of Man stands before him [Adam], and there is given him [Jesus] glory and dominion. Adam delivers up his stewardship to Christ, that which was delivered to him as holding the keys of the universe, but retains his standing as head of the human family (T.P.J.S., p. 157).

Commencing with Adam, who was the first man, who is spoken of in Daniel as being the “Ancient of Days”... he is Michael, because he was the first and the father of all, not only by progeny, but the first to hold the spiritual blessings, to whom was made known the plan of ordinances for the salvation of his posterity unto the end, and to whom Christ was first revealed, and through whom Christ has been revealed from heaven, and will continue to be revealed from henceforth. Adam holds the keys of the dispensation of the fullness of times, i.e., the dispensation of all the times have been and will be revealed through him from the beginning to Christ, and from Christ to the end of the dispensations that are to be revealed (T.P.J.S., p. 167; emphasis added).

Although these teachings were given publicly, they were not given in boldness. They were given only to “those who had ears to hear and eyes to see.” Brigham, as B. H. Roberts said, only enlarged upon Joseph’s teachings as an attempt to raise the spiritual level of understanding commensurate with the mysteries of godliness.

Brigham only expanded on Joseph’s teachings that “Adam obtained the priesthood in the creation,” that “Adam holds the keys of the priesthood over all men.”
that Adam "presides over the spirits of all men," that "it is by Adam's authority that Christ is revealed to mankind," that "Adam holds the keys to all the dispensations of the earth."

Because the Adam-God doctrine in this dispensation appears to arise from Joseph Smith, the question is no longer a matter of rejecting a personal or even a false teaching of Brigham Young, but is a matter of rejecting the very restoration and Joseph Smith as a prophet of God. If these teachings are Joseph's and are rejected, Mormonism may well be reduced to the same foundation with the same saving power as the Christian world at large. To deny Joseph's doctrine is to deny true doctrine which has been revealed by a prophet of God, for Joseph suggested that no other gospel should be taught save that which he taught. To this end he echoed Paul's words by saying: "If any man preach any other Gospel than that which I have preached, he shall be cursed" (T.P.J.S., p. 366). This indicates that there is only one true gospel. There can only be expansion on the gospel taught by Joseph, for only he holds the keys to the mysteries and to the fullness of the gospel in this dispensation. The Adam-God doctrine is either part of the true gospel taught by Joseph or part of a false gospel.

Revelation — The Source for Adam-God

If Joseph was a true prophet and taught the Adam-God doctrine, then we naturally assume that doctrine to have come from God. Brigham testified to this end, stating that he received his understanding of that doctrine directly from God by revelation. He often laid the responsibility for that doctrine with God. This undoubtedly means that he received spiritual confirmation as to the truthfulness of Joseph's teachings and that he had received further light and knowledge in expanding his mind to embrace these doctrinal concepts. Brigham called the Adam-God doctrine "one of the most glorious revelations of the economy of heaven," yet said he, "the world holds it in derision" (M.A.B.Y., Oct. 8, 1861). In his 1873 address, Brigham boldly told the saints that he had received the Adam-God doctrine from God by revelation.

How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to them, and which God revealed to me — namely that Adam is our father and God (Deseret News, June 18, 1873).

On another occasion Brigham said:

I tell you this as my belief about that personage who is called the Ancient of Days . . . to me this is as clear as the sun. . . . I understand it as I do the path to go home. I did not understand so until my mind became enlightened with the spirit and by the revelations of God . . . (M.A.B.Y., April 25, 1855).

In evaluating Brigham's claim that Joseph introduced the Adam-God doctrine, we must also examine the evidenced against such a proposition. Aside from misrepresentations which have been covered elsewhere in this book, the most serious challenge to Brigham's claim is found in Joseph's October 1840 conference address (see T.P.J.S., pp. 168-69). Joseph's remarks on that occasion are of particular interest in that this was one of the few instances where Joseph was known to have prepared his remarks in advance. It is precisely from this address that Adam-God proponents find some support for the doctrine. However, in two instances within this address Joseph subjugates Adam's authority to Christ.

In the original manuscript Joseph is alleged to have said:

These Angels are under the direction of Michael or Adam who acts under the direction of Christ. . . . This then is the nature of the Priesthood, every man holding the Presidency of his dispensation, and one man holding the Presidency of them all, even Adam; and Adam receiving his presidency and authority from Christ (T.P.J.S., pp. 168,169; also, The Words of Joseph Smith, p. 39, 40).

Note that in the Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith the word "Christ" in the original manuscript has been changed to read "Lord." This change apparently took
place during the presidency of Brigham Young. This teaching conflicts with Brigham Young's teachings, for it places Adam in a subordinate priesthood position to Christ (who is assumed to be Jesus). How then could Adam be Christ's father? There are many hypothetical solutions to this problem, depending on one's point of view.

First, it might be assumed that Joseph was right and Brigham's changing of Joseph's words is evidence of sinister complicity; i.e., that Brigham was wrong. Or one might ask what purpose Joseph had in preparing his remarks. Was it that his words would be carefully chosen so as to give the saints a hint but not say too much?

Did Joseph have reference to Jesus Christ or does the word "Christ" have a broader titular meaning and may in fact refer to a personality other than Jesus? Did Joseph purposefully misrepresent the doctrine so as to maintain its secretive nature while placating the saints according to their level of understanding? As precedence for this, one should consider Joseph's denial of plural marriage (T.P.J.S., p. 119 and D&C 101:4, 1835 ed.). Notwithstanding these denials, history bears out that Joseph and others at the time had entered into polygamous relationships.

The most insightful question that could be asked is: Did Joseph, in October of 1840, have a fully developed concept of God? Could then the Adam-God doctrine represent a further theological development within the last years of Joseph's life (subsequent to 1840)?

As was implied in chapter 2, we have no reason to believe that Joseph's concept of God was fully developed in 1820, 1830 or even at his death in 1844. Those who have studied Joseph's life and teachings agree that he, like everyone else, had to obtain knowledge in a "line upon line," ever-increasing manner. Consequently, by October of 1840 Adam-God concepts, which theretofore had been taught by implication, had not reached their full stature. The October 1840 message, rather than reflecting a dogmatic assertion that characterizes finality and precludes further development, may simply reflect a point of progression in the development of a godhead doctrine. This concept not only harmonizes many of Joseph's conflicting statements on the godhead, including incipient Adam-God concepts, but harmonizes Brigham's teachings with Joseph's and explains the many claims that Joseph taught this doctrine.

And, finally, one can just as easily conclude that Brigham felt so strongly about the Adam-God doctrine that Joseph's words were changed to harmonize with subsequent doctrinal developments. This is the reasoning behind many of the changes made by Joseph in his own revelations — to reflect the development of more refined concepts. By what authority did Brigham presume to alter Joseph's text? By the same authority that he authorized changes in the Doctrine and Covenants, Book of Mormon, and The History of Joseph Smith. Certainly, if he could authorize changes in the Lord's word, he could change Joseph's.

A final argument against Brigham's claim is that anti-Adam-God sentiment does not permeate anti-Mormon literature prior to Brigham Young. While we have shown some anti-Mormon response, it is admitted that the overwhelming majority of anti-Mormon literature is void of any reference to Adam-God. This is due to the following factors:

1. The Adam-God doctrine was highly sensitive and consequently was shared only with those who as members of Joseph's select inner circle proved themselves worthy. Although the Laws, Higbees and Foster (publishers of the Nauvoo Expositor) were long-standing church members from relatively high position, they were not trusted members of Joseph's inner circle. It is apparent from the 1860 minutes quoted in this chapter that apostle Orson Pratt was not even a member of that circle. Hence, the Higbees, et al, could have heard the doctrine only second hand.
2. The Adam-God doctrine, if it did reach fruition under Joseph Smith, did so within the last months of his life. The *Nauvoo Expositor* was published only days before Joseph’s death. The *Warsaw Message* was printed just four months prior to his martyrdom.

**Summary**

Brigham Young openly proclaimed that his Adam-God teachings derived from Joseph and the Lord. That Joseph Smith taught the Adam-God doctrine is testified to by Brigham Young, John Taylor, Benjamin F. Johnson, Anson Call, B. H. Roberts, and Joseph’s plural wives Helen Mar Whitney and Eliza R. Snow. Testimony that the Adam-God concepts were contemporary with Joseph Smith is suggested by contemporary writings of the times.

Joseph Smith is the Prophet of God who holds the keys of the restoration, to the mysteries and fullness of the gospel. This restoration has included the doctrinal concepts whereby one may know for a certainty the character of God.

**CHAPTER 12**

**ADAM-GOD AND THE ANCEINTS**

At this point, there can be little controversy as to the existence of Adam-God ideologies in early Mormon thought. Nor can there be much controversy concerning Brigham’s personal beliefs in those ideas. What remains to be addressed is the causality of those ideologies and beliefs. To the believer, they follow as a natural consequence of the restoration of the true gospel. To the disbelieving Latter-day Saint, however, the demonstration of causality is somewhat more problematic.

A further accounting must also be given as to why Brigham saw fit to promote such seemingly heterodoxical ideas. To those who have studied the life of Brigham Young, it must be admitted that he was not only a sensitive and intelligent spiritual leader but was also well versed in the Christian canons. In this context, what must be explained is how an individual from a traditional background could elaborate a doctrine (such as Adam-God) that was alien to both his religious milieu and personal experience. Traditional Christianity had taught Brigham that Adam was a transgressor, the man of sin responsible for the world’s misery. What influences could have led him to speculate and then believe that this man of sin was actually God? Furthermore, what prompted Brigham, as steward over the Kingdom of God, to preach a doctrine so seemingly foreign and contradictory to the restored truth?
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... when brother Pratt went back last fall, and published the Revelation concerning the plurality of wives; it was thought there was no other cat to let out. But allow me to tell you... you may expect an eternity of cats, that have not yet escaped from the bag...

Brigham Young, 1853

On April 9, 1852, Brigham Young rose once again to address a session of general conference. He intended to preach several discourses, he said, and as the Deseret News observed the following week, "the Holy Ghost [rested] upon [him] in great power, while he revealed some of the precious things of the kingdom." One of his subjects was the "mysteries of the kingdom." If mysteries were to be taught, Young advised, they should be discussed here, for this "is the place for you to teach great mysteries to your brethren, because here are those who can correct you." After brief comments on amusements and tithing, Young proceeded to a dramatic announcement:

Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and Sinner! When our Father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael, the Archangel, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! about whom holy men have written and spoken—He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians and non-professing must hear it, and will know it sooner or later.

Jesus Christ, he emphasized, was not begotten by the Holy Ghost; and "who is the Father?"

David John Buerger, a recent graduate of Brigham Young University, is an avid student of Mormon history and a financial planner in the San Francisco Bay area. He wishes to thank Gary James Bergera, Richard A. Hunter, D. Michael Quinn and Lester E. Bush for help in the preparation of this paper.

He is the first of the human family; and when he took a tabernacle in the garden until He could beg the Tabernacle and Adam is Michael or God and all the God that we have anything to do with...

While Young's remarks were not to be published for over two years, he did return to this theme just four months later, in a sermon on August 28. This time Adam was placed in a somewhat larger context. "After men have... become Gods," he said, "they have the power then of propagating their species in spirit... and then commence the organization of tabernacles..."

How can they do it? Have they to go to that earth? Yes, an Adam will have to go there, and he cannot do without Eve; he must have Eve to commence the work of generation, and they will go into the garden.
and continue to eat and drink of the fruits of the corporeal world, until this grosser matter is diffused sufficiently through their celestial bodies to enable them, according to the established laws, to produce mortal tabernacles for their spirit children.6

Brigham’s cosmology thus seemingly held that each “god” was personally responsible for creating spiritual offspring; organizing an earth for their temporal existence, and decelestializing himself to a point where he, with a “Eve,” could procreate physical bodies for their spirit children. Each creator, or “Adam,” would then be esteemed a “Heavenly Father” for the inhabitants of his created world—each being the only God whom these inhabitants would worship. Whatever his special mission, Christ was no different in patriarchal lineage than Cain or Abel—all being the literal spiritual and physical offspring of the same individual.

While some of the faithful accepted their prophet’s new doctrine, others rejected what they perceived as a departure from previous inspiration on the subject. Recounting a discussion of the subject in his journal a few months later, William Clayton wrote that Orson Spencer “spoke of Adam coming to this earth in the morning of creation with a resurrected body” and “endeavor[ed] to substantiate the position taken by President Young: Viz, that Adam came to this earth with a resurrected body, and became mortal by eating the fruits of the earth, which was earthly.” Apostle Orson Pratt, however, took “the literal reading of the scriptures for his guide” and maintained that Adam was created from the dust of the earth. From Clayton’s perspective the issue was far from satisfactorily settled:

The subject was finally left in so much difficulty and obscurity as it has been from the beginning. . . . Elder Pratt advised the Brethren to pray to God for knowledge of the true principles, and it appears evident that when ever the question is decided, it will have to be by revelation from God.7

Clayton provided further evidence of the controversy in a letter the next day to Brigham Young (by which time Clayton providentially had moved to a position of agreement with his president):

There is also another subject which has occupied much of the time, and in which the difference in opinion seems to be wider, and more firmly established than the baby resurrection; and that is in regard to Adam’s coming on this earth; whether he came here with a resurrected body and became mortal by eating the fruits of the earth which are earthly, or he was created direct (that is his mortal tabernacle) from the dust of the earth, according to the popular opinion of the world. On this subject brother Pratt and myself, have rather locked horns, he holding to the latter opinion, and I firmly believing the former; but there can be no difficulty between us, as he is my superior and I shall not argue against him; but if it were an equal I should be apt to speak my feelings in full. There are difficulties on both sides, take it which way we will, and he is unwilling to express anything more than his opinion on the subject. [Emphasis in original]."8

Although we have no record of Brigham’s reply to Clayton, President Young did respond to these points in another public discourse the following October 1853: “Supposing that Adam was formed actually out of clay,” he reasoned with characteristic pragmatism, “out of the same kind of material from which bricks are formed, that with this matter God made the pattern of man, and breathed into it the breath of life, and left it there, in that state of supposed perfection, he would have been an adobe to this day . . . .” Then, turning in a more serious vein to those who opposed his new insights,

Some of you may doubt the truth of what I now say, and argue that the Lord could teach him. This is a mistake. The Lord could not have taught him in any other way than in the way in which He did teach him. You believe Adam was made of the dust of this earth. This I do not believe, though it is supposed that it is so written in the Bible; but it is not, to my understanding. You can write that information to the States, if you please—that I have publicly declared that I do not believe that portion of the Bible as the Christian world do. I never did, and I never want to. What is the reason I do not? Because I have come to understanding, and banished from my mind all the baby stories my mother taught me when I was a child.9

The visibility of President Young’s teachings on Adam rose dramatically a month later. Several months before, in June 1853, the First Presidency had approved a plan to publish a Journal of Discourses in Liverpool, England, containing “Sermons, Discourses, Lectures, etc” delivered in Salt Lake City. Among those to be included in the first volume was Brigham’s April 1852 sermon quoted above. Although this volume was not published until 1854, on November 26, 1853, the Church’s official British publication, the Latter-day Saints’ Millennial Star published a verbatim extract of this important sermon under the title, “Adam, Our Father and God.”10 The following editorial was printed one week later:

Our Father Adam.—The extract from the Journal of Discourses may startle some of our readers, but we would wish them to recollect that in this last dispensation God will send forth, by His servants, things new as well as old, until man is perfected in the truth. And we would here take occasion to remark, that it would be well if all our readers would secure a copy of the Journal of Discourses as it is issued, and also of every standard work of the Church; and not only secure these works, but attentively read them, and thoroughly study the principles they contain.11

The article, as expected, did startle, perhaps even unsettle, some of the British Saints. Two weeks later another editorial, probably authored by Samuel W. Richards (then President of the British Mission and Editor of the Star), was published in the Star which further encouraged support for the doctrine:

ADAM, THE FATHER AND GOD OF THE HUMAN FAMILY

The above sentiment appeared in Star No. 48, a little to the surprise of some of its readers; and while the sentiment may have appeared bias-
This grandfather figure, plausibly the father of Adam in the February 1854 discourse, also was mentioned in a sermon by Young a decade later, again without explicit reference to Elohim:

How has it transpired that theological truth is thus so widely disseminated. It is because God was once known on the earth among his children of mankind, as we know one another. Adam was as conversant with his Father who placed him upon this earth as we are conversant with our earthly parents. The Father frequently came to visit his son Adam, and talked and walked with him; and the children of Adam were more or less acquainted with their Grandfather; and their children were more or less acquainted with their Great-Grandfather.

These last comments, taken alone, almost reflect an “orthodox” understanding, but viewed in the context of Brigham’s many other sermons they rather delineate a belief in a “hierarchy of gods” not unlike that first alluded to by Joseph Smith. Young explicitly separated the identities of Adam and his father—the latter being the god considered in twentieth-century Mormon theology as Elohim; the father of the spirits of mankind. According to Young’s teachings, however, this figure was in reality a true “Grandfather in Heaven” to the descendants of Adam—to both their bodies and spirits—with Adam assuming the position of “God the [immediate] Father” to both body and spirit. As ultimately privately elucidated by Young, Elohim was in fact Adam’s grandfather (and not the “Grandfather in Heaven” to Adam’s descendants referred to in the foregoing quotation). Speaking to the School of the Prophets, he explained that “Elohim, Jehovah & Michael were father, Son and grandson. They made this Earth & Michael became Adam.” Thus, in Brigham’s theology, the Lord or God with whom Adam dealt during his mortality on the earth was apparently the figure he termed Jehovah, the Grandfather in Heaven.

While President Young’s concepts were being preached and clarified in Utah, Mormon missionaries continued to carry his message to British pro-selytes. Several remarks concerning these activities were recounted at a special three-day missionary conference in London, June 26–28, 1854, in honor of the departing mission president, Samuel W. Richards. In reporting on his district to incoming president (and apostle) Franklin D. Richards, Elder Thomas Caffell noted that “some of the officers have not met in council for three years” because “they are lacking faith on one principle—the last ‘cat’ that was let out of the bag.”

Polygamy has been got over pretty well, that cloud has vanished away, but they are troubled about Adam being our Father and God. There is a very intelligent person investigating our principles, and who has been a great help to the Saints; he has all the works and can get along very well with everything else but the last “cat,” and as soon as he can see that clearly, he will become a “Mormon.” I instructed him to write Liverpool upon it.
Elder Joseph Hall, who followed, added,

Relative to the principles recently revealed, we have not the least difficulty. If Adam's being our Father and God cannot be proved by the Bible, it is alright. 22

Later yet another elder, James A. Little, felt the subject worthy of comment in his report, and bore his testimony that “I believe in the principle of obedience; and if I am told that Adam is our Father and our God, I just believe it.” 23

Apostle Richards' response to this was unequivocal:

If, as Elder Calfall remarked, there are those who are waiting at the door of the Church for this objection to be removed, tell such, the prophet and Apostle Brigham has declared it, and that is the word of the Lord. 24

The elders were not to worry that the doctrine was not found in the scriptures:

“I would like to know where you will find scriptures to prove things by, which have never before been revealed.”

As noted, at least one apostle resisted Brigham Young. In September 1854, shortly after returning from a mission in Washington, D.C., Orson Pratt discussed his objections directly with the president and other leading brethren. According to Wilford Woodruff's account,

Brother Pratt . . . thought that Adam was made of the dust of the Earth. Could not believe that Adam was our God or the Father of Jesus Christ. President Young said that He was that He came from another world & made this earth and that it was the result of His partaking of the fruits of the Earth . . . begat children & they were earthly & I had mortal bodies & if we were faithful we should become Gods as He was. 25

Shortly thereafter Young delivered a talk at the October 1854 general conference which is possibly his most forceful and detailed statement on Adam-God ever given. According to the Deseret News, Young's "highly interesting discourse . . . held the vast audience as it were spellbound." 26 Wilford Woodruff was especially moved, writing in his journal, "I believe that He preached the greatest sermon that was ever delivered to the Latter Day Saints since they have been a people." Yet despite this, the speech was not published.

The text for the President's discourse, 28 delivered to an outdoor congregation of several thousand during the administration of the sacrament, was given as:

... This is [life eternal]. If they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” [sic] I will now put another text that will give the idea to this and then after a few remarks on the sayings of the Apostle Paul. “For though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven, or in earth (as there be Gods many and Lords many) but to

to [sic] us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.” This God is the father [of] our Lord Jesus Christ and the father of our spirits . . .

Young emphasized the concept of the patriarchal hierarchy of gods, stating,

Now if you believe what you have heard me say you will believe [sic] there is Lords many, and Gods many; and you will believe [sic] that unto us, the inhabitants of this earth there is but one God with whom we have to do . . . . You and I have only one God to whom we are accountable, so we will let the rest alone, and search after the one we have to do with; let us seek diligently after him, the very being who commenced this creation.

He further clarified his concept of Adam as a name-title by observing that

Every world has had an Adam, and an Eve: named so, simply because the first man is always called Adam, and the first woman Eve . . . . Every world that has been created, has been created upon the same principle . . . .

The President then addressed some thoughts to his attentive audience concerning Adam-God:

But let us turn our attention to the God with which we have to do. I tell you simply, he is our father; the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the father of our spirits. Can that be possible? Yes it is possible, he is the father of all the spirits of the human family . . . . I tell you more, Adam was the father of our spirits. He live upon an earth; he did abide his creation, and did honor to his calling and priesthood [sic], and obeyed his father or Lord; and probably many of his wives did also (the same) and they lived, and died upon an earth, and [then] were resurrected against to immortality and eternal life . . . . I will tell you what I think about it [i.e., the identity of the Savior], and what the revelations say as the say I reckon, and as the Yankys say I guess; but I will tell you what I reason: I reason that father Adam was a resurrected being, with his wives and posterity, and in the Celestial kingdom they were crowned with glory and immortality and eternal lives, with thrones principalities and powers; and it was said to him it is your right to organise the elements; and to your creations and posterity there shall be no end . . . . Adam then was a resurrected being; and I reckon.

Our spirits and the spirits of all the human family were begotten by Adam, and born of Eve.

"How are we going to know this?" Brigham queried. "I reckon it . . . ."

I reason that Father Adam, and mother Eve had the children of the human family prepared to come here and take bodies; and when they come to take bodies, they enter into the bodies prepared for them; and
that body gets an exaltation with the spirit, when they are prepared to be crowned in fathers kingdom.

What, into Adams kingdom?

Yes.

I tell you, when you see your father Adam in the heavens, you will see Adam, When you see your Mother that bear your spirit, you will see mother Eve...

I commenced with father Adam in his resurrected state, noticed our spiritual state, then our temporal or mortal state, [and] traveled until I got back to father Adam again...

As noted, this sermon had a major impact upon the listeners. Joseph Lee Robinson, for example, recorded in his journal that he attended a very interesting conference, for at this meeting President Brigham Young said thus, that Adam and Eve were the names of the first man and woman of every earth that was ever organized and that Adam and Eve were the natural father and mother of every spirit that comes to this planet, or that receives tabernacles on this planet, consequently we are brother and sisters, and that Adam was God, our Eternal Father. This as Brother Heber remarked, was letting the cat out of the bag, and it came to pass, I believed every word, for I remembered saying to the Brethren at a meeting of High Priests in Nauvoo, while I was speaking to them under the influence of the Spirit, I remarked thus, that our Father Adam had many wives, and that Eve was only one of them, and that she was our mother, and that she was the mother of the inhabitants of this earth, and I believe that also...

Despite his conviction of the doctrine, Robinson recorded “there were some that did not believe these sayings of the Prophet Brigham, even our Beloved Brother Orson Pratt told me he did not believe it. He said he could prove by the scriptures it was not correct.” For Robinson there was no question who held the erroneous position: “I felt very sorry to hear Professor Orson Pratt say that. I feared least he should apostatize, but I prayed for him that he might endure unto the end, for I knew verily it was possible that great men might fall.”

The following March 1855, President Young delivered another talk affirming that Adam had come to the earth as a resurrected being.30 And the same month the Millennial Star carried more favorable comments on Young’s Adam-God doctrine.31 A month later, Brigham addressed a meeting of the Deseret Theological Institute. His subject was the identity of God and Jesus Christ, and his remarks were to serve as the “foundation of all theology.” “[T]his is for you to believe or disbelieve as you please,” Young told the Institute audience, “for if I were to say who he was I have no doubt but that there would be many that would say perhaps it is so and perhaps it is not...” He spent a few minutes speaking on Adam, then asked, “Well now who is the father of our Spirits?” Unless Brigham’s ordinarily precise clerk, Thomas Bullock, made an error in recording this speech, Young’s answer to this question must have been confusing to those in attendance. At least one thing is clear, however: a new circumspection (if not circumlocution) in his comments on this sensitive subject:

I do not design to go into any mysteries or to take up worldly sciences to any great extent, but suppose I were to take up a few of them, I should be like the rest of you: tell what I know according to what I understand and believe. And then if I am wrong I should be glad if God or some man upon the earth would correct me and set me right and tell me what it is and how it is...”

“If I were to set before you the principle directly to the truth and yet precisely understand pertaining to him with whom we have to do,” Brigham continued, “I have no question or doubt but what it would be opposed to your traditions and the feelings of many of you.” After seemingly identifying the Father as Adam, he continued,

I tell you this as my belief about that personage who is called the ancient of days, the prince and so on. But I do not tell it because that I wish it to be established in the minds of others, though to me it is as clear as the sun. It is as plain as my alphabet. I understand it as I do the path to go home. I did not understand so until my mind became enlightened with the spirit and by the revelations of God, neither will you understand until our father in heaven reveals all these things unto you. To my mind and to my feelings those matters are all plain and easy to understand.

It appears that Brigham intended to give his audience some latitude on these questions. Yet, while characterizing his own view as a “belief,” Young asserted that the clarity with which he comprehended this belief came only when his “mind became enlightened with the spirit and by the revelation of God.”

In February 1857, President Young again mentioned Adam-God in a public sermon, and as at the Deseret Theological Institute, the tenor of his remarks was somewhat circumspect:

... He [God] is a being of the same species as ourselves; He lives as we do, except the difference that we are earthly, and He is heavenly. He has been earthly, and is of precisely the same species of being that we are. Whether Adam is the personage that we should consider our heavenly Father, or not is considerable of a mystery to a good many. I do not care for one moment how that is; it is no matter whether we are to consider Him our God, or whether His Father, or His Grandfather, or in either case we are of one species—of one family—and Jesus Christ is also of our species.

Restraint was again in evidence in October of the same year when President Young once more spoke publicly on his doctrine. First, however, there was a mildly sarcastic reproach to his dissenters:

Some have grumbled because I believe our God to be so near to us as Father Adam. There are many who know that doctrine to be true. Where was Michael in the creation of this earth? Did he have a mission to the earth? He did. Where was he? In the Grand Council, and performed the mission assigned him there. Now, if it should happen that
we have to pay tribute to Father Adam, what a humiliating circumstance it would be! Just wait till you pass Joseph; and after Joseph lets you pass him, you will find Peter; and after you pass Peter, Joseph, and after Apostles and many of the Prophets, you will find Abraham, and he will say, “I have the keys, and except you do thus and so, you cannot pass”; and after a while you come to Jesus; and when you at length meet Father Adam, how strange it will appear to your present notions. If we can pass Joseph and have him say, “Here; you have been faithful, good boys; I hold the keys of this dispensation; I will let you pass,” then we shall be very glad to see the white locks of Father Adam. 34

Having made the point, Young closed more cautiously, “But those are ideas which do not concern us at present, although it is written in the Bible—This is eternal life, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”

In retrospect 1856–1857 was a pivotal time in Brigham’s public stance on the Adam-God doctrine. It is apparent that this innovative doctrine was still quite controversial four or five years after its public announcement, even among many of the faithful. Thereafter, while in no way discarding this idea, Young advanced his doctrine distinctly less emphatically and less frequently than during the previous four years. A very circumscript tone, for example, is quite evident two years later when, after stating once again that “Mankind are here because they are the offspring of parents who were first brought here from another planet, and power was given to them to propagate their species, and they were commanded to multiply and replenish the earth,” Young concluded with a careful double negative: “Adam and Eve are the parents of all pertaining to the flesh and I would not say that they are not also the parents of our spirits.”

Finally, in January 1860, the Twelve were specifically advised by President Young to avoid discussing the subject publicly. “Michael,” Wilford Woodruff records Young as saying, “was a resurrected being, and he [sic] Eloheim, came to this Earth and with an imaml [sic] Body & continued so till he partook of earthly food and begot Children who were mortal (keep this to yourselves) then they died A Carrington spoke upon the subject a short time & made some useful remarks.”

Limiting the subject to private leadership circles did not end all controversy. A few weeks later, April 4, the persistent Orson Pratt presented grievances against Young before the Twelve: “I would like to enumerate [those] items, first preached and published that Adam is the father of our spirits, & father of Spirit & father of our bodies. When I read the Rev given to Joseph I read directly the opposite. Lord spake to Adam, which Man eventually became Adam’s, I” (The “Rev” referred to here was probably Section 29:42 in today’s D & C, although similar subject matter referred to by Pratt is also found in Moses 4:28 and 5:4–9.17) This time Brigham’s response contained something new and noteworthy:

You came out tonight & place them as charges, & have as many against me as I have you. One thing I thought I might still have omitted It was Joseph’s doctrine that Adam was God with whom the power came upon us, or such that alarmed the neighborhood. God comes to earth & eats & partakes of fruit.28

This claim that Joseph Smith taught “that Adam was God” is the first of three known occasions on which Brigham Young attributed the origin of Adam-God to Smith.29 While there is no reliable primary source documentation from Smith’s era to support this assertion, much later testimony from other intimates of Joseph Smith such as Helen Mar Kimball (one of Joseph’s plural wives) in 1882, and Benjamin F. Johnson in 1903, endorse Brigham’s claim.26 It is therefore appropriate to consider briefly the merits of this assertion.

Joseph Smith unquestionably viewed “Adam” as an individual whose importance extended well beyond the role of first parent to the human race. Five years after the organization of the Church, the Prophet published a revelation which identified “Michael, or Adam, [as] the father of all, the prince of all, the ancient of days[,]”4 Four years later, in a sermon in Nauvoo in 1839, he went much further. As recorded by Willard Richards, Smith announced that “The Priesthood was first given to Adam: he obtained the first Presidency & held the keys of it, from generation to generation; he obtained it in the creation before the world was formed as in Gen. 1:26-28. He had dominion given him over every living creature. He is Michael, the Archangel, spoken of in the Scriptures, ... he will call his children together, & hold a council with them to prepare them for the coming of the Son of Man. He, (Adam) is the Father of the human family & presides over the Spirits of all men, & all that have had the Keys must stand before him in this great Council. The Son of Man stands before him and there is given him glory & dominion. —Adam delivers up his Stewardship to Christ, that which was delivered to him as holding the Keys of the Universe, but retains his standing as head of the human family. [emphasis in original]14

The centrality of Adam’s role was reiterated by the Prophet in a major discourse on the priesthood the following year. He spoke of Adam being the “first and father of all, not only by progeny, but he was the first to hold the spiritual blessings, to whom was made known the plan of ordinances for the Salvation of his posterity unto the end, and to whom Christ was first revealed, and through whom Christ has been revealed from heaven and will continue to be revealed from henceforth.” This has, in retrospect — and in isolation — the ring of Adam-God to it, but Smith then said:

Adam holds the Keys of the dispensation of the fulness of times, i.e. the dispensation of all the times have been and will be revealed through him from the beginning to Christ and from Christ to the end of all the dispensations that have been are to be revealed. . . . This then is the nature of the priesthood, every man holding the presidency of
his dispensation and one man holding the presidency of them all even Adam, and Adam receiving his presidency and authority from Christ, but cannot receive a fulness, until [sic] Christ shall present the kingdom to the father which shall be at the end of the last dispensation.43

In both of these 1839 and 1840 sermons, Joseph clearly places Adam in a position subservient to Christ, a relationship seemingly incompatible with the Adam-God doctrine later articulated by Brigham. As Orson Pratt noted, there also were other important inconsistencies between the fully developed Adam-God doctrine and the scriptures revealed by Joseph Smith. A problem with our present D & C 29 and Book of Moses has already been alluded to; all three of these scriptures clearly place the speaker ("I, the Lord God") in authority above Adam. Moreover, Adam is commanded to repent and seek redemption “through faith on the name of mine Only Begotten Son.”

Pratt’s discomfort with Brigham’s Adam-God doctrine was not limited to Young’s insistence that Adam was not created from the dust of the earth. Other Latter-day Saint scriptures such as the Book of Mormon also pose some difficulties. The prophet Amulek, for example, is there reported as saying a resurrected “mortal body . . . can die no more,” that in the resurrection, “spirits are united with their bodies, never to be divided” (Alma 11:45). As both the Book of Moses (6:12), and the Doctrine and Covenants (107:53) report the death of Adam, there is at least a theoretical problem with the notion that he had been resurrected prior to his earthly experience.

Additionally, Section 107, which was the third section in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, said in part, 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.44

Another early revelation (March 1832), now D & C 78, also appeared in the 1835 edition, and made a very similar point. The “Lord God,” the “Holy One of Zion,” if it reported, “hath appointed Michael your prince and established his feet, and set him upon high, and given him the keys of salvation under the council and direction of the Holy One.”45 As the “Lord,” “God,” and “Holy One” in these passages are all understood in Mormon theology to refer to Jesus Christ, these scriptures are as irreconcilable with Adam being the father of Christ as were Joseph’s later sermons quoted above. Indeed, the sermons essentially restate the message of these scriptures.

These later sermons are all the more significant when one recalls that Brigham had asserted that “it was Joseph’s doctrine that Adam was God when in Luke Johnson’s.” Luke Johnson was ordained one of the original Apostles in mid-February 1835; briefly (six days) disfellowshipped and removed from the Council of the Twelve in September 1837; went again into apostasy in December 1837; and was excommunicated in April 1838. Although he was re-bap-

ized into the Church well after Smith’s death (in 1846), it follows from his church career that any preaching on Adam-God by Smith “in Luke Johnson’s” would have to have occurred in Kirtland well before the Nauvoo sermons.

On the other hand, the Nauvoo period also marked the first major synthesis of the Mormon perception of the nature of God, and all of Smith’s later teachings are not necessarily known. The Prophet’s sermons and writings in this last years more clearly identified God the Father as an actual being who possessed a physical, but “glorified” corporeal body such as our own. Smith’s important discourses on April 7, 1844 (the “King Follett Sermon”) and June 16, 1844 (on the plurality of gods) crystallized ideas on the eternal evolution of mankind. God himself, the Prophet taught, was once a mortal man who had experienced a similar existence to our own. Indeed, both Joseph and Hyrum Smith preached an eternal patriarchal lineage of gods; as there never was a son without a father, so also the God of this earth has a father, as does his father ad infinitum.47

While stopping well short of an “Adam-God doctrine,” such ideas clearly were necessary precursors to the notions advanced by Brigham. The one fragment of evidence that Smith may have carried this at least a step further is found in a poem by apostate Mormon William Law, recently of the First Presidency, published in the Warsaw Message in February 1844. Entitled “Buckeye’s Lamentation for Want of More Wives,” this poem satirically spoke of the “greater” glory a man could have in the hereafter if he had plural wives; “Creating worlds so fair; At least a world for everwife That you take with you there.”48 (Emphasis in original.) While this notion does presage yet another aspect of Brigham Young’s teachings, it obviously still falls well short of a positive link between the Adam-God doctrine and Joseph Smith.

At least as relevant as the foregoing in evaluating Joseph’s possible views, is the total absence in any of his known sermons or writings, or in that of any other Mormon leader before 1852, of anything like the fully developed Adam-God doctrine. Instead, statements such as that found in John Taylor’s 1852 publication, The Government of God, actually suggest that the antithesis of Adam-God was then held to be true: “. . . when God made man, he made him of the dust of the earth . . . ,” and “Adam is the father of our bodies, and God is the father of our spirits,” Orson Pratt’s 1848 discussion of “The Kingdom of God” involved analysis of the nature of God; but nothing could be cited from it which would support Adam-God in any way. Another early Mormon favorite—A Voice of Warning—first published in 1837 by Parley P. Pratt, did cover the scriptural account of Adam’s creation; yet he too did not deviate from Joseph Smith’s expositions cited above.49 Additionally, while Orson Pratt may have been alone in speaking out against the doctrine after 1852, it is notable that no other Mormon leader—aside from Young—seemed willing to ascribe it to Smith, even after 1852. The one other apostle to volunteer a source, Heber C. Kimball, seems to ascribe it to himself. In April 1862, Kimball—long an advocate of the doctrine—testified, “[T]he Lord told me that Adam was my father and that he was the God and father of all the inhabitants of this earth.” Orson Pratt, as noted below, also inferred that the
doctrine originated with Kimball, and T. B. H. Stenhouse, after leaving the Church, made this claim as well, in Rocky Mountain Saints (1873). 33

The fact that Brigham Young claimed at least three times that Smith was the originator of Adam-God nonetheless strongly suggests that Brigham thought Smith taught something related to this doctrine. As illustrated above, this is the case. Possibly Young misconstrued or misremembered what he heard (or heard something no one else did?). Whatever the explanation, it can safely be said that with our current understanding it is a very big step from what is known of Joseph Smith’s teachings on Adam to those later articulated by Brigham Young.

Orson Pratt’s difficulties during these years (to return to our chronology) have been detailed elsewhere. 32 For present purposes it is important only that Brigham’s Adam-God doctrine was one of several major points of disagreement. The day following the April 4 exchange noted above, Orson continued to voice his objections in a meeting with his fellow apostles. Orson Hyde had just remarked that “Brother Brigham may err in the price of a horse . . . but in the revelations from God, where is the man that has given thus saith the Lord when it was not so? I cannot find one instance.” Pratt responded,

In regard to Adam being our Father and God . . . I frankly say, I have no confidence in it, alto advanced by Brother Kimball in the stand, and afterwards approved by Brigham. . . . I have heard Brigham say that Adam is the Father of our spirits and he came here with a resurrected body, to fall for his own children, and I said to him it leads to an endless number of falls which leads to sorrow and death, that is revolting to my feelings, even if it were sustained by revelation.

One [revelation] says that Adam was formed out of the earth, and the Lord put in his spirit, and another that he came with his body, flesh and bones, there are two contradictory revelations. In the garden it is said that a voice said to Adam, in the meridian of time, I will send my only begotten son Jesus Christ, then how can that man and Adam both be the Father of Jesus Christ? . . . It was the Father of Jesus Christ that was talking to Adam in the garden. Young says that Adam was the Father of Jesus Christ both of his spirit and body in his teaching from the stand. 33

Brigham responded indirectly in a sermon several weeks later, acknowledging only that,

. . . if guilt before my God and my brethren rests upon me in the least, it is in this one thing, that I have revealed too much concerning God and his kingdom, and the designs of our Father in heaven. If my skirts are stained in the least with wrong, it is because I have been too free in telling what God is, how he lives, the nature of his providences and designs in creating the world, in bringing forth the human family on the earth, his designs concerning them, etc. If I had, like Paul, said—"But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant," perhaps it would have been better for the people. 34

These comments suggest the continued reluctance to accept Brigham’s doctrine, an attitude which no doubt was responsible for the following outburst in a Young sermon later that year:

I will give you a few words of doctrine, upon which there has been much inquiry, and with regard to which considerable ignorance exists. Br. Watt will write it, but it is not my intention to have it published, therefore pay good attention, and store it up in your memories. Some years ago, I advanced a doctrine with regard to Adam being our father and God, that will be a cause [course?] to many Elders of Israel because of their folly. With regard to it, they yet grovel in darkness and will: It is one of the most glorious revelations of the economy of heaven, yet the world holds it [in] disreput [sic]. Had I revealed the doctrine of baptism from the dead instead of [of] Joseph Smith there are men around me who would have ridiculed the idea until dooms day. But they are ignorant and stupid like the dumb ass. 35

Despite this—perhaps because of it—Brigham appears to have followed his own counsel, and largely abandoned public efforts in support of the Adam-God doctrine after 1861. 36 Indeed, two years later Brigham addressed a group of California emigrants en route through Salt Lake City on Mormon beliefs, and gave no hint of his unique theology on this subject:

. . . We believe in God the Father and in Jesus Christ our elder brother. We believe that God is a person of tabernacle, possessing in an infinite brightness every attribute of his spiritual and material children. We believe that he made Adam after his own image and likeness . . . 37

This statement has become popular with those who wish to deny that Young espoused the Adam-God doctrine, with which it cannot easily be reconciled. While one might reasonably dismiss this particular statement as designed specifically for his non-Mormon audience, there are other similarly difficult statements from Young. Just a few months after the emigrant speech, for example, he told his faithful audience in the Ogden Tabernacle that

. . . the Lord is our God and it is He whom we serve; and we say to the whole world that He is a tangible Being . . . and if He created Adam and Eve in His own image, the whole human family are like Him. This same truth is borne out by the Savior . . . He sent his Angels, and at last sent His Son, who was in the express image of the Father—His Only Begotten Son, according to the flesh here on this earth. This is the God we serve and believe in. 38

Thus, Brigham seems to identify the same Supreme Being as the father both of Adam and Jesus Christ

Seven years later, this time in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, he made the same point quite explicitly: “We are all the children of Adam and Eve, and they and we are the offspring of Him who dwells in the heavens . . . .” 39 These public statements raise several obvious questions, satisfactory answers to
which are not yet known. Was the wording carefully selected to allow an inappropriate alternative understanding to the plain meaning of Brigham's remarks, or did he mean to assert as true what these statements taken at face value would imply? Given the extensive testimony in support of Adam-God before, during, and after the period of these contrary remarks, there seems little question as to Young's true beliefs. Nonetheless this is an area deserving further study.

As indicated, Brigham did continue to espouse the Adam-God doctrine after this time, but usually only within much more restricted circles. For example, according to Wilford Woodruff's account, Brigham discussed the subject in a meeting of the Salt Lake School of the Prophets in 1867, and stated that "Adam was Michael the Archangel & he was the Father of Jesus Christ & was our God & that Joseph taught [sic] this Principle."56 That there were many among this more select group who were favorably disposed to—or at least accepting of—Young's views is evident from the minutes of a School of the Prophets meeting in Provo the following year. Abraham O. Smoot, according to this record, spoke of "[t]he doctrine preached by Pres. Young for a few years back wherein he says that Adam is our God—the God we worship—that most of the people believe this—some believe it because the Pres. says so—others because they can find testimony in the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants." After referring to Orson Pratt's rejection of the belief, Smoot said, "this is not the way to act—we are not accountable on points of doctrine if the President makes a statement it is not our prerogative to dispute it—he is only accountable in points of doctrine, I have heard President Young argue the truth of Adam being our Father and God but have never heard him argue the question at all." Such acceptance of Brigham's beliefs is further evidenced by A. P. MacDonald's remarks to the School:

I thought I would speak briefly in relation to Adam being our God. Since the year 1852 when the President first spoke on this subject, I have frequently endeavored to reconcile what I have read with regard to this matter. I believe what the President says on the subject although it comes in conflict with our tradition. I have not any doubt in my mind but that Adam is our God. Who his God and Father may be, I have no knowledge. President Kimball spoke on this question recently and very plainly illustrated the character and relationship of our Father and God.

Elder George G. Bywater also felt it unwise to question Young's doctrine:

I am not disposed to question the discrepancies on this question of doctrine: if we live faithful, all will become clear to us. We cannot become united only as we get united in understanding. When I first heard the doctrine of Adam being our Father and God, I was favorably impressed—enjoyed, and hailed it as a new revelation—it appeared reasonable to me as the father of our spirits, that he should introduce us here—and what we do not see is only evidence that we have not the light necessary.61

Private endorsement of Young's teachings was even more emphatic in other meetings of the School of the Prophets. In an 1870 meeting, "Elder George Q. Cannon fully endorsed the doctrine that Father Adam was our God and Father . . . ." Indeed, "the above doctrine had been revealed to him, so that he knew it was true."62 In another meeting of the School three years later, Daniel Wells of the First Presidency asked his colleagues whether they endorsed the "doctrine pertaining to Adam being our Father & our God." He personally "bore a powerful testimony to the truth of the doctrine, remarking that if ever he had received a testimony of any doctrine in this church he had of the truth of this. The Endowments plainly teach it and the Bible & other revelations are full of it." Others who "approved or endorsed" the doctrine at the meeting were Henry Grow, D. B. Huntington, John Lyon, George B. Wallace, and Joseph F. Smith, the latter stating that "the enunciation of that doctrine gave him great joy."63

The public de-emphasis on the Adam-God doctrine apparent in the 1860s continued through Brigham's death in 1877. In an 1870 meeting of the School of the Prophets, "Prest. Young" again had advised "the brethren to meditate on the subject, pray about it and keep it to yourselves."64 Three years later, amidst the testimonials of the 1873 meeting noted above, he further counseled that he "was positive of the truth of this doctrine [Adam being our Father and God], but thought we should be cautious about preaching on doctrines unless we fully understand them by the power of the Spirit, then they commend themselves to the hearts of the hearers."65 Perhaps significantly, it was on the relatively rare occasions when President Young addressed this persistently unpopular subject during these years that he began to ascribe regularly the doctrine to Joseph Smith. Such claims made in 1861 and 1867 already have been noted; another was made in 1876. In 1873, however—a year in which T. B. H. Stenhouse wrote that "the mass of the Mormon people do not believe the doctrine of the Adam deity"—Brigham, for the only known time, carried his public case one step further. In a sermon in the New Tabernacle in June, which was published in the Desert News, the prophet commented:

How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day Saints in regard to this particular doctrine which I revealed to them, and which God revealed to me—namely that Adam is our father and God—I do not know. I do not inquire. I care nothing about it.

This, then, was not a personal belief. Nor was there any question about what was being said. After indicating that "Father Adam" held the keys of salvation for his children, Brigham went on: "I could not find any man on the earth who could tell me this, although it is one of the simplest things in the world, until I met and talked with Joseph Smith . . . ." "We say," he then continued, . . . that Father Adam came here and helped to make the earth. Who is he? He is Michael, a great prince, and it was said to him by Eloheim,
“Go ye and make an earth.” . . . Adam came here and got it up in a shape that would suit him to commence business . . . Father Adam came here, and then they brought his wife. “Well,” says one. “Why was Adam called Adam?” He was the first man on the earth, and its frame and maker. He with the help of his brethren, brought it into existence. Then he said, “I want my children who are in the spirit world to come and live here. I once dwelt upon an earth something like this, in a mortal state. I was faithful. I received my crown and exaltation. I have the privilege of extending my work, and to its increase there will be no end. I want my children that were born to me in the spirit world to come here and take tabernacles of flesh, that their spirits may have a house, a tabernacle or a dwelling place as man has . . .”

The following day Brigham elaborated somewhat on revelation at a meeting of the School of the Prophets. “Said there were many revelations given to him that he did not receive from the Prophet Joseph. He did not receive them through the Urim and Thummim as Joseph did but when he did receive them he knew of their truth as much as it was possible for him to do of any truth.” It was also in this meeting that Daniel Wells called for, and received the ringing endorsements of Brigham’s teachings quoted above. Given this context there can be no question about what was understood to be under discussion by those in attendance.

The concluding chapter in the Brigham Young phase of this story is in some ways as predictable as it is surprising. Driven in his last years to reform and standardize a number of administrative and other facets of the Kingdom, the President decided among other things that the temple-endowment ceremony should be standardized in a written format. On February 7, 1877, just six months before his death, Brigham held a meeting in his home in St. George, and recounted some of the initial problems encountered when Joseph Smith first introduced the endowment in the upper room of his store in Nauvoo. Joseph reportedly charged Young with “setting the ordinances right.” Now, over thirty years later, since everything was to be written down by scribes L. John Nuttall and D. T. McAllister, Brigham had prepared a text for a “lecture at the veil to be observed in the Temple” - a summarization of the major aspects of the endowment. Thus, whatever its public fate, Brigham’s inspiration would be preserved in one of the most exalted and restrictive of Mormon ordinances. According to Nuttall, the lecture informed initiates that:

Adam was an immortal being when he came. on this earth he had lived on an earth similar [sic] to ours he had received his Priesthood and the Keys therefrom, and had been faithful in all things and gained his resurrection and his exaltation and was crowned with glory immortality and eternal lives and was numbered with the Gods for such he became through his faithfulness. and had begotten all the spirit that was to come to this earth. and Eve our common Mother who is the mother of all living bore the spirits in the celestial world. and when this earth was organized by Elohim. Jehovah & Michael who is Adam our common Father.

In discussing the earthly phase of Adam’s existence, the lecture revealed that,

Adam & Eve had the privilege to continue the work of Progression. consequently came to this earth and commenced the great work of forming tabernacles for those spirits to dwell in. and when Adam and those that assisted him had completed this Kingdom our earth he came to till and slept and forgot all and became like an infant child . . . Adam & Eve when they were placed on this earth were immortal beings with flesh. bones and sinews [sic]

With respect to the parenthood of Jesus Christ,

Father Adam’s eldest son Jesus the Saviour who is the heir of the family is Father Adams first begotten in the spirit World. who according to the flesh is the only begotten in the spirit World. who according to the flesh is the only begotten as it is written. (In his divinity he having [sic] gone back into the spirit world. and come in the spirit to Mary and she conceived for when Adam and Eve got through with their work in this earth. they did not lay their bodies down in the dust. but returned to the spirit World from whence they came.)

Contrary to many later perceptions, Brigham Young’s death in late August 1877 did not mark the end of the Adam-God doctrine. While available diaries from this period are relatively silent on the subject, and while there is a virtually complete public silence, many of the Church’s leading authorities unquestionably retained a belief in Brigham’s teachings (others apparently did not). In 1880, for example, Edward Stevenson of Seventy “by request of one of the Presidency” [spoke] upon God as the father of our spirits [sic]” at a Davis Stake conference. His message was clear: “... therefore Adam is the Father of my Spirit & also of my body...”

Two years later Stevenson and several others dealt with Thomas Howell, who opposed the Adam-God doctrine, in a general meeting of the Seventies. Howell was advised that if he “could not comprehend these things to lay them up until he could, & if he indulged in that spirit to correct or set President Young rite that he would be dealt with & lose his faith & standing in the Church.” After “many remarks” Howell “said he was wrong, sorry for it & asked for forgiveness.”

Abraham H. Cannon recorded an account during 1888 in which his father, Apostle George Q. Cannon, endorsed some of the doctrine which earlier had been taught by Young.

He [George Q. Cannon] asked me what I understood concerning Mary conceiving the Savior, and as I found no answer he asked what was to prevent Father Adam from visiting and overshadowing the mother of Jesus. “Then,” said I, “he must have been a resurrected Being”. [sic]

“Yes,” said he, “and though Christ is said to have been the first fruits of them that slept, yet the Savior said he did nothing but what he had seen His father do, for He had power to lay down his life and take it
up again. Adam, though made of the dust, was made, as President Young said, of the dust of another planet than this." I was very much instructed by the conversation and this day's service.74

A few months later, Joseph E. Taylor (First Counselor in the Salt Lake Stake Presidency) delivered a speech in the Logan temple in which he claimed that Adam was a resurrected man and that Adam was the father of Jesus Christ,75 based in part on Brigham's April 1852 sermon. This does not appear to have been the Lecture at the Veil prepared by Brigham in his last year. It is not clear, in fact, what did become of the lecture. The apparent ignorance of the subject matter implied by Abraham Cannon’s account—despite his having been a General Authority for six years—suggest it was not routinely presented in the temple. Similar ignorance among some missionaries and their president—noted below—who also presumably had been through the temple prior to their missions supports this conclusion. Although exposed of the temple ceremonies published about this time do not include any reference to this lecture, “fundamentalist” authors have asserted without serious attempt at documentation that Brigham’s lecture was an integral part of the temple ceremony until about 1902-1905. In support of this has been placed the testimony of one individual who in 1959 distinctly remembered hearing during his endowment in the temple in 1902 that “Adam was our God.” On returning from his mission in 1904 he noted that these teachings had been removed.76 While one would expect more extensive evidence than this were it true that the lecture was given for twenty-five years, it is quite possible that something akin to the Joseph E. Taylor remarks is the basis for the recollection. It should also be recalled that other “discarded” notions were still being promulgated in some temples by a few individuals during the early years of the twentieth century—such as the continued legitimacy of plural marriage, also a cherished fundamentalist tradition.

Nonetheless it cannot safely be argued that Young’s teachings on Adam were indeed discarded in the private circles of the church hierarchy. Beyond Authorities George Q. and Abraham H. Cannon and Edward Stevenson, in the 1890s one also finds brief but supportive references to the doctrine by Apostles Brigham Young, Jr., Franklin D. Richards and Lorenzo Snow. Amidst discussions treated below, for example, Snow is reported as leading “out on Adam being our father and God. How beautiful the thought it is. God nearer to us.” To this Richards added that “it made him thrill through his whole body it was new & it was inspiring.”77 By contrast, others among Brigham’s erstwhile supporters did have a change of heart. George Q. Cannon, who for a time had been a counselor to Young in the First Presidency, later reflected,

Some of my brethren, as I have learned since the death of President Brigham Young, did have feelings concerning his course. They did not approve of it, and felt oppressed, and yet they dare not exhibit their feelings to him, he ruled with such strong and stiff a hand, and they felt that it would be of no use. In a few words, the feeling seems to be that he transcended the bounds of the authority which he legitimately held.

I have been greatly surprised to find so much dissatisfaction in such quarters . . . [Some even feel that in the promulgation of doctrine he took liberties beyond those to which he was legitimately entitled.78

While neither specific individuals or doctrines are mentioned, it is worth noting that we have no record of John Taylor explicitly advocating the Adam-God doctrine even during Young’s administration. His Government of God, published the year the doctrine was first publicly advanced surely gave no hint of familiarity with these notions; and as Young’s successor he published The Mediation and Atonement of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (1882) which contained no support whatever for Brigham’s views, despite many references to Adam, Christ, and the Godhead. While there are no passages in this latter work which directly attack Adam-God, Taylor’s approach is very similar to that of Orson Pratt and is implicitly incompatible with facets of Young’s teachings. His overall aim—in the words of a recent observer—was clearly to “re-Christianize” Mormonism.79

Other late nineteenth-century publications by Mormon authorities are also notable for their discretion on (if not rejection of) the subject of Adam-God. Despite his apparent continuing support of Young’s teachings, Franklin D. Richards’ Compendium (1857) contained no hint of this belief. It is noteworthy that while he does cite passages from Brigham’s April 9, 1852, sermon to support several characteristics of God and the Holy Ghost, he fails to quote the portions on Adam-God. His 1882 revision of this book, published in conjunction with James A. Little, totally eliminates any references to Young’s sermon. Not only does this influential second edition contain no support of Adam-God, but the scriptures cited on man’s creation and fall actually are aligned more with Orson Pratt and John Taylor’s writings noted above; later editions through the last one in 1925 leave these items intact.80

Although one might read Adam-God into the vague prose found in Parley P. Pratt’s Key to the Science of Theology (1855), support for Young’s doctrine is not directly stated. Orson Spencer’s celebrated letters to Reverend William Crowell, written in 1847 and widely published for many years thereafter, offer no hint of Adam-God. The same is true for Charles W. Penrose’s influential book, “Mormon” Doctrine, Plain and Simple (1882) and John Nicholson’s The Preceptor (1883). In 1888, B. H. Roberts’ The Gospel, an Exposition of its First Principles (1888), identified God the Father and Jesus Christ as having a “proprietorship to this earth, and . . . are the Supreme Governing Power in it”; but no discussion of Adam’s role is given. His 1893 supplement to this book, Man’s Relationship to Diety, recites the standard scriptural account of Adam’s creation; however, Roberts also expresses doubt in the “creation from the dust” story and postulates instead Brigham Young’s belief in Adam’s procreation on another planet and subsequent transplantation to this earth. Nevertheless, Adam-God is not mentioned.81

Despite Wilford Woodruff’s copious notes on the subject during the Young administration, nothing really conclusive on his later views on Adam-God has been reported. It is notable that one year after Woodruff’s death, the
Church published Dr. James E. Talmage's *The Articles of Faith* (1899) which included such quotations as "He [God] revealed himself to our first earthly parents... [who] heard His voice in the Garden, and... continued to call upon God, and to sacrifice to Him..."; and "[T]he Holy Ghost inspired [Adam] and bare record of the Father and the Son...".

In sum it appears that Brigham's Adam-God doctrine never became thoroughly established in late nineteenth-century LDS theology. While it is evident that many of the leading authorities of the Church endorsed Young's teaching during these years, there was not a unanimous view even among the hierarchy. The published writings of church authorities in these years avoided any endorsement of the doctrine, and evidence suggests that it was not widely accepted among the general membership of the Church.

II

The Council did not deem it wise to lay out any line of procedure in which to deal with the subject, but felt that it is best to avoid bringing it up, and to do the best we can and as the Spirit may suggest when it is thrust upon us.

Apostle Franklin D. Richards, 1897

As early as 1860 critics of the Mormons, notably the newly Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, had used Brigham's Adam-God doctrine as a local point for attack. In the years following Young's death, polygamy was the principal cause celebre, but with the Manifesto of 1890 "anti-Mormon" attention returned to other heretical doctrinal matters. In the face of this development, according to one report, official counsel from the Church was to downplay the Adam-God doctrine. In 1892 George Q. Cannon advised that "[I]t was not necessary that we should [teach] or endorse the doctrine that some taught that Adam was the Father of Jesus Christ. Counsel was given for the Elders to teach that which they knew, not that which they did not." Three years later President Wilford Woodruff made essentially the same point:

How much longer I shall talk to this people I do not know; but I want to say this to all Israel: Cease troubling yourselves about who God is; who Adam is, who Christ is, who Jehovah is. For heaven's sake, let these things alone. Why trouble yourselves about these things? God is God. Christ is Christ. The Holy Ghost is the Holy Ghost. That should be enough for you and me to know. If we want to know any more, wait till we get where God is in person. I say this because we are troubled every little while with inquiries from Elders anxious to know who God is, who Christ is, and who Adam is. I say to the Elders of Israel, stop this.

This did not, of course, stop Protestant ministers from using the issue to discredit the Church. In October 1897, for example, Mormon elders began proselytizing in Fresno, California. They authored a favorable introductory article on the Church which was published in the Fresno paper. A local minister, C. A. Munn, proceeded to publish several articles of his own, in part quoting Brigham Young's April 1952 sermon. Although the elders tried to meet Munn's challenge, they failed, and mission president Ephraim H. Nye came to their aid in a rebuttal which stated that Munn had misrepresented Brigham Young's remarks by taking them out of context. Nye claimed that for Mormons Adam "is not the God to whom we pray, nor did Brigham Young undertake to convey such an idea. We worship the being who placed Adam in the garden of Eden." Pastor Munn responded that Nye's claim was not true; that the Mormon Church in fact did teach that Adam was God.

Nye appealed for assistance to Apostle Franklin D. Richards. Explaining that "this is a matter that we have got to meet continually," Nye asked Richards to indicate any errors in his reasoning. He candidly admitted that his elders were unable to handle the question, and "have to dodge it the best they can." On December 16, 1897, Elder Richards met with the First Presidency and part of the Council of the Twelve and read the Fresno Morning Republican article along with President Nye's letter. Richards' diary records that Nye's letter "was read & highly approved but no action as to the dealing with Adam our F. & G. subject." Another apostle in attendance was Brigham Young, Jr., who, along with President Woodruff, had heard his father's remarks made in St. George on February 7, 1877. (The younger Young evidently believed his father's testimony, for he wrote in his journal the day of the Richard's discussion, "Adam is our father and God and no use to discuss it with Josephites or any one else.") The next day Richards drafted a letter to Nye, as recounted in the Apostle's diary: "Sent Pres E. H. Nye letter of Decision of Council about and approving his Article to the Fresno Republican & a copy of Pres Young's remarks about Adam our Father as contained in Vol. 1 of journal of Discourses." Elder Richards' letter to Nye was itself quite revealing:

On receipt of your letter of the 4th inst., I conferred with Pres. Joseph F. Smith, and we concluded to present the matter to the Council of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles. Both your letters to me, and the Article to the Fresno Republican, were read. Each of the Presidency and several of the Apostles expressed themselves well pleased with your article, that it evinced skill and valor for the Truth, and that we did not see how it could be much improved. The Council did not deem it wise to lay out any line of procedure in which to deal with the subject, but felt that it is best to avoid bringing it up, and to do the best we can and as the Spirit may suggest when it is thrust upon us.

Your having got so many of the Josephites was received with marks of particular pleasure. This, like many other points of more advanced doctrine, is too precious a pearl to be cast before swine: But when the swine get hold of them, let us rescue them by the help of the Spirit as best we can. Thinking it may be convenient to you to have President Young say some on that subject, I enclose a copy from his sermon in the first Volume of the Journal of Discourses."

While one must be cautious in accepting all of Richards' remarks uncritically, in view of his strong previous commitment to the Adam-God doctrine, his
comments about "more advanced doctrine" suggest that Brigham's ideas were not altogether abandoned. On the other hand, the impression is also conveyed that the missionaries in the field were not at all familiar with the notion.

President George Q. Cannon's politic remarks in 1898 reflect well the attitude of the Church at the close of the century:

I was stopped yesterday afternoon by a young man, who wanted to know whether Adam was the Father of our Lord and Saviour—whether he was the being we worshipped, etc. Now, we can get ourselves very easily puzzled, if we choose to do so, by speculating upon doctrines and principles of this character. The Lord has said through His Prophet that there are two personages in the Godhead. That ought to be sufficient for us at the present time. . . . Concerning the doctrine in regard to Adam and the Saviour, the Prophet Brigham Young taught some things concerning that, but the First Presidency and the Twelve do not think it wise to advocate these matters. It is sufficient to know we have a Father—God the Eternal Father, who reveals Himself by His Holy Spirit unto those who seek; and that Jesus Christ is His Son, our Redeemer, the Savior of the world.62

The next few years brought the deaths of many key Church authorities who had worked with Brigham Young and supported his doctrine. Wilford Woodruff died in 1898, Franklin D. Richards in 1900, George Q. Cannon and Lorenzo Snow in 1901, and Brigham Young, Jr., in 1903. Only Joseph F. Smith remained of those who had been apostles during Brigham's lifetime. It is perhaps significant that the major Church commentaries explicitly refuting the Adam-God doctrine—even to the point of denying that it was ever taught—did not come until after the deaths of these men.

III

Speculations as to the career of Adam before he came to the earth are of no real value . . . Dogmatic assertions do not take the place of revelation, discuss matters that, after all disputes, are merely matters of theory.

The First Presidency, 1912

The intense scrutiny to which Mormon beliefs were subjected during the first part of Joseph F. Smith's administration, coupled with the First Presidency and Council of the Twelve's reluctance to discuss Brigham Young's Adam-God doctrine, eventually led to a significant reinterpretation of Young's belief. While this change came about gradually, it ultimately achieved official status with a First Presidency statement issued on the matter in 1912:

The most prominent force in this development was Charles W. Penrose, editor of the Deseret News. During the late 1890s and early 1900s Penrose was the leading Mormon defender of the faith in a critical confrontation with the anti-Mormon Salt Lake Tribune. In response to frequent accusations that Mormons still professed a belief that Adam was God, Penrose undertook a

rebuttal which began in February 1900 with a personal letter to Quincy Anderson of Olathe, Missouri. In offering his explanation of Brigham Young's April 1852 sermon, Penrose denied that Young meant to say that Mormons worshiped Adam, or that Adam was the father of Jesus Christ. "As to Adam, he Young taught that he was God in the sense of being at the head of the human family . . . and in the Patriarchal order he will be the personage with whom they will have to do, and the only one in that capacity."93

Penrose's letter was published without his permission in the Reorganized Church's Saints' Herald. Penrose thereupon reprinted the letter in the Deseret News with the following carefully worded explanation:

Anyone who has carefully read the discourse . . . will perceive that our brief statement of its purport is correct, that there is nothing in one that is in conflict with the other that we have neither apologized for nor disputed anything contained in that sermon, which has been so much misunderstood and perverted by the enemies of our later venerable president. We are familiar with the doctrine he taught and which he did not attempt fully to explain in the discourse which has been published. And it should be understood that the views entertained by the great leader and inspired servant of the Lord, were not expressed as principles to be accepted by mankind as essential to salvation. Like the Prophet Joseph Smith, his mind was enlightened as to many things which were beyond a common understanding, and the declaration which would bring upon him the opposition of the ignorant.

Penrose indicated that "[i]f there are men in the church who entertain ideas of a more advanced nature, some of which, although they may be expressed in public . . . are not put forth as binding upon any person . . . ."

That which President Young put forth in the discourse referred to, is not preached either to the Latter-day Saints or to the world as a part of the creed of the Church. In answering the letter of our correspondent we simply explained in private that which was asked in private, so that he might understand the tenor of President Young's views, and not with any intention of advocating or denying his doctrine, or of controverting anything that may have been said upon the subject by opponents of his utterances.94

One implication of these remarks—i.e., that Young's belief could have been valid—was not amplified. The heart of Penrose's statement to readers of the Deseret News was simply this: regardless of the meaning of Young's dogma, it did not represent binding or official Church doctrine.

In September 1902, Penrose published a lengthier article, entitled "Our Father Adam," in the Improvement Era, which in a sense marked the first major effort by the Church to "explain" Brigham's declaration that "Adam was our God and the only God with whom we have to do." The substance of his remarks followed closely what had been suggested in the Deseret News two and a half years earlier—principally, that Young was being misinterpreted; and that his comments were better understood when taken in con-
junctioin with the concept of patriarchal order. Wrote Penrose, "The view
then expressed were uttered in a single sermon, which created so much
comment that the speaker did not afterward enter into further details or
explanation." "Opponents" of Mormonism were "very fond of quoting iso-
lated passages" from Young's 1852 sermon, but ignored the "hundreds of
illusory" to that "Supreme Being" which Young made throughout the course
of his life. Moreover, Young's bigotry, he again explained with a certain
inconsistency in logic, had never been "formulated or adopted" by the
Church.  

Although arguments such as these were to become the standard "Church"
approach to the issue, some Church leaders were not willing to gloss over
Brigham Young's beliefs. In February 1902 Bishop Edward Bunker, Jr., of
Bunkerville, Nevada, wrote to Church President Joseph F. Smith explaining
that a recently returned missionary had been "advancing the Doctorn [sic]
that Adam is the very eternal Father in the Godhead and the Father of Jesus
Christ and that Pres Kelch so taught the Elders in that mission I say the
Doctorn [sic] is Faule [sic] . . . ." 99 In response to Bunker's quest for clarifi-
cation, President Smith appears also to have chosen his words carefully:

It is certainly unwise for the Elders or any other member of the
Church to advocate doctrines that are not clearly set forth in the
revealed word of God, and concerning which, in consequence, differ-
icence of opinion exist . . . . While it is far from my purpose to stifte
thought and free speech among the brethren, or to brand as "false
doctrine" any and every mystery [sic] of the kingdom, it is neverthe-
less [sic] my wish and my advice, in which Presidents Winder and
Lund, my counselors, heartily join, that the Elders should not make a
practise of preaching upon these abstruse themes, these partly revealed
principles, respecting which there are such wide differences of belief.
What is called the Adam God doctrine may properly be classed
among the mysteries. The full truth concerning it has not been revealed
to us; and until it is revealed all wild speculations, sweeping assertions
and dogmatic declarations relative thereto, are out of place and
improper. We disapprove of them and especially the public expression of
such views . . . .

President Smith then identified the accepted Church belief as being that
Adam was Michael, the Ancient of Days, and that he held a patriarchal
position as "head of the human family." He remarked that "Christ is not
Adam, nor is Adam Christ, but both are eternal Gods, and it may even be
said Fathers, since they are the parents of eternal or spiritual children." The
President concluded by saying, "As to the personality and position of each
God, and as to which all is the greater, these are matters immaterial at the
present time, and are best but an unprofitable speculation. Let us be content
with what is plainly revealed on the subject, that though there be
Lord and many Gods many as the Apostle Paul declares, yet to us there is
but one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." 97

A more forceful endorsement of Brigham Young's innovation appen-
dantly occurred when B. H. Roberts, a member of the First Council of Seventy since
1888, participated in a debate with Reverend C. Van Der Donckt in 1902. In
a ringing, but ultimately ambiguous tribute, Roberts said:

Some of the sectarian ministers are saying that we "Mormons" are
ashamed of the doctrine announced by President Brigham Young to
the effect that Adam will thus be the God of this world. No, friends,
it is not that we are ashamed of that doctrine. If you see any change
come over our countenances, when this doctrine is named, it is sur-
prise, astonishment, that any one at all capable of grasping the large-
ness and extent of the universe—the grandeur of existence and the
possibilities in man for growth, for progress, should be so lean of
intellect, should have such a paucity of understanding, as to call it in
question at all. That is what our change of countenance means—not
shame for the doctrine Brigham Young taught. 98

The First Presidency, as such, first became publicly involved in the issue
in 1909 when they issued a statement on "The Origin of Man," directed
primarily at evolutionary questions. In this they explained that "Adam our
great progenitor, the First Man, was, like Christ, a pre-existent spirit, and
like Christ he took upon him an appropriate body, the body of a man, and so
became a living soul." 99 While this official declaration had not dealt with
the Adam-God question, nor specified the method by which Adam "took
upon him an appropriate body," it did generate sufficient discussion that
President Joseph F. Smith, as the editor of the Improvement Era, published
the following editorial:

Whether the mortal bodies of men evolved in natural processes to
present perfection, through the direction and power of God; whether
the first parents of our generation, Adam and Eve, were transplanted
from another sphere, with immortal tabernacles, which became cor-
rupied through sin and the partaking of natural foods, in the process
of time; whether they were born here in mortality, as other mortals
have been, are questions not fully answered in the revealed word of
God. 100

Two years later, in March 1912; the First Presidency placed another state-
ment, more explicitly on Adam-God, in the Improvement Era. The language
reflects an apparent debt to the previous writings of editor Charles W. Pen-
rose, who became an Apostle in 1904 and was now a member of the First
Presidency. In part the statement read:

Speculations as to the career of Adam before he came to the earth
are of no real value. We learn by revelation that he was Michael, the
Archangel, and that he stands at the head of the hierarchy on earth
(Doctrine and Covenants, Sect. 107:53–56). Dogmatic assertions do not
take the place of revelation, and we should be satisfied with that which
is accepted as doctrine, and not discuss matters that, after all disputes,
are merely matters of theory. 101
While it was not specified which "dogmatic assertions" were in question, the message was unmistakable.

A few weeks later at a special priesthood meeting held during the Church’s annual conference, President Penrose reportedly read a letter received by the First Presidency which stated that some patriarchs had been teaching the Adam-God doctrine to Church members. Penrose then read from D & C 19 and 107 in refutation of the belief and, according to Thomas Clawson’s journal, argued that “Brigham Young did not qualify his remark which was taken in longhand and there may have been something said which unless further explained might be misconstrued.”

Prest. Jos F. Smith then said that he was in full accord with what Prest Penrose had said and that Prest. Brigham Young when he delivered that sermon only expressed his own views and that they were not corroborated by the word of the Lord in the Standard works of the Church.

After describing how the Church’s scriptures were voted upon and sustained as Standards of the Church,” President Smith stated: “Now all doctrine if it can’t be established by these standards is not to be taught or promulgated [sic] by members.”

Four years later the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve again addressed the issue, in a pamphlet entitled “The Father and the Son.” The purpose of this publication was to clarify title and role definitions of God the Father and Jesus Christ. The Presidency stated, unequivocally, “God the Eternal Father, whom we designate by the exalted name-title Elohim, is the literal Parent of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and of the spirits of the human race.”

This, notwithstanding some definitional imprecision, seems a clear rejection of at least part of Brigham’s understanding, for Mormons have always distinguished “Elohim” from Adam (i.e., Michael).

Despite the seeming finality of this language, questions still persisted. President Penrose, who had continued to speak regularly on the subject, again responded, this time in General Conference, April 6, 1916:

There still remains, I can tell by the letters I have alluded to, [i.e., those sent to the First Presidency] an idea among some of the people that Adam was and is the Almighty and Eternal God. [The notion has taken hold of some of our brethren that Adam is the being that we should worship.] I am sorry that has not been rectified long ago, because plain answers have been given to brethren and sisters who write and desire to know about it, and yet it still lingers, and contentions arise in regard to it, and there should be no contentions among Latter-day Saints.

Who was the person Adam prayed to? Adam prayed to God. . .

So Adam was neither the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Ghost; was he? Then who was he? Why, we are told he was Michael in his first estate, and as Adam he will stand at the head of his race.

A few years later Penrose was even more explicit as he affirmed that “Jesus of Nazareth, born of the virgin Mary, was literally and truly the Son of the Father, the Eternal God, not of Adam.” Thus it was Penrose more than any of his colleagues who articulated the new “official” interpretation of or response to Brigham Young’s theological innovation. Indeed, his logic and interpretation became the pattern for virtually all the twentieth-century Mormon responses to Adam-God.

IV

We warn you against the dissemination of doctrines which are not according to the scriptures and which are alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities of past generations. Such, for instance, is the Adam-God theory. We denounce that theory and hope that everyone will be cautioned against this and other kinds of false doctrine.

Spencer W. Kimball, 1976

As time passed, the repudiation of Young’s teachings on Adam-God became more pronounced. President Heber J. Grant wrote quite bluntly to an inquirer in 1931: “[To claim] that Adam had passed on to celestial glory through resurrection before he came here, and that afterwards he was appointed to this earth to die again, the second time becoming mortal . . . is not scriptural or according to the truth.”

John A. Widtsoe, in his celebrated series of apologetic articles for the Improvement Era later republished as Evidences and Reconciliations, was even less restrained. To Widtsoe, “[t]hose who peddle the well-worn Adam-God myth” relied on “[a] long series of absurd and false deductions . . . .” Referring to Brigham’s April 1852 sermon and following Penrose’s lead, Widtsoe continued,

Certain statements there are made confusing if read superficially, but very clear if read with their context. Enemies of President Brigham Young and of the Church have taken advantage of the opportunity and have used these statements repeatedly and widely to do injury to the reputation of President Young and the Mormon people. An honest reading of this sermon and of other reported discourses of President Brigham Young proves that the great second President of the Church held no such views as have been put into his mouth in the form of the Adam-God myth.

“Brigham Young,” continued Widtsoe. “held the accepted doctrine of the Church, that God, the Father, and not Adam, is the earthly Father of Jesus . . . . President Young merely followed the established doctrine of the Church.” Moreover, again with reference to the 1852 sermon, “nowhere can an intelligent reader confuse Adam with either member of the Godhead.” It should be noted that Widtsoe—and most later commentators on this subject—appears to have the misconception that Brigham Young’s Adam-God theory alleged that Adam was Elohim. As has been previously discussed, Young, while placing Adam in the position most Latter-day Saints today
would reserve for Elohim, distinguished between 'Father Adam' and one or two grandfather figures. One of the latter was Jehovah, Adam's father (thus the grandfather to Adam's descendants, including Christ); and the other was Elohim, Adam's grandfather.109

Although other Church authorities have spoken against the Adam-God doctrine in recent decades, the most conspicuous spokesmen in this context have been Joseph Fielding Smith, Jr., and Mark E. Peterson. Smith, who as early as 1939 had asserted that Brigham Young's 1852 sermon was "in all probability . . . erroneously transcribed,"110 published an essay entitled, "Adam is Not the Father of Jesus Christ," in partial refutation of this sermon. After citing several Young statements, Smith said, "It is very clear from these expressions that President Brigham Young did not believe and did not teach, that Jesus Christ was begotten by Adam. He taught that Adam died and that Jesus Christ redeemed him."111 [Emphasis in original.]

Mark E. Peterson is the author of the book presently accepted by the Church as the "official" response to the subject: Adam, Who is He? (1976).112 His approach draws heavily on his predecessors, Penrose, Widtsoe and Joseph Fielding Smith, Jr. The preface states:

We accept the ancient and modern scriptures as the word of God. They are our unerring guides. But some teach doctrines contrary to the scriptures. Under these circumstances it is well to remember President Joseph Fielding Smith, who said: "If I ever say anything contrary to the scriptures, the scriptures prevail." It is so with everyone.

In commenting on this later in the text, he adds, "This applies to all, even to Brigham Young." 

L. Peterson's main argument, however, centers on the alleged mistranscription of Brigham Young's April 1852 sermon.113 He also asks, of a sermon by Young in which the President separated the identities of Elohim and Adam, "Then could Adam possibly be Elohim, as some say?" Expanding on this point later, he continues:

We do not know what part Michael played in the creation of this earth. President Young did not make it clear. But that he did take part, President Young declares with certainty. The very fact that he did, the very fact that Elohim and Jehovah did likewise, the three working in a "quorum capacity," as President Young explains, again clears the air so far as Michael being Deity is concerned. He was not Deity. He was the Archangel working with Deity.114

Like Widtsoe, this author believes the pivotal question was whether Young equated Adam with Elohim.

The most significant recent comment on this subject by a Mormon leader—and the first public injunction by a Church President in decades—came during the October 1976 conference of the Church. President Spencer W. Kimball addressed the priesthood session, and, in the midst of his comments proclaimed the following:

We warn you against the dissemination of doctrines which are not according to the scriptures and which are alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities of past generations. Such, for instance, is the Adam-God theory. We denounce that theory and hope that everyone will be cautioned against this and other kinds of false doctrine.115

That the subject, despite all this, has remained an active one is evidenced by the continued denunciations of Adam-God by Church authorities right up to the present day. One of the most widely publicized of these was a speech by Apostle Bruce R. McConkie in June 1980 to students at Brigham Young University in which he stated:

There are those who believe, or say they believe, that Adam is our Father and our God, that he is the Father of our spirits and our bodies and that he is the one we worship. The devil keeps this heresy alive as a means of obtaining converts to cultism. It is contrary to the whole plan of salvation set forth in the scriptures. Anyone who has read the Book of Moses, and anyone who has received the temple endowment and who, yet believes the Adam-God theory does not deserve to be saved.116

V

Facts do not cease to exist because they are ignored.

Aldous Huxley

The Adam-God doctrine has been a sensitive subject for most Latter-day Saints from the very day it was introduced to the Church. It is apparent that a substantial—and ultimately a dominant—number of Mormons rejected what Brigham Young held to be one of the "precious things of the kingdom." For Young clearly believed that Adam was the father of the spirits of mankind in addition to being the first procreator of mankind's physical bodies; that Adam came to this earth as a resurrected and exalted being; that he "fell" to a mortal state of existence in order to procreate mortal bodies; and that Adam was the spiritual and physical father of Jesus Christ. Had these beliefs evolved into an official doctrine of the church, one supposes there would be relatively little controversy to discuss—but, they did not. If one accepts at face value the sermons of President Young and his colleagues, and their successors, on Adam-God, it is apparent that official (or even quasi-official) teachings on the subject have undergone considerable change.
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"Some difficulty exists in specifying the precise identity of "Elohim" when discussed by early church authorities, given that Joseph Smith (and others) identified Elohim as a title denoting "many gods."64 If Joseph Smith, Jr., History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Period II, 17 vols., B. H. Roberts (ed.), (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1975), vol. VI, pp. 475–76 (hereafter cited as HSDS), Smith noted the propensities of biblical scholars to identify Elohim as many god—be he who created this earth, an interpretation still maintained by scholars, cf. Encyclopedia Britannica, 1973; Micropædia, vol. III, p. 863. This source noted, "Though elohim is plural in form, it is understood in the singular sense." (emphasis in original) However, Smith argued that "if in the very beginning the Bible shows there is a plurality of Gods beyond the power of refutation...the word Elohim ought to be in the plural all the way through—Gods. The conception of God is first one God for us..." (HSDS, VI, p. 47), esp. in HSDS, vol. II, p. 612. In this sermon, the Prophet also claimed to have gleaned this perception from "the papyrus which is now in my house." This correlates well with Joseph's Book of Abraham (chap. 4) which describes the creation process as having been performed by "the gods." A later interpretation by Brigham Young identified Adam as "the chief manager in that operation." (Discourse, April 20, 1856, reported in JD 3:319, also cf. Heber C. Kimball's discourse, June 30, 1842, reported in JD 2:431.) When compared with Young's sermon Adam-God in HSDS, it is apparent that Brigham would probably have replaced "Elohim" in the 1916 statement with "Adam," however, he would not have equated Adam with Elohim, for the president clearly saw them as two separate patriarchs. C.f. his remarks on April 9, 1852: "It is true that the earth was organized by three distinct characters, namely Elohim, Yahovah, and Michael, these three forming a quaternary...perfectly represented in the Deity as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." (reported in JD 1:51) Also cf. Note 46, below.

Brigham Young, as reported in the Joseph F. Smith Journal, entry for June 17, 1871 (LDS Archives).

Joseph's declaration of "Jehovah" being the "Father" over Adam during his mortality seems to imply that "Jehovah" was also the creator of Adam, a position directly contradicting
today’s belief that Jehovah is Jesus Christ (cf. D & C 110:1-3, also 109:34, 42, 56, 68, 128:9, and James E. Talmage, Jesus the Christ, A Study of the Messiah and His Mission according to Holy Scripture both Ancient and Modern [Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1971 ed.], pp. 36–38), and that both Jesus Christ and Adam were created by Elohim, their common father in Heaven.

*3* Remarks given on June 26, 1854, reported in LDSMS, vol. XVI (August 5, 1854), no. 31, p. 482.

*4* Remarks given on June 26, 1854, ibid., p. 483.

*5* Remarks given on June 28, 1854, LDSMS, vol. XVI (August 26, 1854), no. 34, p. 530.

*6* Remarks given on June 28, 1854, ibid., pp. 534–35.

*7* WWJ, September 17, 1854. Young and Pratt had another discussion on October 1, 1854, where Young explained about “Adam being created first” after he had received his revelations that all have got to become “Adam” upon some earth or other (ibid. Historian’s Office Journal, same date, vol. 17, p. 148, LDS Archives).

*8* DN, October 12, 1854.

*9* WWJ, October 8, 1854. Woodruff noted that J. D. Watt and himself recorded the conference minutes. Young’s preliminary remarks suggest that this speech was given in response to Orson Pratt’s discussions regarding Adam-God.

*10* October 8, 1854. Brigham Young, LDS Archives. Young followed his first speech with a second one, “History of the Church” (cf. DN, October 12, 1854). Young delivered a discourse at the First Presidency meeting held on October 26, 1854, in Salt Lake City (see DN, November 3, 1854). Young’s discourse was reported in LDSMS, vol. XVI (December 31, 1854), no. 42, p. 333–34.

*11* Joseph Lee Robinson Diary, entry dated “Oct. 6th.” Young’s sermon was on the 8th, also on LDS Library (typescript).
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Discourse, before August 8, 1839, reported in the Willard Richards Pocket Companion, as cited in Ehat and Cook, op. cit., pp. 8-9; J. C., vol. II, p. 385-87. According to Orson Hyde’s "of patriarchal order: principally defined the future structural order within the highest degree of the celestial kingdom. With Adam at the head of the human family, other families would be sealed, with the their priesthood leader (now understood to be the immediate patriarchal order) to their priesthood leader (now understood to be the immediate Sealed to Jesus Christ who would then be sealed to the Father. LDS theology teaches that all of these participating sealed priesthood leaders would, with their wives, be gods capable of their own eternal exaltation.

Discourse, October 5, 1840, original ms. in handwriting of Robert B. Thompson, LDS Archives, as cited in Ehat and Cook, op. cit., pp. 39-40; J.C., vol. IV, pp. 207-19.

I D & C 107:53-56 in today’s edition. This revelation reportedly was received on March 28, 1835, in Kirtland; however, the Kirtland Revelation Book’s manuscript version (LDS Archives) Version 53-55 are quoted almost verbatim in a blessing given by the Prophet to his father on date. LDS Archives (cited in Joseph Fielding Smith, Jr., Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith [Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1972], pp. 8-9). This passage was originally published when John 1, 1845), no. 12, p. 947.

IV D & C 78:15-16, today’s edition. While the present version is practically identical to the different in form: "Holy One of Zion" is recorded there as "Holy One of Israel" (emphasis mine); as the important passage in vs. 16 which places Michael under Enoch (cited above in the text) are 1832 (date given) and full 1833 when it was first published in the D & C, it was never type-set in the Book of Commandments.

Indeed, the apparent speaker in D & C 78 refers to himself not only as "King God," but also as: "your Redeemer..."—a clear allusion to Christ. D & C 89, and announced the same month, is even more explicit: "...your Redeemer, even Jesus Christ..." Notably, Orson Pratt once testified in a church conference held on April 7, 1843 that "the None of Days cannot be the Father, I" (Times and Seasons, vol. IV [May 15, 1843], no. 13, p. concerning certain additional points in his speech, he did not object to Pratt’s reasoning that the Ancient of Days (Adam) could not have been the Father of mankind’s spirits; cf. HC, vol. V, p. 339.


Jeremy Messenger, February 4, 1844. An additional source is occasionally cited as further evidence of Joseph teaching Adam-God: this is a brief passage in the "Anti-Mormon" Nauvoo Expositor (vol. 1, June 7, 1844) by A. Fisk. The assumption is that this is an allusion to Brigham’s belief that Adam—"a celestial being"—has a right to come upon this earth. The context of this passage, however, clearly shows that he means "...if he "varies from the law unto which he is subjected," a Mormon belief which was embodied in the Law of God.

John Taylor, who became the President of the Church (London: W. Bowden, 1832), pp. 28, 30; Orson Pratt, The Cross of Christ (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1966), pp. 85-86, 96, and 111. reprint edition (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1978). The complete absence of any hint that Adam-God was taught by Brigham is further substantiated by a literature search of over 1,000 doctrinal books, essays, brochures, bywords, "anti-Mormon" texts, speeches, etc., published between 1826 and 1852, which failed to turn up any evidence. (A complete list of items reviewed is in Chad Hake, ed., A Mormon Bibliography, 1830-1910 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1979), pp. 814-15.) Consultation with several individuals familiar with unpublished manuscripts and diaries dating from this period (e.g., Peter L. Crawley, James B. Allen, Reed C. Durham, Jr., H. Michael Marquand, and others) also yielded nothing. As one member wrote, "Brigham’s April 9, 1852, Adam-God sermon represented "new doctrine." (Lorenzo Brown Journal, April 10, 1852, Lee Library.

Early references to Adam-God often identified it in terms of Brigham Young’s April 1852 sermon thereby suggesting that this represented its initial presentation, this is readily seen in the sermons and writings cited throughout the present text and notes.

Solomon F. Kimball Papers, "Sacred History," LDS Archives. Wrote Steenhouse, "Brother Heber had considerable pride in relating to his intimate friends that he was the source of Brigham’s revelation on ‘Adam-deity.’ In a moment of reverse, Heber said: ‘I have an idea that Adam is not only our father, but also our God. That was enough; Brigham sprang at the novelty, and announced it with all the flourish of a new made revelation.’ (op. cit., p. 561, fn. 1).


April 5, 1861, Miscellaneous Papers, Brigham Young Collection, LDS Archives. On October 7, 1862, however, Pratt taught that “angels are Gods, and still possess the lower office called angels. Adam is called Archangel, yet he is a God.” (reported in LD 13:187)


Discourse, October 8, 1861, manuscript entitled "A Few Words of Doctrine," LDS Brigham Young Collection, LDS Archives.

Many of Young’s public statements on Adam-God became alluionary and less direct than those previously given. For a sample of several minor references by Brigham related to Adam-God, cf. D & F 9:263 (February 23, 1862); J. D. 11:119-21 (June 18, 1860); J. D. 1:12:23 (February 10, 1867); J. D. 2:12 (May 21, 1881); J. D. 3:12-13 (January 1871); J. D. 3:16-21 (May 18, 1871); and J. D. 4:122-26 (December 13, 1870). Other church members such as Eliza R. Snow published additional support in favor of Young’s beliefs on Adam-God. This body of literature is quite large, due to both space limitations and the nonauthoritative nature of these statements, they will not be discussed. For a partial treatment, however, see Rodney Turner, op. cit., a more complete collection without commentary, may be found in Eldred Cannon, "The Mormon God," (unpublished manuscript), copy on file in the LDS Archives and Lee Library.

Discourse, July 8, 1863, reported in J.D. 10:230-31.

Discourse, November 13, 1863, reported in J.D. 13:308-9.

Discourse, April 17, 1870, reported in J.D. 13:311.
December 16, 1867. Young's comments were made only one week after he re-established Young Collection, LDS Archives, and WW), December 11, 1869. The LDS Journal History's entry for this last date is almost identical, except the words "forosh the Father Adam" have been handwritten and inserted above the typed version which omitted this phrase.

Minutes of the School of the Prophets, Provo, Utah, June 8, 1867, "LDS Archives (excerpted from a typescript copy located at the Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City).

Remarks given on October 15, 1870, Salt Lake School of the Prophets Minutes Book, LDS Archives. [Emphasis in original.] "Apostle Orson Hyde had recently taught in a Mormon Church in Salt Lake City on the practice of polygamy. Young is quoted as saying that "The practice of polygamy is the most important doctrine taught by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints."

Salt Lake School of the Prophets Minutes Book, entry for June 9, 1873. LDS Archives. Most of these men were prominent members of the church. Wallace became president of the Salt Lake Stake in 1874 (through 1876), and Joseph F. Smith became president of the church in 1910.

Remarks given on October 15, 1870, Joseph F. Smith Journal. LDS Archives.

Remarks given on June 9, 1873, Salt Lake School of the Prophets Minutes Book. LDS Archives.

T. H. Stenhouse, op. cit., p. 492. Stenhouse continued, "But of them all, one, Orson Pratt, has dared to make a public protest against that doctrine." The only other known statement by Young which suggests (but does not directly state) a tie-in of Adam to God-Joseph Smith was made on June 8, 1873, cited below.

Discourse, June 8, 1873, reported in DN, June 13, 1873, pp. 308-9. This is the only known statement by Young where he directly claimed that God revealed "that Adam is our Father and God." To him.

Salt Lake School of the Prophets Minutes Book. entry for June 9, 1873. Notably, "First Young quitted with the brethren thought he was too liberal in laying out on this doctrine before the people."

"Mormonism" of 1. John Nuttall to Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith, June 3, 1892. Lee Library. Nuttall stated that "The spirit of the Lecture is kept at the St. George Temple, in which President Young refers to Adam in his creation. It is the transcript of the lecture copy. According to Wilford Woodruff (WJ), February 1, 1877 and Nuttall (Nuttall Journal, February 1 and 2, 1877), the lecture was first given by Young on February 1, 1877.

Nuttall Journal, February 7, 1877. Nuttall—much impressed by Young's remarks—closed this lecture, saying: "I feel myself much blessed in being permitted to associate with such men and hear such instructions as they have preserved of the light of the evidence presented above."

Two of the only articles published during this period which supportively mention Adam God concepts appeared in The Contributor (Salt Lake City: Contributor Company, 1879-81), the only prominent pro-Adam-God article published during this period was Joseph Taylor's speech cited below.

Edward Stevenson Diary, entry for March 7, 1888, LDS Archives: "By this mean, in attendance, said that he could endorse all that had been said although he did not understand all of it, and it made him feel good & like living his religion."

Ibid., entry for March 4, 1882.

A. Wiltsoe, with James E. Talmage, being added in 1924. George F. Richards was the primary mover of this task force as he attempted to codify and simplify the ceremony (cf. his journal entries during this period, LDS Archives).

Brigham Young, Jr., Journal, entry for October 12, 1857 (LDS Archives); also cf. his entry for December 16, 1887 (cited below). Edward Stephenson Diary, entries for July 22, 1885, February 20, 1896, and March 3, 1898 (the latter two cited below in Note 88). Austin H. Lund Journal, entry for December 13, 1897 (LDS Archives); and John Henry Smith Journal, entry for January 11, 1899 (University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah).


Cannon’s journal entry was written just a few months after Brigham’s death. A similar point was made in an 1892 meeting of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve. This time with Young’s approval of the subject of whether Adam is God or not. (See Abraham H. Cannon, “Reflections With Brigham Young,” The Instructor, Vol. 80 (June 1945), No. 6, p. 259.)

Samuel W. Taylor, The Kingdom or Nothing: The Life of John Taylor, Militant Mormon (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1976), p. 278. Some of the more obvious quotations from Mediation and Atonement (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Co., 1882) which are in disagreement with Young are his citations of a scripture (Moses 5:8) on pp. 62–63 in which the Lord tells Adam he should repent and “call upon God, in the name of the Son, for evermore...” (p. 63) called upon our Father Adam by his own voice, saying, I am God...” (p. 63) and included Taylor saying...” He also stated that Lucifer was before Adam; so Adam was commanded... (pp. 62–63)


James E. Talmage, The Articles of Faith (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1899), p. 29. Talmage’s reference to the可视化 as the Creator, the God who revealed Himself to Adam, and the God of the Godhead is in the book of Genesis (1:1). (pp. 32; 33)


Charles W. Penrose to Quincy Anderson, February 17, 1900, published in the Deseret Evening News, March 21, 1900, p. 4.

Woodruff and Cannon have no comments on the subject of whether Adam is God or not. (See Note 66, above.)

Edward B. Wilkie to John Smith, February 27, 1902, John Smith Letters, p. 26–27, LDS Archives.

M. H. Roberts, The Mormon Doctrine of Deity (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1903), pp. 42–43. On p. 243–49, Roberts cites a sermon by Joseph Smith which discussed Adam's stewardship...
ardship under Christ's; he also cited one sermon by Brigham Young which mentions Adam-God concepts (pp. 259-69). Roberts' comments in 1908 suggest that he personally did not believe the Adam-God doctrine [U. S. Smith's version of his sermons.].

First Presidency Statement, Joseph F. Smith, John H. Winder and Anthon H. Lund, Improvement Era, vol. 13 (November 1909), pp. 131-32. The First Presidency stated that they had not previously heard of the Adam-God doctrine and that it was not taught in the Church. They advised their members to study the Bible and the scriptures to determine the truth of the doctrine.

Second Presidency Statement, Joseph F. Smith, Anthon H. Lund, and John H. Winder, Improvement Era, vol. 13 (November 1909), pp. 282-83. The Second Presidency stated that they had not previously heard of the Adam-God doctrine and that it was not taught in the Church. They advised their members to study the Bible and the scriptures to determine the truth of the doctrine.

Third Presidency Statement, Joseph F. Smith, Anthon H. Lund, and John H. Winder, Improvement Era, vol. 13 (November 1909), pp. 332-33. The Third Presidency stated that they had not previously heard of the Adam-God doctrine and that it was not taught in the Church. They advised their members to study the Bible and the scriptures to determine the truth of the doctrine.

Fourth Presidency Statement, Joseph F. Smith, John H. Winder and Anthon H. Lund, Improvement Era, vol. 13 (November 1909), pp. 382-83. The Fourth Presidency stated that they had not previously heard of the Adam-God doctrine and that it was not taught in the Church. They advised their members to study the Bible and the scriptures to determine the truth of the doctrine.

In 1910, the First Presidency ordered all Church publications to stop using the term Adam-God. This was part of a broader effort to standardize Church teachings and to ensure that all Church publications presented a clear and consistent message. The Adam-God doctrine was not taught in the Church at this time, and the use of the term was discontinued.
was based upon a claim that Apostle Charles C. Rich heard Young's April 9, 1852 sermon and personally corrected the text to a "more accurate" version in his copy of the Journal of Discourses.

After publication of Adam: Who is He?, however, subsequent research showed that Elder Rich was not present from San Bernardino to Salt Lake City and could not have heard Young's sermon. The "personal" correction was actually made by Rich's son, Ben E., who was born in 1855. The actual inscription by Rich states, "as corrected above is what Pres Young said, as testified to me by my father C. C. Rich. is/Ben E. Rich" (LLS Archives). For a discussion of this oversight, cf. Chris Alex Vlachos, op. cit., pp. 99-100. This error was corrected in the book's 1976 edition.

114Adam: Who is He?, pp. 83-84

115Discourse, reported in CR, October 2, 1976, p. 115. This citation has been reprinted in the church's 1980-81 Melchizedek Priesthood study guide, Choose Ye the Day (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979), p. 59.

116"The Seven Deadly Heresies," Fourteen Stake Fireside Address at Brigham Young University, June 1, 1980. Transcribed from tape purchased at BYU's Media Marketing. Elder McConkie evidently was condemning claims which are still espoused by Mormon fundamentalists. Notably, the published version of his talk changed the latter sentence to read: "... anyone who has received the temple endowment, has no excuse whatever for being led astray by it." (T. S. D. S. 1981: Devotional Speeches of the Year, 1980 [Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1981], p. 78). A few months later in the October 1980 semi-annual church conference, Mark E. Petersen reiterated his co-apostle's sentiments: "Adam was not our God nor was he our Savior. ... Adam was the Savior's progenitor only in the same sense in which he is the ancestor of us all. ... Then was Adam our God, or did God become Adam? Ridiculous! Adam was neither God, nor the Only Begotten Son of God. He was a child of God in the spirit as we all are." (Discourse, reported in CR, October 4, 1980, pp. 22-23.)

THE IDEA OF PRE-EXISTENCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORMON THOUGHT

BLAKE OSTLER

The Mormon Belief that the individual spirit of man existed in the presence of God before the creation of the world is unique in modern Christianity. Mormons have rejected the Creator/creature dichotomy of Patristic theology and its logical corollaries, creatio ex nihilo and the idea of God as a single, infinite Absolute. Mormons consider man one of the given entities of the universe, the necessary, self-existing offspring of God and therefore of the same ultimate nature as God—uncreate and capable of eternal progression. Man, as necessary being, could not not exist; his primal self is not created and cannot be. Nevertheless, the history of the idea of pre-existence in Mormon thought is one of varying interpretation, of refinement and controversy. The controversy stems largely from the inherent tension in a finitistic theology from an earlier period of absolutist preconceptions. Nowhere is this tension more evident in Mormonism than in its doctrine of pre-existence.

Abolition Preconceptions: 1830-1835

The doctrine encountered by the earliest Mormon converts was not a significant departure from the Catholic/Protestant view of the day which stressed the Creator/creature dichotomy and a single, infinite and absolute God. The doctrine of pre-existence of souls had not been a part of Christian thought since 543 A.D. when that doctrine was declared "anathema" by a

BLAKE OSTLER has a B.S. in psychology and a B.A. in philosophy from Brigham Young University and is beginning graduate study in law and philosophy at the University of Utah.
The purpose of this paper is to determine if Brigham Young, second prophet of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, taught what has become known as the Adam-God theory. Also, I will explore differing positions taken by a variety of groups concerning this topic.

Growing up in the church I had heard allusions to something called the Adam-God theory. I didn't have any idea what it was and frankly didn't care to find out. All I knew was that anti-Mormons claimed it proved the church false and I knew that the church was true so therefore discarded their claims as untrue and fabricated. I also had read many quotes by the brethren that the whole thing was false and misconstrued. I held this viewpoint on the subject during most of my missionary experience. During the latter part of my mission I somehow came to the conclusion that there was something to the Adam-God theory which the anti-Mormons were taking out of context and reconciled the brief exposure I had to it as understandable and not in disharmony with my mainstream Mormon beliefs.

Several years after my mission I decided to study the topic in more depth. It was at this point that I first really understood what Brigham Young had taught and was surprised to learn that the apostates were in fact correct in their accusations of the doctrine. Brigham emphatically and in no uncertain terms taught that Adam, the same Adam who fell in the Garden of Eden, was God the Father and a resurrected being, the father of our spirits and the father of Jesus Christ in the flesh. What was the most surprising, however, was that current Mormon leaders denied that Brigham Young ever taught the doctrine and that he was misquoted. Since I had read several instances where the doctrine was taught, I found this response most absurd and even deceiving.

Shortly after, I came across a personal letter from Bruce R. McConkie to a very liberal BYU professor dated Feb. 19, 1981, which contained the following quote:

Yes. President Young did teach that Adam was the father of our spirits, and all the related things that the cultists ascribe to him. This, however, is not true. He expressed views that are out of harmony with the gospel. But, be it known, Brigham Young also taught accurately and correctly, the status and position of Adam in the eternal scheme of things. What I am saying is, that Brigham Young, contradicted Brigham Young, and the issue becomes one of which Brigham Young we will believe. The answer is we will believe the expressions that accord with the teachings in the Standard Works. (Bruce R. McConkie, personal letter, p. 6)

At last I had found an apostle who did not try to deny the mountain of evidence relating to the teachings of Brigham Young concerning Adam. Also of note is a conversation I had with Stephen Robinson, Dept. Chair of Ancient Scripture at Brigham Young University, in which he proposed to me the two Adam theory. Simply that God the Father as currently understood by mainstream Mormonism today came down to the garden and acted as an Adam in calling and had Adam. This Adam Senior, Adam Junior theory would provide a reconciliation for the numerous statements made by Brigham Young and the current teachings of the church. I agreed that this theory could be possible and left my study of the topic with that basic belief.

It is at this point that my study for this course really begins. I have over the years purchased several books on the Adam-God topic and have not had the time to reopen the study of this doctrine. This course provided an excellent chance to attempt to thoroughly study every available source on this topic and gain a deeper understanding of what Brigham really meant. With that historical background of my previous experiences with the topic I will now attempt to present my findings and feelings on this most interesting topic.

On April 9, 1852, Brigham first made public the Adam-God doctrine in a priesthood conference. It has been this discourse which has been the most frequently quoted in anti-Mormon literature as it was publicly published in the Journal of Discourses and also the Millennial Star. A portion of this discourse is quoted below.

Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is MICHAEL, the Archangel, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! about whom holy men have written and spoken - He is our FATHER and our GOD, and the only God with whom WE have to do. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians or non-professing, must hear it, and will know it sooner or later... When Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden fruit, their bodies became mortal from its effects and therefore their offspring were mortal. When the Virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the Father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the Father? He is the first of the human family; and when he took a tabernacle, it was begotten by his Father in heaven... Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the Garden of Eden, and who is our Father in Heaven. Now, let all who may hear these doctrines, pause before they make light of them, or treat them with indifference, for they will prove their salvation or damnation (J.D. 1:50-51 emphasis in the original).

This single talk began the endless debate over not only who Adam really was, but in later years the denial that Brigham really made such a statement. I would first like to present the quotes from leading brethren on the topic that are held to be truth in the Mormon mainstream. Below is a sampling of these quotes:

Joseph Fielding Smith

President Brigham Young is quoted - in all probability the sermon was erroneously transcribed! (Doctrines of Salvation 1:96)

President Brigham Young did not believe and did not teach, that Jesus Christ was begotten by Adam (Answers to Gospel Questions, p. 20-22).

Bruce R. McConkie

Cultists and other enemies of the restored truth, for their own nefarious purposes, sometimes try to make it appear that Latter-day Saints worship Adam as their Father in Heaven. In support of their false assumptions, they quote such statements as that of President Brigham Young to the effect that Adam is our father and our god and the only god with whom we have to do. There is no mystery about this doctrine except that which persons ignorant of the great principles of exaltation and unfriendly to the cause of righteousness have attempted to make (Mormon Doctrine, p. 17-18).
Jesus said at one time, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs." This saying applies to all the dispensations that has been brought forth to the children of men from the days of Adam until now.

I wish the congregation to understand in connection with my sayings thus far, that the Latter-day Saints believe in God the Father, in Jesus Christ His son, in the Holy Ghost, God's minister, and in the Celestial Law, or, in other words, the ordinances of the House of God, which, if obeyed, are calculated to save intelligent beings, exalt them, and bring them back into the presence of their God.

I will tell you what I believe still further than this; though I do not pretend to say that the items of doctrine, and ideas I shall advance are necessary for the people to know, or that they should give themselves any trouble about them whatever. I believe in the eternities of worlds, saints, angels, kingdoms, and gods: In eternity without beginning. I believe the gods never had a beginning, neither the formation of matter, and it is without end; it will endure in one eternal round, swimming in space; basking, living, and moving in the midst of eternity. All the creations are in the midst of eternity, and that is one eternity, so they move in one eternal round.

Consequently, when you here philosophers argue the point how the first god came, how intelligence came, they are talking about that which is beyond their conception; about that which never was, and never will be worlds without end. It manifests their folly. It shows they know nothing of such matters; and if they do know some things they have a right to know, there are things they have no right to know.

This applies to all classes of mankind.

These are my views with regard to the gods, and eternities. Do you wish I should particularize?

Then, can you by any process of reasoning or argument, tell whether it was an apple that bore the first seed of an apple, or an apple seed that made the first apple? Or, whether it was the seed of a squash that made the first squash, or a squash that bore the first squash seed? Such abstruse questions belong to the philosophy of the world; in reality there never was and never will be a time when there was not both the apple and the apple seed.

(You must be patient with me, as I am not well enough to preach to such a large congregation in the open air, and labor onward without cessation; you must allow me to take my own time.) I will proceed a little further with my preliminaries before I commence my subject. Inasmuch as I have taken the ground that there never was a beginning, nor end -- I wish to say further; there is an eternity of elements, and an eternity of space and there is no space without a kingdom; neither is there any kingdom without a space. Were the best mathematician to multiply figures from the time he first commenced to learn at five or ten years of age, until he is one hundred years old, or until he has exhausted the capacity of figures known to man, he can then tell no more about the number of the creations of God in comparison than child who knows nothing whatever of figures. There is no beginning, no end; there is no bonds, no time, when the elements will cease to be organized into bodies with all the variety you have a faint specimen of on this Earth.

There are philosophers who believe that this Earth upon which we stand has been in existence for millions of ages. I wish to advance a few items that will open the minds of these philosophers, that they may be like well instructed scribes who treasure up in their hearts the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, the Principles of Eternity. Those who wish to be taught eternal principles, and become true philosophers, their minds can reach forth into the unlimited fields of eternity and still discover no end to the boundless expanse, and to its fullness.

There is no necessity of creating a world like this and keeping it in one unalterable state or condition for the express purpose of bringing intelligent beings upon it, while there is an eternity of matter yet to be organized; and when we have lived as long as the best mathematicians among you can figure by millions, billions, trillions, etc., when [you have] exhausted all your wisdom and knowledge, and figures, you are then in the midst of eternity where you began.

A true philosopher wishes to grow, and increase continually; he wishes his mind to expand and reach forth, until he can think as God thinks; as angels think, and behold things as God beholds them.

You recollect I told you in the commencement, I should talk about things that did not particularly concern you and me; but the people want to hear something in advance of their present knowledge; they want to find out if there is anything else for us to learn. When you have lived through eternities to come, learning continually, you may then inquire, "Brother Brigham, is there anything more for me to learn?" My reply to such an inquiry would be, yes there is an eternity of knowledge yet to learn.

Search after wisdom, get knowledge, and understanding, and forget it not; and be not like the fool whose eyes are in the ends of the Earth, or like the misers who are around us here; they are so craving, and anxious after property, that if they saw a picayune on the wall opposite to me there, they would run over forty dollars to secure that picayune; their eyes are on earthly riches to the neglect of riches that are more enduring.

There are a great many persons who are so anxious to learn about eternity, gods, angels, heavens, and hells, that they neglect to learn the first lessons preparatory to learning the things they are reaching after. They will come short of them.

I wish to speak a few words about the Bible as I have hinted at it. The Ordinances of the Kingdom of God on the Earth are the same to the children of Adam from the commencement to the end of his posterity pertaining to the carnal state on this Earth, and the winding up scene of the mortality. With regard to the Bible, we frequently say, we believe the Bible, but circumstances alters cases, for what is now required of the people may not be required of a people that may live a hundred years hence. But I wish you to understand, with regard to the Ordinances of God's
House to save the people in the Celestial Kingdom of our God, there is no change from the days of Adam to the present time, neither will there be until the last of his posterity is gathered into the Kingdom of God.

Those who are not acquainted with our doctrine are astonished, and say, "That is strange indeed; we thought no such thing as preaching Faith, Repentance, and Baptism was practiced in ancient, or old Testament times. I can tell you that no man from the days of Adam, no woman from the days of Eve to this day, who have lived, and who are now living upon the Earth will go into the Kingdom of their Father and God, to be crowned with Jesus Christ, without passing through the same Ordinances of the House of God, you and I have obeyed. I wish you distinctly to understand that.

There are many duties, and callings spoken of in the scriptures, and there are many not written, those for instance which are handed out to you by your President as circumstances require. Those imposed by the President of the Church of God, or by the president of any portion of it, are duties as necessary to be observed as though they were written in the Bible; but these requirements, duties, callings etc. change with the circumstances that surround the people of God. But when you speak of the system of Salvation to bring back the children of Adam and Eve into the presence of our Father and God, it is the same in all ages, among all people, and under all circumstances worlds without end Amen.

I think these preliminaries will satisfy me, and I feel prepared to take my text; it is the words of Jesus Christ, but where they are in the Bible I cannot tell you now, for I have not taken pains to look at them. I have had so much to do, that I have not read the Bible for many years. I used to be a Bible student; I used to read and study it, but did not understand the spirit and meaning of it; I knew well enough how it read. I have read the Book of Mormon, the book of Doctrine and Covenants, and other revelations of God which [He] has given to his people in latter times; I look at them, and contrast the spirit and power of them with my faithfulness. My clerks know how much time I have to read, it is difficult for me to snatch time enough even to eat my breakfast and supper, to say nothing of reading. I tell you my text is in the Bible and reads as follows. "And this is Life Eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." I will now put another text with this and then offer a few remarks, it is one of the sayings of the Apostle Paul. "For though there be that are called gods, whether in Heaven, or in Earth (as there be gods many and lords many) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." This God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Father of our Spirits. I feel inclined here to make a little scripture. (Where I under the necessity of making scripture extensively I should get Brother Heber C. Kimball to make it, and then I would quote it. I have seen him do this when any of the Elders have been pressed by their opponents, and were a little at a loss; he would make a scripture for them to suite the case, that never was in the Bible, though none the less true, and make their opponents swallow it as the words of an Apostle, or one of the Prophets. The Elder would then say, "Please turn to that
Israel which pertains to the kingdom of God on Earth; and if the whole world were before me I would ask them the same question. Can any man, or set of men officiate in dispensing the laws, and administering the ordinances of the kingdom of God, or of the kingdoms and governments of the world legally, without first obeying those laws, and submitting to those ordinances themselves. Do you understand me? If a foreigner wishes to become a citizen of the United States he must first become subject to this government; must you not first acknowledge and obey the laws of this government? Certainly you must.

Then, to apply this to the Kingdom of God on Earth, and ask yourselves if any man has the power, the influence, the right, the authority, to go forth and preach this gospel, and baptize for the remission of sins unless he himself has, in the first place, been baptized, ordained and legally called to that office? What would the Elders of Israel and every other sensible man say to this? They would all decide at once with me, that no man can lawfully officiate in any office in the Kingdom of God, or in the governments of men, he has not been called to, and the authority of which has not been bestowed upon him. I am not going to talk a thousand things to you, but I wish to tell you a few, and desire you to understand them, and connect them together.

There are a few more questions I would like to ask, for the simple reason of bringing the minds of the people to bear upon certain items of principle, and the philosophy of the Kingdom of God on Earth, that they may know how heavenly things are. But I will pass on, and notice some of the texts I have quoted. Before I proceed however, I will put one more question, at the same time I wish you to bear in mind the one I have just asked, do not forget that no man has authority to officiate in the ordinances of heavenly or earthly governments only so far as he has obeyed them himself. Now to know the only wise God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, will put the man, woman, congregation, or nation in possession of Eternal Life. Are the hearts of the Latter-day Saints prepared to have Eternal life given to them enmass, and say there shall be no more apostasy, but bring them all up that they may know and understand the Gods, Eternities, Creations, Heavens, Hells, Kingdoms, Thrones, Principalities and Powers? It cannot be done. The sheep and goats are together, the wheat and the tares are growing together; the good and the bad are mixed; and they must so remain until the time when Jesus Christ will say, "gather my sheep into my fold; gather my wheat into my garner, and let the tares, and chaff, and stubble be burned." That is not yet.

Now if you believe what you have heard me say you will believe there is lords many, and gods many; and you will believe that unto us, the inhabitants of this Earth there is but one God with whom we have to do; and according to the tenor of the Bible, we believe there are many, very many who have entered into Power, Glory, Might and Dominion, and are gathering around them Thrones, and have power to organize elements, and make worlds, and bring into existence intelligent beings in all their variety, who if they are faithful and obedient to their calling and creation will in their turn be exalted in Eternal Kingdoms of the Gods. Do you believe that? You and I have only one God to whom we are accountable, so we will let the rest alone, and search after the one we have to do with; let

us seek diligently after him, the very being who commenced this creation. (asked blessing on bread)

We will now make our inquiries with regard to our position with the God with whom we have to do. You will please recollect all ye Elders in Israel, for I want you to be instructed, by my remarks, that you may not fall into errors, that you have tested the question in your own minds with regard to the rights of officiating in ordinances. Now I wish to ask you if you have any conception or idea as to the creation of the world? "Oh yes," you reply. "A great many of us have a tolerable idea of it, but still there are mysteries we do not understand; there are some things in the Bible about the creation that seem to be dark: we have learned some things in this Kingdom we do not understand, and that do not correspond with the reading of the Bible." Let me open the eyes of your understanding.

There has never been a time when the creations of worlds commenced, they are from eternity to eternity in their creations and redemption. After they are organized they experience the good and the evil, the light, and the dark, the bitter and the sweet, as you and I do. There never was a time when there were not worlds in existence as this world is, and they pass through similar changes in abiding their creation preparatory to exaltation. Worlds have always been in progress, and eternally will be.

Every world has had an Adam, and an Eve: named so, simply because the first man is always called Adam, and the first woman Eve; and the Oldest Son has always had the privilege of being Ordained, Appointed and Called to be the Heir of the Family, if he does not rebel against the Father, and he is the Saviour of the family. Every world that has been created, has been created upon the same principle. They may vary in their varieties, yet the eternity is one: it is one eternal round. These are things that scarcely belong to the best of this congregation. There are items of doctrine, and principles, in the bosom of eternity that the best of the Latter-day Saints are unworthy to receive. If the visions of their minds were open to look into the vast creations, and gaze upon the Power, and Glory, and Goodness, and Exaltation of the Gods they would exclaim: "Wo is me, I am undone, I am of unclean lips."

But we will look at it a little. Do any of you know anything about the creation of this world? "Oh yes, we understand a good deal about it from the account given in the Bible." So you read in the Bible of there being three persons in one god; many religious in the world believe in a three [in] one god, however, I do not wish to spend time to deliberate upon the notions adopted by the sectarians, the world is full of them. There are lords many and gods many according to the Bible; it does not contradict the doctrine, neither can you find a single passage that does away with that idea.

But let us turn our attention to the God with which we have to do. I tell you simply, He is our Father; the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Father of our spirits. Can that be possible? Yes, it is possible, He is the Father of all the spirits of the human family.

All things are first made spiritual, and brought forth into His kingdom. The spirits of all the human family were
begotten by one Father. Now be watchful, for if I have
time, and feel able, I shall communicate something in
connection with this you are not expecting. Yes, every son
and daughter of Adam according to the flesh can claim one
parentage; he the Heathen, and the Christian, the Jew and the
Gentile, the high and the low, the king and the beggar,
the black and the white, all who have sprung from Adam and
Eve have one father. "Then you make it out we are
brethren and sisters." Certainly for the whole human
family are made of one blood of the same material; they are
all begotten and brought forth by one parentage, and from
one generation to another they are of one flesh and blood,
and of one kindred. The God and Father [of] our Lord
Jesus Christ is the Father of our spirits.

I began at the end, and shall probably finish at the
beginning of my discourse; but it is no matter which end a
man begins at, for the first shall be last, and the last first;
which proves it is one eternal round; it is one eternity.
Eloheim looks round upon the eternity of matter, and said
to His associates, and those that He was pleased to call
upon at that time for His counselors, with regard to the
Elements, Worlds, Planets, Kingdoms, and Thrones; said
He, "Yahovah Michael, see that Eternal Matter on all sides,
this way and that way; we have already created Worlds
upon Worlds, shall we create another World? Yes, go and
organize the elements yonder in space"; not empty space
for there is no such thing, once in a while, earth quakes,
and the extensive destruction of combustible matter by fire
will come nigh making empty space for perhaps the
millionth part of a second. "Yahovah Michael go and
create a world, make it, organize it, form it; and then put
upon it everything in all the variety that you have seen,
that you have been in the habit of being associated with in
other worlds, of beasts, birds, fowls, fish, and every insect,
and creeping thing, and finally, the whole eternity of
element is full of life, bring it together and make of it living
creatures."

Yahovah Michael goes down and does as he is told. What
I am now going to tell you, will no doubt astonish the
whole of you. When Yahovah Michael had organized the
world, and brought from another kingdom the beasts, fish,
fowl, and insects, and every tree, and plant with which we
are acquainted, and thousands that we never saw, when He
had filled the Earth with animal and vegetable life, Michael
or Adam goes down to the new made world, and there he
stays.

Do you suppose he went there alone? Moses made the
Bible to say his wife was taken out of his side, was made of
one of his ribs. I do not know anything to the contrary of
my ribs being equal on both sides. The Lord knows if I had
lost a rib for each wife I have, I should have had none left
long ago. Some try to say how many wives the Governor
of Utah has, but if they can tell, they can tell more that I
can, for I do not know how many I have; I have not
counted them up for many years. I did not know how many
I had before I left the United States I had so many. I hear
that I had ninety. Why bless your souls, ninety is not a
beginning. You might ask me if I have ever seen them all;
I answer no; I see a few of them I pick up myself here. I
have lots, and scores I never see nor shall not until the
morning of the resurrection.

Now about the rib. As for the Lord taking a rib out of
Adam's side to make a woman of, he took one out of my
side just as much.

"But, Brother Brigham, would you make it appear that
Moses did not tell the truth?"

No not a particle more than I would that your mother did
not tell the truth, when she told you that little Billy came
from a hollow toad stool. I would not accuse your mother
of lying, any more than I would Moses; the people in the
days of Moses wanted to know things that was not for
them, the same as your children do, when they want to
know where their little brother came from, and he answered
them according to their folly, the same as you did your
children.

Now some will be ready to say, "We always heard these
Mormons did not believe the Bible." I believe all the truth
that is there and that is enough for me, and for you to
believe.

"Then the Lord did not make Adam out of the dust of the
earth?"

Yes he did, but I have not got to that part of my discourse
yet. Adam was made of the dust of the earth.

"Was he made of the dust of this earth?"

No, but of the dust of the earth where he was born in the
flesh; that is the way he was made; he was made of dust.

"Did the Lord put into him his spirit?"

Yes, as the Lord put into you your spirit, he was begotten
of a father, and brought forth as you and I were; and so are
all intelligent beings brought forth from eternity to eternity.
Man was not made the same as you make an adobe to put
in a wall. Moses said Adam was made of the dust of the
ground, but he did not say of what ground. I say he was
not made of the dust of the ground of this Earth, but he was
made of the dust of the earth where he lived, where he
honored his calling, believed in his Saviour, or Elder
Brother, and by his faithfulness, was redeemed, and got a
Glorious Resurrection. All creatures that dwell upon this
Earth are made of the elements that compose it; which are
organized to see if they will abide their creation, and be
counted worthy to receive a resurrection. "What, every
flesh?"

Yes every flesh, for all flesh pertaining to this world is
made of the dust of this Earth, it is all made from the same
material, according to the will and pleasure of Him who
dictates all things. Our bodies are composed of the same
material that composes this Earth; they are composed of the
water, air, and solid earth, either of which will resolve back
to their native fountain.

How many elements are there I do not know any more than
you. They have never all been classified by science,
though scientific gentlemen have tried to do it.

I tell you more, Adam is the Father of our spirits. He lived
upon an earth; he did abide his creation, and did honor his
calling and Priesthood; and obeyed his Master and Lord, and probably many of his wives did the same, and they lived, and died upon an earth, and then were resurrected again to Immortality and Eternal Life.

"Did he resurrect himself," you inquire? I want to throw out a few hints upon the resurrection as it seems to come within the circuit of my ideas whether it ought to come within the circuit of my remarks or not. I believe we have already acknowledged the truth established that no person can officiate in any office he has not been subject to himself and been legally appointed to fill. That no person in this Kingdom can officiate in any ordinance he himself has not obeyed; consequently no being who has not been resurrected possesses the Keys of the Power of Resurrection. That you have been told often. Adam therefore was resurrected by someone who had been resurrected.

I will go a little further with this lest some of you will be querying, doubting, and philosophizing this away. It is true, Jesus said, "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." I do not doubt the power of Christ; but did he prove that in his resurrection? No. But it is proved that an angel came and rolled away the stone from the door of the sepulcher, and did resurrect the body of the Son of God.

"What angel was this?"

It is not for me to say. I do not know him. If I ever did know him it is so long since I have entirely forgotten who it was. That Jesus had power to lay down his life, and power to take it up again I do not dispute. Neither do I dispute, but what an angel came, that was sent by the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to roll away the stone from the sepulchre, and resurrect the Son of God. Suffice it to say that he was some character who had himself been resurrected.

"Is there any further proof with regard to this sacred order of the Kingdom of God on the Earth?"

Oh yes, you can find it in all the scriptures. For instance when the Saviour appeared to Paul of Tarsus, on the road, in answer to the question, "Lord what wilt thou have me do," he was told to go into the city of Damascus, and it should be told him there what to do. In the mean [time] one Ananias was sent to him, who Baptized and Ordained him. Jesus would not do this, because he had servants on Earth whose special duty it was to administer these ordinances.

Again the angel that appeared to Cornelius would not operate in the ordinances of the Gospel, but told him to send men to Joppa to the house of one Simon the Tanner, and call for one Peter etc. whose duty it was to do it, he being called and ordained to that power. Many more instances of this kind might be quoted but the above will suffice to illustrate the principle.

Now, many inquiries will be made about the Saviour, such as "Who is he? Is he the Father of Adam? Is he the God of Adam? When Christ has finished his labor and presented it to his father, then he, Adam, will receive a fullness." That is all easily understood by me. He cannot receive a fullness of the kingdoms He has organized until they are completed. If He sends His servants off to the right and to the left to perform a certain labor, His kingdom is not complete, until His ministers have accomplished everything to make His kingdom complete and returned home again.

Many inquire, who is the Saviour? I will tell you what I think about it, and as the [ ] say I reckon, and as the Yankees say I guess; but I will tell you what I reckon. I reckon that Father Adam was a resurrected being, with his wives and posterity, and in the Celestial Kingdom they were crowned with Glory, Immortality and Eternal Lives, with Thrones, Principalities and Powers: and it was said to him, "It is your right to organize the elements; and to your Creations and Posterity there shall be no end, but you shall add Kingdom to Kingdom, and Throne to Throne; and still behold the vast eternity of unorganized matter." Adam then was a resurrected being.

Our spirits and the spirits of all the human family were begotten by Adam, and born of Eve.

"How are we going to know this?"

I reckon it. And I reckon that Adam came into the Garden of Eden, and did actually eat of the fruit that he himself planted; and I reckon there was a previous understanding, and the whole plan was previously calculated, before the Garden of Eden was made, that he would reduce his posterity to sin, misery, darkness, wickedness, wretchedness, and to the power of the Devil, that they might be prepared for an Exaltation, for without this they could not receive one.

I reckon that all things were first made spiritual preparatory to the natural organization. "What was the use of all this, could not spirit be happy?" Yes as far as they could. These Indians that roam upon the plains, and upon the mountains are comparatively happy in their degraded condition, because they do not know the comforts of civilized life. They can lay upon the ground; pull up sage brush to form a temporary shield against the cold, and get plenty of lizards, and crickets to eat, and they are happy. We would want a comfortable house to live in and something comfortable to eat, something that is suited to our nature, ability, taste, and appetite. We would not be happy and satisfied short of that. So our spirits are as happy as they know how to be. Were you now to live without a house you could not be happy; neither could their spirit be happy without a tabernacle which is the house of the spirit. Whenev[n] the spirit enters the body it is pure, and good, and if the body would be subject to the spirit it would always be taught to do the will of the Father in Heaven. But the spirit is interwoven with the flesh and blood; it is subjected to the body, consequently Satan has power over both. I reckon the Father has been through all this.

Do you recollect what I told the brethren who came across the plains this season, when they were perplexed by their oxen; and were calling upon God to give you grace to perform the labor which lay before you? He could not sympathize with you, or know the nature of your trials if He had not passed through the same Himself. He knew just
as much about crossing the plains, and the trials connected with it as any of us.

The inquiry will arise, among those who are strenuous, and tenacious for the account given by Moses as to Adam.

"Did not Adam die?"

Yes he died.

"Does not the Bible say he died?"

I do not know nor care, but I think it would be hard to find where he died; or where Moses died (Reporter's note: see Genesis 5:5, Deuteronomy 34:5), though I have no doubt Moses died, and Adam also, how? Just as you and I have to die, and be laid away in the bowels of Mother Earth; that, however, Moses did not see fit to tell us.

Adam planted the Garden of Eden, and he with his wife Eve partook of the fruit of this Earth, until their systems were charged with the nature of Earth, and then they could beget bodies, for their spiritual children. If the spirit does not enter into the embryo man that is forming in the womb of woman, the result will be false conception, a living, intelligent being cannot be produced. Adam and Eve begat the first mortal bodies on this Earth, and from that commencement every spirit that was begotten in eternity for this Earth will enter bodies thus prepared for them here, until the winding up scene, and that will not be until the last of these spirits enters an earthly tabernacle.

Then I reckon that the children of Adam and Eve married each other; this is speaking to the point. I believe in sisters marrying brothers, and brothers having their sisters for wives. Why? Because we cannot do otherwise. There are none others for me to marry but my sisters.

"But you would not pretend to say you would marry your father and mother's daughter."

If I did not I would marry another of my sisters that lives over in another garden; the material of which they are organized is just the same; there is no difference between them, and those who live in this garden. Our spirits are all brothers and sisters, and so are our bodies; and the opposite idea to this has resulted from the ignorant, and foolish traditions of the nations of the Earth. They have corrupted themselves with each other, and I want them to understand that they have corrupted their own flesh, blood, and bones, as all the family of the Earth.

I am approaching the subject of our marriage relations Brother Hyde lectured upon, but I shall not have time, or strength to say much about this. But, I reckon that Father Adam, and Mother Eve had the children of the human family prepared to come here and take bodies; and when they come to take bodies, they enter into the bodies prepared for them, and that body gets an exaltation with the spirit, when they are prepared to be crowned in Father's Kingdom.

"What, into Adam's Kingdom?"

Yes.

As to my talking what I want to say at this time I shall not do it. I am exhausting myself; I have to speak loud, and it is hard labor.

I tell you, when you see your Father in the Heavens, you will see Adam; when you see your Mother that bore your spirit, you will Mother Eve. And when you see yourselves there you have gained your Exaltation; you have honored your calling here on the Earth; you body has returned to its mother Earth; and somebody has broken the chains of death that bound you, and given you a resurrection.

How are you going to get your resurrection? You will get it by the President of the Resurrection pertaining to this generation, and that is Joseph Smith Junior. Here it all ye ends of the Earth; if ever you enter into the Kingdom of God it is because Joseph Smith let you go there. This will apply to Jews and Gentiles, to the bond, and free; to friends and foes; no man or woman in this generation will get a resurrection and be crowned without Joseph Smith says so. The man who was martyred in Carthage Jail State of Illinois holds the Keys of Life and Death to this generation. He is the president of the Resurrection in this dispensation and he will be the first to rise from the dead. When he has passed through it, then I reckon the Keys of the Resurrection will be committed to him. Then he will call up his Apostles. You know I told you last conference I was an Apostle of Joseph Smith; and if faithful enough I expect Joseph will resurrect the Apostles; and when they have passed through the change, and received their blessings, I expect he will commit to them the Keys of the Resurrection, and they will go on resurrecting the Saints, every man in his own order.

I want to say a little more about marriage relations, so that you may understand what my views are. When you get your resurrection, you are not yet exalted; but by and by, the Lord Jesus Christ, our Elder Brother, the Saviour of the world, the Heir of the Family; when he has put down Satan, and destroyed death; then he will say, come let us go home into the presence of the Father.

What will become of the world then? It will be baptized with fire. If it has been baptized with water, and it will then be cleansed by fire, and become like a sea of glass, and be made Celestial; and Jesus Christ our Elder Brother will take the whole Earth, with all the Saints and go with them to the Father even to Adam; and you will continue to receive more and more Intelligence, Glory, Exaltation, and Power.

I want to tell you a thing with regard to parents, wives, brothers and sisters etc. The time will come when it will be told where this man, and that woman shall be placed; The real blood of Joseph will be selected out from among the tribes of Israel, and every man, and woman will be put back into the presence of God, and the Lord should say, "Who have you brought with you?" Your reply would be, "My wife and children," but in reality you have only with you your brothers and sisters. The Father would say, "These are my children." When you meet your Father in Heaven you will know Him, and realize that you lived with Him, and rested in His bosom for ages gone passed, and He will hail you as His sons and daughters, and embrace you, and you will embrace Him, and "Hallelujah, thank God I have come to Father again, I have got back home" will resound.
through the Heavens. There are ten thousand things connected with these ideas. You see the human family of every shade of color between black and white. I could stand here and tell you all there is about it.

We have all come from one father even Adam, both the black and the white, the grizzled and the gray, the noble, and the ignoble; and the time will come, when they will all come back and again into His presence. When they have behaved themselves, and proved faithful to their calling, and to their God the curse will be removed, from every class, and nation of them that desires to work the work of God. This [has] been told you, that savours would come upon Mount Zion, and judge the mount of Esau. What does gentle signify? Disobedience. What does Israel signify? Obedience. What is the name of the first man? Adam, which signifies first man, and Eve signifies first woman. And when Michael the Archangel shall sound his trumpet and the Ancient of Days shall come, all things that we have once been familiar with will come back again to our memory.

President Brigham Young then spoke for a few minutes on the subject of our marriage relations, and closed his discourse with the following remarks:

I wish you to understand well the position I have taken, and the nature of the remarks I have made. Profit by them, both saints and sinners. You have had things laid before you that does not belong to the world, nor to men and women, who calculate to apostatize. They belong to the wise; to those who are serving God with all their hearts. Now let me say to the wicked in heart, you cannot remember a word of this discourse unless you remember it in the Lord. I might reveal all there is in eternity, and those who have not their hearts on righteousness would know nothing about it, nor be in the least instructed.

I commenced with Father Adam in his resurrected state, and noticed our spiritual state, then our temporal, or mortal state, and traveled until I got back to Father Adam again. After considering all this, what have you seen that make[s] it appear we are not brethren and sisters? Does it appear that we are not because we are commanded to multiply and replenish the Earth? You think when you run into grand children and great grand children etc. that by and by there will be no connection. They are just as much connected in spirit and body, in flesh, blood, and bone, as your children are that you bear off your own body.

This is something pertaining to our marriage relation. The whole world will think what an awful thing it is. What an awful thing it would be if the Mormons should just say we believe in marrying brothers and sisters. Well we shall under the necessity of doing it, because we cannot find anybody else to marry. The whole world are at the same thing, and will be as long as man exists upon the Earth.

I feel as though I had said enough. I have talked long enough for my own good; and we shall bring our Conference to a close.

I would bless you all so that you would be saved if I had the power - I have the power to bless all the faithful and I do bless you in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen. (Brigham Young, Oct. 8, 1854, Afternoon Session of the General Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Church Archives, as quoted in Adam-God by Craig Tholson)

I find it hard to misconstrue the above discourse into teaching anything other than the doctrine of Adam being God, one and the same personage. However, in order to fully satisfy skeptics who still believe that Brigham never taught that Adam was God, I will present a plethora of statements proving the point.

When father Adam and mother Eve became mortal by eating of the fruits of this earth they were then prepared to organize the mortal tabernacle, and they were prepared to organize and form living spirits long before that, now they are prepared to form mortal bodies for their spiritual children to dwell in. His former works and experience Adam had forgotten a great deal of, but he once knew it all beforehand.

As to the great wedding bro. Orson has been telling us about is nothing more or less than this, Adam's father came to him, saying here is the wife you have had so long, now you are going to have one wife to take with you to yonder earth, and if any or your other wives ever go to an earth to become the mother of all living, to become an Eve, it will be to another earth, not to that one. She is called Eve because she is the mother of all living on this earth, as Eve is the mother of all living on this earth. (Brigham Young, August 25, 1867, Church Archives)

Who was it that spoke from the heavens and said, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him"? Was it God the Father? It was. The Apostles bear testimony that such a voice was actually heard, "This is my beloved Son"... Who did beget him? His Father, and his Father is our God, and the Father of our spirits, and he is the frame of the body. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ - Who is He? He is Father Adam - Michael - the Ancient of Days. Has he (Jesus) a Father? He has! Has he a Mother? He has! (Brigham Young, February 19, 1854, Church Archives)

...He said that our GOD was Father Adam. He was the Father of the Savior Jesus Christ. Our God was no more or less than ADAM, Michael the Archangel. (Wilford Woodruff Journal, February 19, 1854)

After men have got heir exaltations, and their crowns, have become Gods, even the sons of Gods, are made King of Kings and Lord of Lords, they have the power then of propagating their species in spirit, and that is the first operation with regard to organizing a world. Power is then given to them to organize the elements, and then to commence the organization of tabernacles. How can they do it? Have they to go to that earth? Yes, an Adam will have to go there and he cannot go without Eve; he must have Eve to commence the work of generation, and they will go into the garden and continue to eat and drink of the fruits of the corporeal world, until this grosser matter is diffused sufficiently through their celestial bodies, to enable them, according to the established laws to produce mortal tabernacles for their spiritual children. This is a key for you. (Brigham Young, J.D. 6:275)
offspring. You will see the time when you will have millions of children around you. If you are faithful to your covenants, you will become mothers of nations. You will become Eves to earths like this; and when you have assisted in peopling one earth, there are millions of earths still in the course of creation. And when they have endured a thousand million times longer than this earth, it is only as it were the beginning of your creations. Be faithful, and if you are not blessed with children in this time, you will hereafter. But I would not dare tell you all I know about these matters. (Brigham Young, J.D. 8:208)

Some have grumbled because I believe our God so near to us as Father Adam. There are many who know that doctrine to be true. Where was Michael in the creation of this earth? Did he have a mission to the earth? He did. Where was he? In the Grand Council, and performed the mission assigned him there. Now if it would happen that we have to pay tribute to Father Adam, what a humiliating circumstance it would be! Just wait till you pass Joseph Smith; and after Joseph lets you pass him, you will find Peter; and after you pass the Apostles and many of the Prophets, you will find Abraham, and he will say, ‘I have the keys, and except you do thus and so, you cannot pass’; and after awhile you come to Jesus; and when you at length meet Father Adam, how strange it will appear to your present notions. If we can pass Joseph and have him say, ‘Here, you have been faithful, good boys; I hold the keys of this dispensation; I will let you pass’; then we shall be very glad to see the white locks of Father Adam.” (Brigham Young, J.D. 5:331, 332)

Things were first created spiritually the Father actually begot the spirits, and they were brought forth and lived with him. Then He commenced the work of creating earthly tabernacles, precisely as He had been created in the flesh himself, by partaking of the coarse material that was organized and composed this earth, until His system was charged with it, consequently the tabernacles of His children were organized from the coarse materials of this earth. (Brigham Young, J.D. 4:218)

My brother said that God is as we are. He did not mean those words to be literally understood. He meant simply, that in our organization we have all the properties in embryo in our bodies that our Father has in his, and that literally, morally, socially, by the spirit and by the flesh we are his children. Do you think that God, who holds the eternities in His hands and can do all things at his pleasure, is not capable of sending forth His own children, and forming this flesh for His own offspring? Where is the mystery in this? We say that Father Adam came here and helped to make the earth. Who is he? He is Michael, a great Prince, and it was said to him by Elohim, ‘Go ye and make an earth.’ What is the great mystery about it? HE CAME AND FORMED THE EARTH...Adam came here and got it up in shape that would suit him to commence business. What is the great mystery about it? None that I have seen. The mystery in this, as with miracles, or anything else, is only to those who are ignorant. Father Adam came here, and then they brought his wife. ‘Well,’ says one, ‘why was Adam called Adam?’ He was the first man on earth, AND ITS FRAMER AND MAKER. He, with the help of his brethren, BROUGHT IT INTO EXISTENCE. Then he said ‘I want my children who are in the spirit world to come and live here.’ I ONCE DWELT UPON AN EARTH SOMETHING LIKE THIS, IN A MORTAL STATE. I was faithful. I received my own exaltation. I have the privilege of extending my work, and to its increase there will be no end. I want my children that were born to me in the spirit world to come here and take tabernacles of flesh that their spirits may have a house, a tabernacle, or a dwelling place as mine has, and where is the mystery? (Brigham Young, Deseret News, June 18, 1873)

The above quotes demonstrate that Brigham did in fact teach that Adam was God and the Father of Jesus Christ. Having come this far, numerous questions start to arise as to how this doctrine could be true in light of the scriptures and the temple ceremony. In fact, leaders such as Joseph Fielding Smith, Mark E. Peterson and others emphatically state that Brigham was misunderstood since on the surface his teachings are contrary to what the scriptures and temple teach. Proponents of the Adam-God doctrine are quick to point out that these contradictions are the result of a misunderstanding as to who the gods spoken of in the temple ceremony really are.

It is the current teaching of the church that Elohim is the spiritual and literal father of Jehovah (who is Jesus Christ) and the spiritual father of Adam (who is Michael) and the rest of the earth’s inhabitants. However, this concept of the Godhead did not come about until the late 1800’s. Brigham as with most of the early brethren taught something entirely different.

Elohim, Yahovah and Michael were father, Son and grandson. They made this Earth and Michael became Adam. (Brigham Young, as recorded in the Joseph F. Smith Journal, 17 June 1871 entry; Church Archives)

How has it transpired that theological truth is thus so widely disseminated? It is because God was once known on the earth among his children of mankind, as we know one another. Adam was as conversant with his Father who placed him upon this earth as we are conversant with our earthly parents. The Father frequently came to visit his son Adam, and talked and walked with him; and the children of Adam were more or less acquainted with their Grandfather, and their children were more or less acquainted with their Great-Grandfather. (J.D. 9:148)

Adam had been with the Lord and had lived with him upon an earth like this and had been faithful and overcome, and had received his body and was resurrected and was well acquainted with the Lord and was one of his mates. He had eaten and drank with him and had lived with him from generation to generation and in many worlds, probably while many had come into and gone out of existence. And he helped to make this earth and brought the seeds with him that you see springing up spontaneously, and when he called, the elements came rolling together... When we can see that very character and talk and live with him in our tabernacles, if we are so fortunate as to get there into his society, then we can say that to us there is but one living and true God and he is the father of our Lord Jesus Christ and of our spirits. And when we get back to him and learn that he is actually our father we shall not feel any anxiety to call upon anybody else for the blessings we are in need of. It is a subject I am aware that does not appear so clear to our understandings at present as we could wish it or as it will some day, and it is one that should not trouble us at all.
All such things will become more clear to your minds by and by.

I tell you this as my belief about that personage who is called the Ancient of Days, the Prince and so on, but I do not tell it because that I wish it to be established in the minds of others, though to me this is as clear as the sun, it is as plain as my alphabet. I understand it as I do the path to go home. I did not understand so until my mind became enlightened with the Spirit and by the revelations of God, neither will you understand until our Father in Heaven reveals all these things unto you. To my mind and feelings those matters are all plain and easy to be understood. (Brigham Young, April 25, 1855, Church Archives)

Brigham Young believed in a plurality of Gods, with each one having father. In his teachings, any god whether he be the father, grandfather, or great grandfather could call all offspring his children and the children and could call any of the gods in the hierarchy of the gods father.

Whether Adam is the personage that we should consider our heavenly Father, or not, is considerable a mystery to a good many. I do not care for one moment how that is; it is no matter whether we are to consider Him our God, or whether His Father, or His Grandfather, for in either case we are of one species - of one family - and Jesus Christ is also of our species. (J.D. 4:217)

Brigham also did not believe Jehovah and Jesus Christ to be one and the same as we are taught to believe today. Brigham was not alone in distinguishing Jehovah from Jesus Christ. In fact, most of the early brethren taught that they were in fact different. Jehovah being the patriarchal superior to Jesus Christ. In fact, careful analysis of the titles Jehovah and Elohim will reveal that they were used interchangeable, however never in relation to Jesus Christ until the late 1800's. Below are some quotes to support the above statement.

We believe in God the Father, who is the great Jehovah and head of all things, and that Christ is the Son of God, co-eternal with the Father. (Times and Seasons 3:578, November 15,1841)

O Thou, who seest and knowest the hearts of all men - Thou eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent Jehovah - God - Thou Elohim, that sittest, as saith the Psalmist, "enthroned in heaven," look down upon Thy servant Joseph at this time; and let faith on the name of Thy Son Jesus Christ, to a greater degree then Thy servant ever yet has enjoyed, be conferred upon him. (Joseph Smith, HC 5:127)

We obey the Lord, Him who is called Jehovah, the Great I Am, I am a man of war, Eloheime, etc. (Brigham Young, J.D. 12:99)

We may ask them the question, "Do you believe in the God of Abraham, Isaac and of Jacob?" So do the Latter-day Saints. If they believe in the God who told Moses to say to Pharaoh that He was a man of war; so do the Saints. I say, O Israel, ancient Israel do you believe in the God who brought the children of Israel out of Egypt with a high hand and an outstretched arm! "Yes," say they; and so do the Latter-day Saints. Have you faith, that if necessary, He would again shower manna from Heaven and send flocks of quails to allay your hunger and cause water to burst from the rock to quench your thirst as He did when the Children of Israel were passing through the Wilderness? Do you believe that he is the God whom Moses followed and by whom he was directed? "Yes," says the whole house of Israel. Well, that is the very God that we - the Latter-day Saints - are serving. He is our Father, He is our God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ - whom the tribe of Judah discarded, heaping ridicule upon his name. He is the Father of our Spirits, everyone of us, Jew and Gentile, bond or free, white or black. (Brigham Young, August 4, 1867, Utah Historical Quarterly 29:68)

We begin with the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of our spirits - who is he? Do you know anything about him? Can you find out who he is? Suppose we go to the scriptures and inquire who he is. At one time he says "I am that I am," at another time when the question was proposed by somebody, he replied, "I am the Lord your God"; at another time he is spoken of as a Man of War, a General and so on. You may trace the scriptures through, and you will find that he is known to one people by one title today, and tomorrow by another, and the next day by another, and there he leaves it. . . . I tell you this as my belief about that personage [father of Christ, The Prince, Man of War, I AM - the Jehovah of the Old Testament] who is called the Ancient of Days, the Prince, and so on (Brigham Young, M.A.B.Y. April 25, 1855)

The eternal Jehovah has revealed himself to man as enthroned in the heavens while the earth is his footstool, and Jesus Christ as his son seated at his right hand. . . . He [Jehovah] created the worlds, he stopped the mouths of lions. He quenched the violence of fire. He manipulated the widow's meal and oil. He overturned kingdoms and defended his people. He smote the rock and the water gushes out (Millennial Star, vol. 2, p. 187)

The Lord [Jehovah] hath spoken through Isaiah (4:1), saying "Behold my servant whom I uphold - mine elect in whom my soul delighted," evidently referring to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God chosen, or elected, by the Father (DHC, vol 4, p. 256)

He [Jesus] bore the sins of the world and suffered in His own person the consequences of an eternal law of God broken by man. Hence His profound grief, His indescribable anguish, His overpowering torture, all experienced in the submission to the eternal fiat of Jehovah and the requirements of an inexorable law. (John Taylor, The Mediation and Atonement, p. 150)

The Savior said He could call to His help more than twelve legions of angels; more than the Roman host; but He knowing the great purposes of Jehovah could go like a lamb to the slaughter. (Franklin D. Richards, J.D. 26:172)

Certainly Heloheime and Jehovah stands before Adam, or else I am very much mistaken. Then 1st Heloheime, 2nd Jehovah, 3d Michael-Adam, 4th Jesus Christ, Our Elder Brother, in the other World from whence our spirits come... Then Who is Jehovah? The only begotten Son of Heloheime on Jehovah's world. (Edward Stevenson Diary, February 28 & March 3, 1896, Church Archives)
The above quotes are but a sampling of the teachings of the earthly brethren as to who Jehovah is. In depth research has been conducted in this area and the results are startling to most members of the church.

In some 256 references to Elohim and Jehovah and the God of the Old Testament in the Journal of Discourses, the title Jehovah is only specifically applied to Jesus once. This occurred in 1885 when the new doctrine of identifying Jesus as Jehovah was just beginning to be developed.

(Boyd Kirkland, Line Upon Line, p. 40-41)

The entire doctrinal transformation as to who Jehovah was is the topic for another paper. However, it is crucial to understand that the Jehovah - Christ relationship did not begin until after Brigham’s death and correlates to the retraction of denial of the Adam-God teachings. With the publication of Jesus the Christ by James Talmage, the new Jehovah - Christ theology took hold and has been the teaching of the authorities ever since.

In connection with the Adam-God doctrine, is the understanding that the names of God are simply titles. Just as Brigham taught that the first man and woman on any earth are called Adam and Eve, so every redeemer on any world is called the Savior. All these names being titles and can even be considered offices. Therefore, Elohim could be called Jehovah, since he once acted in that calling. He could also be called Adam, Savior, Christ, etc. as to get to his grand station, he passed through several different stages or callings. We see this today in the church as people are called Bishop, President, Elder, Patriarch, etc.: Joseph E. Taylor of the Salt Lake Stake Pres. gave a lecture in the Logan Temple which amplifies this teaching.

It is recorded in the fifth chapter of Genesis that Adam died at the advanced age of 930 years. But it is often asked, "Did Adam die in the grave until he was redeemed therefrom through the death and resurrection of the Only Begotten?" I will ask a question in reply: "Did Jesus have power to lay down his life and take it up again?" He so declared (John 10:18). It might be well at this point to inquire who was the Savior of the world: and what relation did he bear to our father Adam? For the veil of the mysterious past has been lifted just a little to enable us to see within. I will first quote from a discourse preached by President Brigham Young, in Salt Lake City, April 9th, 1852. [Elder Taylor here quotes the famous part of the discourse that was presented at the beginning of this paper]

We will now quote some of the sayings of Joseph Smith upon this point, as uttered by him in Nauvoo, April 6, 1844:

"It is the first principle of the gospel to know for a certainty the character of God, and to know that we may converse with Him, as one man converses with another, and that he was made a man like us. Yea, that God Himself, the Father of us all, dwelt on our earth the same as Jesus Christ did...What did Jesus Christ say?..."As the Father hath power in himself, so hath the Son power." To do what? Why, what the Father did. The answer is obvious, in a manner, to lay down his body and take it up again. Jesus, what are you going to do?" "To lay down my life and take it up again." Do you believe it? If you do not believe it you do not believe the Bible. The Scriptures tell it, and I defy all the learning and wisdom of all the combined powers of earth and hell together to refute it. What did Jesus do? Why, "I do the thing I saw my Father do when worlds came rolling into existence. My Father worked out His Kingdom with fear and trembling: and I must do the same; and when I get my kingdom, I shall present it to my Father, so that He may obtain kingdom upon kingdom and it will exalt Him in glory. He will then take a higher exaltation and I take His place, and thereby become exalted myself," so that Jesus treads in the track of his Father and inherits what God did before." [quoted from HC 6:305-306, 1.D. 6.3]

I think these two quotations from such a reliable authority fully solve the question as to the relationship existing between Father Adam and the Savior of the world, and prove beyond question the power that Adam possessed in regard to taking his body again after laying it down - which power he never could have attained unless he had received first a resurrection from the grave to a condition of immortality. We further say that this power was not forfeited when as a celestial being he voluntarily partook of the forbidden fruit, and thereby rendered his body mortal in order that he might become the father of mortal tabernacles, as he was already the father of immortal spirits - thus giving opportunity to the offspring of his own begetting to pass through the ordeals necessary to prepare them for a resurrection from the dead, a celestial glory.

All that Father Adam did upon this earth, from the time that he took up his abode in the Garden of Eden, was done for his posterity's sake and the success of his former mission as the Savior of a world, and afterwards, or now, as the Father of a world only added to the glory which he already possessed. If, as the Savior of a world, he had the power to lay down his life and take it up again, therefore, as the father of a world which is altogether an advanced condition, we necessarily conclude that the grave was powerless to hold him after that mission was completed. All those who have now for the first time taken upon themselves mortality, must wait for their resurrection through Him who alone possesses the power to bring it to pass. It is these, and these only, whose resurrection we here wish to consider. (Deseret News Weekly 38:20-21)

I find this quote from Joseph E. Taylor most interesting, especially his saying "the success of his former mission as the Savior of a world." I find that there is much presented here that is deep water. He is referring to a whole theology of multiple mortal probations which can be substantiated from numerous other teachings and sources. However, this is divergent from the topic at hand to explore such a concept in depth and so I will refrain from the temptation to present such a theology in this paper.

At this point, I think it fair to conclude that any reasonable person cannot deny that Brigham emphatically taught that Adam was God, the father of Jesus Christ. I would now like to explore briefly what happened to this teaching and several theories as to why Brigham's view are no longer publicly taught by the Mormon church. First, let me present statements in chronological order from authorities of the church to put the teaching in a historical perspective. I will quote from part of a chapter of Craig Tholson's book Adam-God.

An Overview Of The Devolution

From the historical record, it is quite clear that Adam-God has encountered opposition from the very day it was
revealed. This opposition planted the seeds of dissension and what eventually became the rejection of the Adam-God doctrine. What we have inherited today is a legacy of unbelief and misunderstanding. We are taught today that Adam-God was never taught and that the historical evidence corroborating the teaching is erroneous. But as we have seen, this synopsis is itself an insult to the truth, for it in no way resembles what was taught and the extent to which Adam-God was promoted as a doctrine of the Church.

A brief overview of the devolution of the Adam-God doctrine will help us keep modern attitudes in a true light, giving us the perspective we need in order to understand the almost complete misunderstanding we encounter today by those who have written or spoken upon the subject. The overview is presented in chronological order:

1830

...Michael, or Adam, the father of all, the prince of all, the ancient of days. (D&C 27:11)

Michael is the father of all!

And Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living; for thus have I, the Lord God, called the first of all women, which are many. (Moses 4:26)

Eve was the mother of all living before she came to the garden!

1835

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. (D&C 107:55)

Michael has been set at the head, and he shall be over the multitude of the earth forever!

1838

Adam-ondi-Ahman...is the place where Adam shall come to visit his people, or the Ancient of Days shall sit, as spoken of by Daniel the prophet. (D&C 116)

1839

Our Savior speaks of children and says, Their angels always stand before my Father. The Father called all spirits before him at the creation of man, and organized them. He(Adam) is the head, and was told to multiply. The keys were first given to him, and by him to others....The keys have to be brought from heaven whenever the Gospel is sent. When they are revealed from heaven, it is by Adam's authority. (HC 3:387,386)

1852

Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is MICHAEL, the Archangel, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! about whom holy men have written and spoken - HE is our Father and our GOD, and the only God with whom WE have to do. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians or non professing, must hear it, and will know it sooner or later...

Now, let all who may hear these doctrines, pause before they make light of them, or treat them with indifference, for they will prove their salvation or damnation. (Brigham Young, J.D. 1:50-51; underline added for emphasis)

1853

ADAM, THE FATHER AND GOD OF THE HUMAN FAMILY. The above sentiment appeared in Star No. 48, a little to the surprise of some of its readers; and while the sentiment may have appeared blaspemous to the ignorant, it has no doubt given rise to some serious reflections with the more candid and comprehensive mind. (Millennial Star 15:801, December 10, 1853)

...It is upon this foundation that the throne of Michael is established as Father, Patriarch, God; and it is for all his children who come into this world, to learn and fully understand the eternity of that relationship. (Ibid. 15:802)

1857

Some have grumbled because I believe our God so near to us as Father Adam. (J.D. 5:331)

1861

I will give you a few words of doctrine, upon which there has been much inquiry, and with regard to which considerable ignorance exists. Br. Watt will write it, but it is not my intention to have it published, therefore pay good attention, and store it up in your memories. Some years ago, I advanced a doctrine with regard to Adam being our Father and God, that will be a cause [curse] to many Elders of Israel because of their folly. With regard to it they yet grovel in darkness and will. It is one of the most glorious revelations of the economy of heaven, yet the world holds it [in] derision. Had I revealed the doctrine of baptism from the dead instead [of] Joseph Smith there are men around me who would have ridiculed the idea until dooms day. But they are ignorant and stupid like the dumb ass. (manuscript entitled "A Few Words Of Doctrine," October 8, 1861, Brigham Young Collection, Church Archives)

1862

The Lord told me that Adam was my father and that He was the God and Father of all the inhabitants of this earth. (Heber C. Kimball, Memorandum, April 30, 1862; Sacred History, Solomon F. Kimball, Church Archives)

1867

Adam is Michael the Archangel and he is the Father of Jesus Christ and is our God and Joseph taught this principle. (Brigham Young, December 16, 1867, Wilford Woodruff Journal)

1868

...Adam is our God. Who his God and Father may be I have no knowledge. (A. F. MacDonald, June 8, 1868, Minutes of the Provo School of the Prophets)

1869
Some have thought it strange what I have said concerning Adam. But the period will come when this people, if faithful, will be willing to adopt Joseph Smith as their Prophet, Seer, Revelator, and God, but not the Father of their spirits, for that was our Father Adam. (Brigham Young, December 11, 1869, Wilford Woodruff Journal)

1873

How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to them, and which God revealed to me - namely that Adam is our father and God - I do not know, I do not inquire, I care nothing about it. Our Father Adam helped to make this earth, it was created expressly for him, and after it was made he and his companions came here. (Brigham Young, Deseret Weekly News 22:308-309, June 18, 1873)

1876

Is there in the heaven of heavens a leader? Yes, and we cannot do without one and that being the case, whoever this is may be called God. Joseph said that Adam was our Father and God. (Brigham Young, Journal History, May 14, 1876, Church Archives)

1889

There are two personages, the Father and the Son. God is the being who walked in the Garden of Eden, and who talked with the prophets. This revelation came to us in certainty. (George Q. Cannon, 1889, Millennial Star 51:278)

1892

...I was at my quorum meeting where were present all the presidency and myself, as also Bro. Lyman; Geo. Gibbs, clerk. Bro. Jos. F. Smith was mouth in prayer. Thereafter some conversation followed as to whether Adam is our God or not. There are some in the Church who do not accept of the statements of President Young that such is the case... (Abraham H. Cannon Journal, May 26, 1892, Church Archives)

1895

How much longer I shall talk to this people I do not know; but I want to say this to all Israel: Cease troubling yourselves about who God is; who Adam is, who Christ is, who Jehovah is. For heaven's sake, let these things alone. Why trouble yourselves about these things? God has revealed himself and when the 121st section of the Doctrine and Covenants is fulfilled, whether there be one God or many Gods they will be revealed to the children of men, as well as all thrones and dominions, principalities, and powers. Then why trouble yourselves about these things? God is God. Christ is Christ. The Holy Ghost is the Holy Ghost. That should be enough for you and me to know. If we want to know anymore, wait till we get where God is in person. I say this because we are troubled every little while with inquiries from Elders anxious to know who God is, who Christ is, and who Adam is. I say to the Elders of Israel, stop this. Humble yourselves before the Lord; seek for light, for truth, and for a knowledge of the common things of the Kingdom of God. The Lord is the same yesterday, today, and forever. He changes not. The Son of God is the same. He is the Savior of the world. He is our advocate with the Father. We have had letter after letter from Elders abroad wanting to know concerning these things. Adam is the first man. He was placed in the Garden of Eden, and is our great progenitor. God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, are the same yesterday, today, and forever. That should be sufficient to know. (Wilford Woodruff, Millennial Star 57:355-356, April 7, 1895)

Adam is our father and God and no use to discuss it with Josephites or any one else. (Brigham Young Jr., Journal, December 16, 1897, Church Archives; underline added for emphasis)

This, like many other points of more advanced doctrine, is too precious a pearl to be cast before swine. But when the swine get hold of them, let us rescue them by the help of the Spirit as best we can. (Franklin D. Richards, Richards Family Collection, Franklin Dewey Richards Letterbook, Church Archives)

1898

Concerning the doctrine in regard to Adam and the Savior, the Prophet Brigham Young taught some things concerning that; but the First Presidency and the Twelve do not think it wise to advocate these matters. It is sufficient to know we have a Father - God the Eternal Father, who reveals Himself by His Holy Spirit unto those who seek him; and the Jesus Christ is His Son, our Redeemer, the Savior of the world. (George Q. Cannon, Proceedings of the First Sunday School Convention of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, pp. 87-88, November 28, 1898)

1902

What is called the Adam-God doctrine may properly be classed among the mysteries. The full truth concerning it has not been revealed to us; and until it is revealed all wild speculations, sweeping assertions and dogmatic declarations relative thereto, are out of place and improper. We disapprove of them and especially the public expression of such views. (Joseph F. Smith, Joseph F. Smith Personal Letterbook, p. 26-27)

Men had ridiculed the elders for believing that Adam was a God. We are not ashamed of this doctrine. Jesus said in speaking to the Jews in relation to Abraham, that they were Gods unto whom the word of God comes. But though we look upon Adam as a God, we worship the same God that Adam worshipped in the Garden of Eden. (Anthon H. Lund, Millennial Star 64:742)

1903

There has been much discussion in Mutual Improvement Associations, and in theological classes of the Sunday Schools, over the exact status of "the first man Adam" in the doctrines of our church. Some remarks concerning him by President Brigham Young, in a discourse delivered in this city many years ago, have been commented upon, added to, and sometimes misinterpreted in a manner that has led to considerable confusion and misunderstanding. (Charles W. Penrose, Improvement Era 5:873)

1912

Brigham Young did not qualify his remarks which were taken longhand and there may have been some
things said which unless further explained might be misconstrued. (Charles W. Penrose, Thomas Clawson Journal, April 8, 1912, Utah State Historical Society; see also Anthony W. Ivins Journal, April 8, 1912, Utah State Historical Society)

Speculations as to the career of Adam before he came to the earth are of no real value. We learn by revelation that he was Michael, the archangel, and that he stands at the head of his posterity on earth. Dogmatic assertions do not take the place of revelation, and we should be satisfied with that which is accepted as doctrine, and not discuss matters that, after all disputes, are merely matters of theory. (Joseph F. Smith, Anthon H. Lund, Charles, W. Penrose, Improvement Era 15:417)

1916

There still remains, I can tell by the letters I have alluded to, an idea among some of the people that Adam was and is the Almighty and Eternal God...The notion has taken hold of some of our brethren that Adam is the being that we should worship...I am sorry that has not been rectified long ago, because plain answers have been given to brethren and sisters who write and desire to know about it, and yet it still lingers, and contentions arise in regard to it, and there should be no contentions among Latter-day Saints...

Who was the person Adam prayed to? Adam prayed to God... So Adam was neither the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Ghost, was he? Then who was he? Why, we are told he was Michael in his first estate, and as Adam he will stand at the head of his race...

Jesus of Nazareth, born of the virgin Mary, was literally and truly the Son of the Father, the Eternal God, not of Adam. (Charles W. Penrose, Conference Report of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, April 1916, pp. 16-17,23)

1921

As a matter of fact the "Mormon" Church does not teach that doctrine. A few men in the "Mormon" Church have held such views, and several of them quite prominent in the councils of the Church, but the Church has made announcement of no such doctrine, nor has the Church propounded it to the world or accepted it by any article of its faith. Here I invoke the principles laid down in the early part of my remarks, viz., that the Church may only rightly be charged with those doctrines which may be adduced from the official documents she herself sets forth as the sources of her doctrine, the very revelations of God that she has officially accepted; and from these sources the above may not be proven. Brigham Young and others may have taught that doctrine, but it has never been accepted by the Church as her doctrine, and she is not in any way responsible for it. (B. H. Roberts, July 10, 1921, reported in the Deseret News July 23, 1921)

They (the unbelieving gentiles) mocked at Brigham Young, Adam-God, and we seek to mollify and pacify them by telling them that it is not the doctrine of the Church, but only the doctrine of Brigham Young. But we are making matters worse, for next we will have to explain that it was only an idea of Joseph Smith, and the Prophet Daniel, and of Jesus Christ, for Jesus gave this revelation to Joseph Smith. (Heber Bennion, Supplement to Gospel Problems, p.13)

1922

Jesus of Nazareth, born of the virgin Mary, was literally and truly the Son of the Father, the Eternal Father, not of Adam. (Charles W. Penrose, Conference Report, April 22, p.23)

This overview is merely a representative sampling of the many historical references already cited in this book.

As was clearly shown in chapter eleven, and here reviewed, the devolution of the Adam-God doctrine was so gradual that many of the Latter-day Saints probably didn't perceive what was happening. The passing of a century of history, however, has given our generation a perspective heretofore unknown. Today, we have the added benefit of dozens of personal journals kept by the brethren of the priesthood who personally witnessed the events surrounding Adam-God; and many of these records have only come to light in the last twenty years. Much more might be expected to come forth in the near future.

By the end of the first quarter of this century, Adam-God was an unscriptural, unsound, and untrue doctrine espoused by fundamentalist "apostate" Mormons (many of them so-called because they clung to the teachings of Joseph and Brigham). How ironic that those who would cling to the teachings of the Restoration unconditionally would be the ones who would later become ostracized by the main body of the Church, who had chosen to reject further light and knowledge. This emergence in Mormonism is not unlike "heretical" movements of early Christianity, which were criticized and hated by the mainstream Christian church, some no doubt for adhering to unpopular doctrines of the Church Jesus established. (Adam-God, pp.298-304)

Many in and out of the church have different theories as to why the church rejected the teachings of its prophets and later denied they ever took place. The first group are the anti-Mormons and apostates who no longer believe in Joseph Smith, the Book of Mormon or anything else dealing with Mormonism. This group tries to prove Brigham's teachings as contrary to the Bible and teachings of the Savior and therefore false. Thereby proving him to be a false prophet, as they claim Joseph also was and that Mormonism is false and usually ascribed as being of the devil. I don't feel this theory needs any further explanation.

The next theory is held by fundamental Mormons. Mormons who have been excommunicated from The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for not sustaining the current leadership of the church. Most of these excommunication's are the result in the belief and practice in polygamy, however, active teaching of the Adam-God theory will also get you cut-off from the church as it is usually accompanied by the teaching that the current leaders have gone astray.

I personally know many people who fit into this fundamentalist category. Basically they believe Brigham taught true doctrine as revealed to him from God and that the church leaders apostatized from the truth. Hand in hand with their belief that the church rejected the Adam-God teaching is the fact that the church abandoned the practice of plural marriage. They are quick to criticize the current
John A. Widtsoe

Those who peddle the well-worn Adam-God myth, usually charge the Latter-day Saints with believing that: (1) Our Father in heaven, the Supreme God, to whom we pray, is Adam, the first man; and (2) Adam was the father of Jesus Christ. A long series of absurd and false deductions are made from these propositions. . . . An honest reading of this sermon and of other reported discourses of President Brigham Young proves that the great second President of the Church held no such views as have been put into his mouth in the form of the Adam-God myth (Evidences and Reconciliations, p.68).

Spencer W. Kimball

We warn you against the dissemination of doctrines which are not according to the scriptures and which are alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities of past generations. Such for instance the Adam-God theory. We denounce that theory and hope that everyone will be cautioned against this and other kinds of false doctrines (Deseret News, Oct. 9, 1976).

The above quotes represent today's public views on the Adam-God theory of the leading brethren of the church. It is quite plain that they publicly denounce the doctrine and deny that Brigham ever taught such a doctrine. It is this view that the vast majority of Mormons have about the doctrine as they are ignorant of Brigham's true teachings.

I would now like to present quotes from those present concerning the April 9, 1852 discourse which prove that Brigham was not misquoted.

Friday 9th April 1852 - Another meeting this evening. President B. Young taught that Adam was the father of Jesus and the only God to us. That he came to this world in a resurrected body, etc. More hereafter. (Hosea Stout Jnl. Vol 2:435)

April 16, 1852, Conference commenced on the 6 and continued until the 11, it was held in the new tabernacle, adjourned until the 6 of next October. We had the best Conference that I ever attended during the time of the Conference President Brigham Young said that our spirits were begotten before that Adam came to the Earth, and that Adam helped to make the Earth, that he had a Celestial body when he came to the Earth, and that he brought his wife or one of his wives with him, and that Eve was also a Celestial being, that they eat of the fruit of the ground until they begat children from the Earth, he said that Adam was the only God that we would have, and the Christ was not begotten of the Holy Ghost, but of the Father Adam...(Journal of Samuel H. Rogers, Vol 1, pg. 179).

Who begat the Son of God? Infidels say that Jesus was a bastard, but let me tell you the truth concerning that matter. Our Father begat all the spirits that were, before any tabernacles were made. When our Father came into the garden, He came with His celestial body and brought one of His wives with Him and ate of the fruit of the garden until He could beget a [mortal] tabernacle, and Adam is Michael or God and all the God that we have anything to do with. They ate of this fruit and formed the first tabernacle that was formed. And when the Virgin Mary was begotten with child, it was by the Father and in no other way, in no other way, only as we were begotten. I will tell you the truth as it is in God. The world don't know that Jesus Christ our elder brother was begotten by our Father in Heaven. Handle it as you please, it will either seal the damnation or salvation of man. He was begotten by the Father and not by the Holy Ghost. (Wilford Woodruff Journal, April 9, 1852)

If this one discourse were the only discourse given by President Young in which he advanced the Adam-God doctrine, the above quotes notwithstanding, the present position of denial by the church could be accepted. However, Brigham Young continued teaching this doctrine during the remainder of his life. The most comprehensive and complete discourse of this doctrine was delivered by Brigham on October 8, 1854. The following is a large portion of the discourse.

I purpose to speak upon a subject that does not immediately concern yours or my welfare.

I expect in my remarks I shall allude to things that you search after as being absolutely necessary for your salvation in the kingdom of God. It is true if you are faithful, and diligent they are things that will be fully made known unto you in due time - at the proper time, according to the will of the Lord. But so many among us are preaching, lecturing, contemplating upon, and conversing about things away beyond our reach, sometimes I wish to gratify the people by speaking upon these subjects, for I think upon them as well as you; I meditate upon the future and the past as well as you, and I now gratify myself by gratifying the people.

In the first place, I wish to say to all men and women who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, in the Holy Bible, and in the revelations that have been given at sundry times from the days of Adam to the present, I request that I may have your faith and prayers united with mine that whatever the Lord is pleased to give to the Latter-day Saints through your humble servant this afternoon, He may give it, and that He does not wish to give He may retain, and keep from you. I make this request of the Saints for this reason; I know by my experience, by the visions of eternity that God reveals things to individuals that does not belong to the Church at large at present, or that does not yet belong to the Mass. That I know.

It is natural for the people to desire that which is not beneficial to them. It is so in temporal things, and it is so in things that are spiritual. That I know.

Again, the Lord blesses His people with temporal things in abundance, and wishes to bless them with knowledge and understanding that is not for the world of mankind who do not believe in Him. That I also know.

I may say things this afternoon that does not belong to the world. What if I do? I know the Lord is able to close up every person's mind who have eyes but see not, hearts but do not understand, so I may say what I please with regard to the Kingdom of God on the Earth, for there is a will over the wicked that they cannot understand the things which are for their peace.
leadership of the church and try to show by historic statements that
the church is not going in the direction prophesied by the early
brethren. Another doctrinal point which they like to sight as an
example of falling away from the truth is allowing all worthy male
members the blessing of the priesthood. They site statements by
Brigham and others that this would not happen until all the other of
God's children had been given the opportunity. I must admit, they
can be very articulate and convincing with their arguments and
presentation of quotes. In fact, Craig Tholson who wrote Adam-God
was excommunicated shortly after he published his book.

As this is a personal paper, I will take some liberties not usually
allowed in an academic setting in expressing my views. There are
many reasons why fundamentalists are incorrect in their theory as to
why the Church stopped teaching the Adam-God theory. The first
and most persuasive argument is the fact that the current leadership
of the church has not been led astray and is in fact under the direction
of the Savior. This truth to me is irrefutable as I had a revelation in
the Provo temple in 1990 which undeniable proved to me that God
still leads His church and that the leaders have not apostatized from
the truth. This same testimony can be had by anyone who
approaches God in prayer on the subject.

Also, as mentioned, there are several intertwining doctrines that the
fundamentalists cling to in their rationalization for leaving the
church, one of which is the revelation in 1978 on blacks being able to
receive the priesthood. I personally know from one of the Seven
President's of the Seventy that after the First Presidency and the
Twelve had spent many months discussing the subject and after
inquiring of the Lord in the True Order of Prayer in the Salt Lake
City Temple that Jesus Christ himself appeared to the group
assembled and gave the revelation personally. There is no doubt as
to the source of this glorious revelation. The current leadership are
acting with approval of our Lord.

Being personally aquatinted with many of these fundamentalists, I
would like to point out a teaching of President Kimball that I have
seen come true many times.

Apostasy usually begins with question and doubt and
criticism. It is a retrograding and devoluntary process.
The seeds of doubt are planted by unscrupulous or
misguided people, and seldom directed against the doctrine
at first, but more often against the leaders.

They who garnish the sepulchers of the dead prophets
begin now by stoning the living ones. They return to the
pronouncements of the dead leaders and interpret them to be
incompatible with present programs. They convince
themselves that there are discrepancies between the
practices of the deceased and the leaders of the present. . . .
They allege love for the gospel and the church but charge
that leaders are a little "off the beam"! Soon they claim that
the leaders are making changes and not following the
original programs. Next they say that while the gospel and
the church are divine, the leaders are fallen. Up to this
time it may be a passive thing, but now it becomes an
active resistance, and frequently the blooming apostate
begins to air his views and to crusade. He is likely now to
join groups who are slipping away. He may become a
student of the Journal of Discourses and is flattered by the
evil one that he knows more about the scriptures and
doctrines than the church leaders who, he says, are now
persecuting him. He generally wants all the blessings of
the church: membership, its priesthood, its temple
privileges, and expects them from the leaders of the
Church, though at the same time claiming that those same
leaders have departed from the path. He now begins to
expect persecution and adopts a martyr complex, and when
finally excommunication comes he associates himself with
other apostates to develop and strengthen cults. At this
stage he is likely to claim revelation for himself, revelations
from the Lord directing him in his interpretations and his
actions. These manifestations are superior to anything
from living leaders, he claims. He is now becoming quite
independent. (The Teachings of Spencer W. Kimball p. 462.)

President Kimball does an excellent job here demonstrating the path
that most fundamentalists have followed. I would like to point out
that Craig Tholson is a prime example of someone who followed
President Kimball's pattern in recent months. Seeing people like
Craig and others has really brought me great concern. These are
usually good people who really believe they are taking the right
course and they cannot see that their pride has blinded them and left
them open to the flattering and false revelations of the devil. Having
studied in depth the reasons why they have left the church made me
intellectually understand their reasoning. This made me feel like I
had sympathy for these fundamentalists which caused a dilemma
during my recent temple recommend interview when asked if I
sympathized with any apostate groups. I had to answer that I do
sympathize with them and explained to my bishop why. Shortly after
I wrote my bishop a letter, a part of which is below.

I wanted to write you a letter and confess that I told a lie in
our recent temple recommend interview. As I was in the
temple Thursday morning and contemplating in the
celestial room about things, it occurred to me that I had not
been totally truthful with you. After coming home and
looking up the word sympathize in the dictionary, I was
convinced I had in fact not been truthful with you.
According to Webster's dictionary, sympathize means to
"feel or express sympathy". And sympathy was defined as
"1. fellow-feeling; compassion. 2. condolence. 3.
agreement; approval; accord." I want it for the record that I
DO NOT affiliate or sympathize with apostate groups.
Yes, I feel sorry for them, broken hearted over several dear
friends who have left the church, but feelings of "fellow-
feeling or agreement and approval", NO.

I guess I was just trying to have a little fun during the
temple interview by saying I did sympathize with them, but
I was using the word as meaning more of a sorrowful
sympathy, not an agreement of the path they have taken. I
apologize if I caused you any concern over my testimony or
future commitment to the church. I have a very strong
testimony of the gospel and of the leaders of the church.
If I gave you the impression by my comments that I was in
any way speaking evil of the Lord's anointed, know that I
did not mean that feeling to be conveyed. I look up to the
brethren as examples to follow and am aquatinted with
experiences many of them have had with our Lord and
Savior as described in D&C 93:1. My prayers are
continually ascending to heaven in their behalf. I think
Pres. Kimball did an outstanding job describing how
people fall away from the church who get caught up in
doctrines etc. of prior generations.

Again, I apologize for any troubled thoughts I caused you
during our interview. I thought it interesting that the
member of the Stake Pres. that interviewed me simply
got to ask me that question so it didn't even come up
with him. I didn't want to remind him, as I didn't feel it my
place.

The above excerpt shows my views about the sympathy I have for
these dissenters. I feel this also demonstrates my beliefs about the
theory proposed by the fundamentalists that the current church
leadership has gone astray. There are many more proofs that this
view held by the fundamentalists are false. Some of which are how
are these tiny splinter groups going to preach the gospel to the entire
world as prophesied the true church would, where are their temples
that will dot north and south America as prophesied by many early
church brethren. If in fact the leaders have gone astray, therefore
having long ago losing the power of the priesthood, where did they
get their authority from if not from another restoration? If so, why
was the restoration to Joseph Smith prophesied as being the
beginning of the last dispensation, the dispensation of the fullness of
times. Why isn't this falling away and restoration prophesied by the
scriptures or early brethren whom they claim to follow? Etc. at
infinitum.

Another theory which holds more credibility than those previously
discussed is that the Adam-God teachings were sacred and viewed as
choice doctrines taught to a people who as a whole rejected them.
Therefore the Lord in His wisdom withdrew these priceless pearls
which had been cast before swine. This is the view most heavily
supported in The Adam-God Maze by Culley K. Christensen. In
support of this view, its proponents quote from the Book of Mormon.

9 And now Alma began to expound these things unto him,
saying: It is given unto many to know the mysteries of
God; nevertheless they are laid under a strict command that
they shall not impart only according to the portion of his
word which he doth grant unto the children of men,
according to the heed and diligence which they give unto
him.
10 And therefore, he that will harden his heart, the same
receiveth the lesser portion of the word; and he that will not
harden his heart, to him is given the greater portion of the
word, until it is given unto him to know the mysteries of
God until he know them in full.
11 And they that will harden their hearts, to them is given
the lesser portion of the word until they know nothing
concerning his mysteries; and then they are taken captive
by the devil, and led by his will down to destruction. Now
this is what is meant by the chains of hell. (Alma 12:9-11)

This theory espouses the belief that many leaders of the church
secretly believe in the Adam-God theory as taught by Brigham
Young, but that these are sacred things, only to be learned by oneself
through study and revelation and not things to be taught to the
general saints. Brigham's famous quote is also frequently quoted to
prove this point which is as follows.

... if guilt before my God and my brethren rests upon men
in the least, it is in this one thing - that I have revealed too
much concerning God and His kingdom, and the designs of
our Father in heaven. If my skirts are stained in the least
with wrong, it is because I have been too free in telling
what God is, how he lives, the nature of his providences and
designs in creating the world in bringing forth the
human family on earth, his designs concerning them, etc.
If I had, like Paul, said - "But if any man be ignorant, let
him be ignorant," perhaps it would have been better for the
people (J.D. 8:58).

In order to fully present this view, I would like to quote parts of a
chapter from The Adam-God Maze.

Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye
your pearls before the swine, lest they trample them under
their feet, and turn and rend you. (Matthew 7:6)

Nothing is more difficult, my brethren, than to reason
concerning the truth in the presence of a mixed multitude
of people. For that which is may not be spoken to all as it
is, on account of those who hear wickedly and
treacherously; yet it is not proper to deceive, on account of
those who desire to hear the truth sincerely. That, then,
shall he do who has to address a mixed multitude? Shall he
conceal what is true? How, then shall he instruct those
who are worthy? But if he set forth pure truth to those who
do not desire to obtain salvation, he does injury to Him by
whom he has been sent, and from whom he has received
commandment not to throw the pearls of His words before
swine and dogs, who, striving against them with arguments
and sophisms, roll them in the mud of carnal
understanding, and by their barking and base answers break
and weary the preachers of God's word. Wherefore I also,
for the most part, by using a certain circumspection,
effort to avoid publishing the chief knowledge
concerning the Supreme Divinity to unworthy ears. (Peter,
Recognitions of Clement, Book 3 chapter 1)

... the most sublime truths are best honored by means of
silence. (Peter, Recognitions of Clement, Book 1, chapter
23)

The author then spends several pages discussing how the Savior and
Joseph Smith taught things to trusted disciples and friends that were
not publicly taught. He then talks about the Adam-God theory in the
same light. He then continues:

What of the saints' faith today? Priesthood meetings are a
constant harangue to "magnify your priesthood calling by
getting 80 percent home teaching." Greater than 50 percent
of the church population is inactive. The divorce rate
among temple marriages is on the increase and may
approach the Gentile standard. Probably less than 20
percent of the church pays a full tithe. The word of
wisdom, given not by way of commandment and adapted
tot he least of the saints, has become one of the most
exalted laws of the church (and that is not lived in its
entirety by the saints). Only 28 percent of household
fathers are active Melchizedek priesthood bearers (Alvin R.
Dyer, A Photographic Essay on the Old Lower B.Y.U.
Campus).

But the church has grown worldwide, and perhaps this is the
price that had to be paid for that adoration. All kinds of
fish have been caught in the net. Tares have grown up in
the church with the wheat. They will be allowed to grow
together until fully ripe, at which time the wheat will be
harvested, the tares bound into bundles and burned (D&C
86:7)

In the meantime, one must hold sacred that which is holy.
Is it any wonder that little strong doctrine is publicly taught
in the church today? Teachings today have been reduced to
Thus, the pearls of the greatest worth have been held from public derision. These pearls are only to be acquired by those who personally give proper "heed and diligence" to the word of God. We have by sad experience come to know the value of the Savior's words: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you" (Matt. 7:6).

The pearls of the kingdom of God have been withdrawn from an unbelieving generation only to be discovered by the individual. It was to preserve these very pearls of Adam-God that President Kimball delivered his carefully worded 1976 comments on Adam-God, for analysis of his statement reveals him to have said something quite different from what one would initially conclude. President Kimball's remarks were addressed to an "Adam-God theory"..."which is not founded in scripture." The real issue, the Adam-God doctrine as taught by Joseph and Brigham which is founded in scripture, was not a consideration in President Kimball's remarks for, according to this statement, we should reject all false teachings not founded in scripture. Indeed, this is the same teaching of Brigham and Joseph. Illusion, however, was given to those who didn't understand that the church discredits the Adam-God doctrine. He could only have meant to give the illusion of discreditation, for there is no possible way the church could repudiate the restored doctrines of Jesus Christ and maintain its favor with God. This is the circumlocution referred to by Peter. President Kimball's remarks were neither dishonest nor without precedent; they were, in reality, the final steps taken to reclaim the Adam-God pearls which had been cast before the feet of swine. (The Adam-God Maze pp. 177-186)

Proponents of this theory also believe that many of the leading brethren of the church do not know the truth of the Adam-God theory and that they are blind to its truth due many statements by the brethren at the turn of the century when they were removing this doctrine from public view. Proponents discard this a real problem and rationalize that someday they will also know the truth of this doctrine and are not bothered by statements against the Adam-God doctrine. It is this feeling that leads to pride in these people as they feel they know more than the brethren and feel they are privy to secret teachings which are only know to a few elect of God. This can lead to a very precarious position, as few withstand the flattering of Satan and soon follow the course President Kimball outlined.

I find this theory somewhat appealing, as I believe Brigham Young was not deluded, but was speaking some real kernels of truth. However, do not totally ascribe to it.

Many times Brigham spoke of Adam's father and our Heavenly Father as being the same person. I will present a sampling of these statements that make it appear that Brigham Young contradicted some of his teachings concerning Adam which I have already quoted. However, I feel that Brigham Young in fact was not contradicting himself, but it is our lack of understanding of what Brigham was really teaching.

The world may in vain ask the question, "Who are we?" But the Gospel tells us that we are the sons and daughters of that God whom we serve. Some say, "We are the children of Adam and Eve." So we are, and they are the children of our Heavenly Father. We are all the children of
Adam and Eve, and they and we are the offspring of Him who dwells in the heavens, the highest Intelligence that dwells anywhere that we have any knowledge of. (Brigham Young, J.D. 13:311)

We believe in God the Father and in Jesus Christ our elder brother. We believe that God is a person of tabernacle, possessing in an infinitely higher degree all the perfections and qualifications of his mortal children. We believe that he made Adam after his own image and likeness, as Moses testifies; and in this belief we differ from the professedly Christian world, who declared that "His center is everywhere, but his circumference is nowhere." Their God has no body nor parts; our God possesses a body and parts, and was heard by Adam and Eve "Walking in the garden in the cool of the day." (Brigham Young, J.D. 10:231-232)

"...you must believe that Adam was created in the exact image of the Father."...Says Jesus, "Whosoever has seen me has seen the Father." he is the Being the Latter-day Saints worship; He is a man-God....This character whom we serve is God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Father of our spirits, if the Apostle tells the truth; (Brigham Young, J.D. 12:69)

Many leaders often site these examples as showing that Brigham contradicted himself and therefore discard any statements by Brigham concerning Adam being our God as false. In a personal letter from Harold B. Lee to a BYU professor, this avenue of explanation is taken. The letter reads as follows:

This reply is apparently long overdue in answer to your inquiry of Dec. 17, 1962. Your letter expressed your concern over the statement of the First Presidency in a letter to Elder Samuel O. Bennion; and again, a statement by Elder John A. Widtsoe in his book "Evidences and Reconciliations" to the effect that Brigham Young never did teach that God the Eternal Father is Adam. If you will read carefully these letters you will find that what they do say is that in the sermon contained in Vol. 1, page 50, of the Journal of Discourse Brigham Young did not intend to teach the doctrine that Adam was our God. Whether or not at other times he did or did not, was not the subject of these particular writings to which you have made reference.

Inasmuch as you have referred to Rodney Turner's Thesis on the position of Adam in Latter-day Saint scriptures and theology, I quote two paragraphs on page 54:

"There are many instances where Brigham Young speaks of Adam on the one hand, and God on the other; as, for instance, when he said "We believe that He made Adam after His own image and likeness, as Moses testifies. . . . Our God possesses a body and parts and was heard by Adam and Eve walking in the garden in the cool of the day." JD 10:231

And again, "the world may in vain ask the question, "Who are we? but the Gospel tells us that we are the sons and daughters of that God whom we serve! Some say, 'We are the children of Adam and Eve. So we are, and they are the children of our Heavenly Father. We are all the children of Adam and Eve and they, and we, are the offsprings of Him who dwells in the heavens, the highest intelligence that dwells anywhere that we have knowledge of." JD13:311

Then Rodney Turner makes this statement: "This certainly suggests that if Brigham Young ever did entertain the Adam-God theory he has contradicted himself in these statements."

I trust these comments may be helpful to you in clarifying your thinking on this point of controversy. (Harold B. Lee, Feb. 8, 1963)

I find it very interesting that Harold B. Lee quotes Rodney Turner to make his point. Also, I am at a loss to find the last quote Harold B. Lee quotes saying:

"This certainly suggests that if Brigham Young ever did entertain the Adam-God theory he has contradicted himself in these statements."

What Rodney Turner said after stating the above quotes by Brigham Young would have given the reader of his letter a completely different idea concerning whether or not Brigham contradicted himself. I would like to quote what Rodney Turner really had to say about the matter.

These quotations bring us to grips with the apparent contradiction in his statements; for how can he claim that Adam is "our Father and our God, and the only God with whom WE have to do" at one time, and yet assert that Adam and Eve heard "our God" walking in the garden, and that they are the "children of our Heavenly Father," at other times? We must either assume that he has contradicted himself, or that he has not. If he has, then one or the other, if not both, of his statements must be discarded as being false. If, however, he has not contradicted himself, then we are faced with the task of harmonizing seemingly opposing views. Basing the decision on an application of the rules of procedure previously set up, the writer has accepted the second hypothesis as being the more likely—the contradiction is more apparent than real: the general pattern of Brigham Young's views on the status of the Gods, and the future divinity possible to man, as related to the general concept of Latter-day Saint cosmology, seems to support this decision.

Brigham Young, like the church today, was polytheistic in his beliefs. He recognized not only three Gods pertaining to this earth—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—but an endless line of Gods pertaining to other worlds and universes as well:

Refuse evil, choose good, hate iniquity, love truth. All this our fathers have done before us; I do not particularly mean father Adam, or his father; I do not particularly mean Abraham, or Moses, the prophets, or apostles, but I mean our fathers who have been exalted for millions of years previous to Adam's time. They have all passed through the same ordeals we are now passing through, and have searched all things, even to the depths of hell. (Deseret News, May 14, 1862, p. 361)

He also believed that these Gods were of one patriarchal lineage, or "species", as he expresses it here: "Whether Adam is the personage that we should consider our heavenly Father, or not, is considerable of a mystery to a good many. I do not care for one moment how that is; it is no matter whether we are to consider Him our God, or
whether His Father, or His Grandfather, for in either case we are one species—of one family—and Jesus Christ is also of our species." (J.D. 4:217) Thus Brigham Young implied that to recognize one, is to recognize all; but even so, he makes it clear in other statements that there is but "one God to us," (J.D.11:122) and he is "our Father who made us; for he is the only wise God, and to him we owe allegiance; to him we owe our lives. He has brought us forth and taught us all we know. We are not indebted to any other power of God for all our great blessings." (Deseret News, Oct. 26, 1859)

...Therefore, when Brigham Young says that both Adam and Eve, and all the rest of mankind, are the children of the "highest Intelligence that dwells anywhere that we have knowledge of," it is the writer's opinion that he is speaking in terms of an ultimate God, or an ultimate source, to which "our fathers who have been exalted for millions of years" owe their rule and existence; and by which the present race of man on this earth has also come into being as children—by virtue of the patriarchal relationship of the "species"—of that "highest Intelligence." Again, this differentiation between the principle of godhood and the individual personages comprising and subscribing to that principle will, the writer feels, resolve the seeming conflict in President Young's pronouncements concerning Adam.

(Rodney Turner, The Position of Adam in Latter-day Saint Scripture and Theology, pp. 55-58)

I tend to ascribe to the same view expressed above by Rodney Turner, that Brigham Young did not contradict himself.

Another theory concerning the Adam-God doctrine is one of disregarding it altogether without trying to come to a conclusion of whether it is true or false. Stephen E. Robinson does an excellent job of describing this theory held by many who have studied the topic and cannot deny that Brigham Young taught it, yet at the same time cannot accept what Brigham Young meant and therefore say we don't know what Brigham really meant. This view allows its proponents to brush the whole issue aside without taking a view on the topic.

An anomaly is something unexpected that cannot be explained by the existing laws or theories, but which does not constitute evidence for changing the laws and theories. An anomaly is a glitch...

Just as there are anomalies in the world of science, there are anomalies in the realm of history. By historical anomalies in the LDS tradition I do not mean doctrines that are little known or seldom taught. Mormonism has both, but these are not anomalies. By LDS anomalies I mean reported statements of leaders of the Church that cannot be understood even by the Church, and that cannot be reconciled to the official doctrines of the Church...

A classic example of an anomaly in the LDS tradition is the so-called "Adam-God theory." During the latter half of the nineteenth century Brigham Young made some remarks about the relationship between Adam and God that the Latter-day Saints have never been able to understand. The reported statements conflict with LDS teachings before and after Brigham Young, as well as with statements of President Young himself during the same period of time. So how do Latter-day Saints deal with the phenomenon? We don't; we simply set it aside. It is an anomaly. On occasion my colleagues and I at Brigham young University have tried to figure out what Brigham Young might have actually said and what it might have meant, but the attempts have always failed. The reported statements simply do not compute - we cannot make sense out of them. This is not a matter of believing it or disbelieving it; we simply don't know what "it" is. If Brigham Young were here we could ask him what he actually said and what he meant by it, but he is not here, and even expert students of his thought are left to wonder whether he was misquoted, whether he meant to say one thing and actually said another, whether he was somehow joking with or testing the Saints, or whether some vital element that would make sense out of the reports has been omitted. For the Latter-day Saints, however, the point is moot, since whatever Brigham Young said, true or false, was never presented to the Church for a sustaining vote. It was not then and is not now a doctrine of the Church, and - like the chemist who can neither explain nor reproduce her results - the Church has merely set the phenomenon aside as an anomaly.

(Stephen E. Robinson, Are Mormons Christians?, pp.18-20)

I personally don't find much support for this theory which is basically one of ignorance. Like the ostrich, the proponents of this theory stick their intellectual heads in the sands of ignorance and don't investigate the evidence at hand.

This brings me to the last theory which I wish to discuss. This is one of acknowledging Brigham's teachings, yet denying them and even labeling them heretical and false. Usually the leaders who hold this view do not state so publicly, do to respect to Brigham Young as prophet, yet in private admit he taught the Adam-God doctrine but was incorrect in his views. At the beginning of this paper I presented a quote by Bruce R. McConkie who ascribes to this view. I would like to present a greater part of his letter to a BYU professor.

In that same devotional speech I said: "There are those who believe or say they believe that Adam is our father and our God, that he is the father of our spirits and our bodies, and that he is the one we worship." 1, of course, indicated the utter absurdity of this doctrine and said it was totally false.

Since then I have received violent reactions from Ogden Kraut and other cultists in which they have expounded upon the views of Brigham Young and others of the early Brethren relative to Adam. They have plain and clear quotations saying all of the things about Adam which I say are false. The quotations are in our literature and form the basis of a worship system followed by many of the cultists who have been excommunicated from the Church.

Now may I say something for your guidance and enlightenment. If what I am about to say should be taken out of context and published in Dialogue or elsewhere, it would give an entirely erroneous impression and would not properly present the facts. As it happens, I am a great admirer of Brigham Young and a great believer in his doctrinal presentations. He was called of God. He was guided by the Holy Spirit in his teachings in general. He was a mighty prophet. He led Israel the way the Lord wanted his people led. He built on the foundation laid by the Prophet Joseph. He completed his work and has gone on to eternal exaltation.
Nonetheless, as Joseph Smith so pointedly taught, a
prophet is not always a prophet, only when he is acting as
such. Prophets are men and they make mistakes.
Sometimes they err in doctrine. This is one of the reasons
the Lord has given us the Standard Works. They become
the standards and rules that govern where doctrine and
philosophy are concerned. If this were not so, we would
believe one thing when one man was president of the
Church and another thing in the days of his successors.
Truth is eternal and does not vary. Sometimes even wise
and good men fall short in the accurate presentation of
what is truth. Sometimes a prophet gives personal views
which are not endorsed and approved by the Lord.

Yes, President Young did teach that Adam was the father
of our spirits, and all the related things that the cultists
ascribe to him. This, however, is not true. He expressed
views that are out of harmony with the gospel. But, be it
known, Brigham Young also taught accurately and
correctly, the status and position of Adam in the eternal
scheme of things. What I am saying is, that Brigham
Young, contradicted Brigham Young, and the issue
becomes one of which Brigham Young we will believe.
The answer is we will believe the expressions that accord
with the teachings in the Standard Works.

...I think you can give me credit for having a knowledge of
the quotations from Brigham Young relative to Adam, and
of knowing what he taught under the subject that has
become known as the Adam God Theory. President Joseph
Fielding Smith said that Brigham Young will have to make
his own explanations on the points there involved.

...I do not know all of the providences of the Lord, but I do
know that he permits false doctrine to be taught in and out
of the Church and that such teaching is part of the sifting
process of mortality. We will be judged by what we
believe among other things. If we believe false doctrine,
we will be condemned. If that belief is on basic and
fundamental things, it will lead us astray and we will lose
our souls...I repeat; Brigham Young erred in some of his
statements on the nature and kind of being that God is and
as to the position of Adam in the plan of salvation, but
Brigham Young also taught the truth in these fields on
other occasions. And I repeat, that in his instance, he was a
great prophet and has gone on to eternal reward. What he
did is not a pattern for any of us. If we choose to believe
and teach the false portions of his doctrines, we are making
an election that will damn us.

The Lord is finding out what we will believe in spite of
the allurements of the world or the philosophies of men or
the seemingly rational and logical explanations that astute
people make.

...I advise you to take my counsel on the matters her
involved. If I err, that is my problem: but in your case if
you single out some of these things and make them the
center of your philosophy, and end up being wrong, you
will lose your soul. One of the side effects of preaching
contrary to what the Brethren teach is to get a spirit of
rebellion growing up in your heart. This sort of thing
cankers the soul spiritually. It drives people out of the
Church. It weakens their faith. All of us need all of the
faith and strength and spiritual stability we can get to
maintain our positions in the Church and to work out our
salvation.

...Now I hope you will ponder and pray and come to a basic
understanding of fundamental things and that unless and
until you can on all points, you will remain silent on those
where differences exist between you and the Brethren.
This is the course of safety. I advise you to pursue it. If
you do not, perils lie ahead. It is not too often in this day
that any of us are told plainly and bluntly what ought to be.
I am taking the liberty of speaking to you at this time,
and become thus a witness against you if you do not take
the counsel. (Bruce R. McConkie, Personal Letter, pp.4-9)

When I read this letter I want nothing more than to totally believe in
it wholeheartedly, yet, when I spend a lot of time reading Brigham's
teachings and explanations on how they can in fact be reconciled
with the scriptures and the temple ceremony, I find myself believing
that maybe Brigham was correct in his views. Unfortunately, this
means I am still a child doctrinally as the scripture states:

That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro,
and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the
sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in
wait to deceive; (Ephesians 4:14)

I will state that I would not teach such a doctrine publicly or even in
private to others as being the eternal truth. I simply will not take a
dogmatic stand on either side of the issue. I guess I am one who
believes what Brigham taught when reading and studying the topic,
yet at other times think maybe Bruce R. McConkie is correct in
saying Brigham was mistaken as to the identity of Adam. For me it is
classified as one of the mysteries of the kingdom which I look
forward to learning either in this life or the life to come.

I feel it appropriate to conclude this brief paper on the controversial
Adam-God theory with a quote by Brigham himself which is the key
to understanding the entire mystery!

I tell you this as my belief about that personage who is
called the Ancient of Days, the Prince and so on, but I do
not tell it because that I wish it established in the minds of
others; though to me this is as clear as the sun, it is as plain
as my alphabet. I understand it as I do the path to go home.
I did not understand so until my mind became enlightened
with the spirit and by the revelations of God; neither will
you understand until our Father in Heaven reveals all
things unto you. (Brigham Young, M.A.B.Y., April 25,
1855, bold added for emphasis)
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Chapter 13

INTRODUCTION

In restoring the true knowledge of the nature of God to the Prophet Joseph Smith, we find that the Father did indeed reveal something absolutely contrary to the traditions of man: be he Jew, Christian, or pagan! All alike were offended by Joseph’s revelation. Hebrew Christians (those converted from Judaism to Christianity), in trying to convince their fellow Jews that the Old Testament indeed teaches the existence of three Gods and that it does not teach the monotheism with which Jews so warmly pride themselves, have produced some convincing arguments supporting the separate trinity. But they usually, at the end of their arguments, conclude that the Godhead is really three-in-one after all, thus seriously weakening their original hypothesis. Most Jews, like Latter-day Saints, do not study their Scriptures. They rely upon the Talmud and the interpretations of their rabbis. Included in the following are many of these arguments taken from the original Hebrew. The reason the Hebrew Christian arguments are so much closer to Truth is that, in trying to convince Jews, they follow the Massoretic Hebrew and are not locked into the neoplatonistic philosophy of the 4th Century, as in modern theology, until they arrive at their conclusion—at which time they introduce the Greek three-in-one mystery.

The following diagram illustrates the personalities in the Godhead, during the different stages of this earth’s development, since it was assigned to Father Michael as an abode for his spirit offspring.

GENERAL REFERENCES—The Father (see Chapter 1, “Adam”)

I. GODHEAD (Plurality as Taught in the Old Testament and New Testament)

A. Deu 6:4—Shema Israel, YHVH Eloheu YHVH echad (Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God one Lord) This is called the Shema, it is repeated daily by devout Jews and was quoted by Jesus, Mark 12:29.

---

DIAGRAM 4 Showing the Individuals Fulfilling the Various Offices of the Godhead During the History of This Earth

---

1. All three individuals had been Christ (or redeemer) on previous planes (Heb. 1:14; 1:19).
2. Jesus was the mortal office on the Earth during this time. He left the mortal sphere after 900 years, or so to 570 B.C.
3. Michael entered the mortal office of an Adam, the patriarchal head, known in LDS literature as Yehovah Christ, becomes the God of the Earth for the next 900 years.

---

CREATION

ELOHIM (Creator, repre- sentative of the Godhead)

YAHWEH CHRIST (representative, probably Michael’s latter)

MICHAEL (Creator, mediator, father of the spirits that were to come in Earth

FATHERS

FATHERS (Yahweh Christ, representative of the Godhead)

SON (Jesus, who would become mortal, a spirit)

HOLY GHOST

FATHERS (Michael, the YHVH of the Old Testament, who had two Adams)

SON (Jesus, who is 56 years older)

HOLY GHOST

FATHERS (Michael, who had been Adam)

SON (Jesus, reborn, 2000 years after New Testament)

HOLY GHOST
NOTE: This is very often quoted by Jews and Christians to oppose the
document of plurality of Gods, but it is one of the strongest proofs in the
Old Testament of the same. To quote this thusly would be like pouring
gasoline on a fire in hopes of extinguishing it!
First, let's consider the elements of this passage.
1. YHWH -- see (13.1 III B) -- This word is usually rendered "Jehovah";
   (NOTE: The Jews do not pronounce this word because of its sacred
   nature. The word "Adoni" is usually substituted for YHWH. "Yahovah", the
   3rd form of Jehovah, was formed by adding the vowels of
   "Adoni" to YHWH. Jehovah should not be pronounced around Jews.
   "Adoni" or "Adon Sham" (Hebrew for the sacred name) is used by
   them lest they break the command not to take God's name in vain.
   The colloquial "Ya" should be avoided for it is a common form of
   YHWH found in the Hebrew Old Testament. German Jews really have
   trouble with this.
2. Eloheu is the plural possessive of Eloheim, which itself is plural,
   "our Gods".
3. Eloheim (appears characteristically in the plural form modified
grammatically by plurals.)
   a. Gen 1:26; 3:22; 11:7; Isa 6:8 -- "us" and "our" are pl. pronouns.
   b. Gen 2:4 -- Elohim refers to themselves twice as "we" (plural
      endings) and uses plural form of verb "maaseh" (let us make).
   (NOTE: Hastings Dict. of Bible, p. 205 -- the "us" in Gen 1:26;
      3:22; 11:17 is strange but perhaps due to the consciousness of
      God surrounded by other beings of a loftier order than man.
   c. Gen 3:2 -- plural construct participle "yadhei" (knowers of) modi-
      fies then our Eloheim, therefore plural. (This participle may
      be predicated of the subject "you", then which would follow
      the definite verb, a very unusual Hebrew construction for early
      writers, but one such is found in Gen 4:17; "he became (one)
      build a city."
   d. Gen 20:13 -- And it came to pass when God (Eloheim) caused me to
      wander (pl. verb) from my father's house
   e. Gen 36:7 -- Eloheim appeared (pl. verb)
   f. Ex 20:3 -- am thy Eloheim, vs. 3 -- no other Eloheim (Gods) before
      me vs. 5 -- am a jealous El (God)
   g. Deu 4:7 -- God is nigh (pl. adjective) (See also Deu 5:26, "unity"
      is plural)
   h. Josh 24:19 -- holy (pl. adjective)
   i. Ps 149:2 -- Maker (p. noun) "Makers" in Hebrew
   j. Eccl 12:1 -- Creator (pl. noun) refers to Gen 1:26
   k. MDD 234 -- in Hebrew, plural nouns can be used with singular verbs,
      see Job 40:15, "behoemot" is plural, "esteth" is singular
   l. Harper's Hebrew Syntax 111 -- When the predicate precedes the
      subject, it may agree with the subject in number or it may assume
      the primary form, viz: 3rd masculine singular, whatever be the
      number of the following subject. (MDD 235) See Gen 1:26 and
      Gen 1:14, verb "hayah" (singular) (to be) is followed by the
      plural noun "meoroth" (lights)
   m. Gen 11:7 -- let us descend ("merdab", singular), let us confuse
      ("nablah", singular), from God (Eloheim, plural)
   n. Gen 41:50 -- was born ("yulad", singular) followed by noun
      "shenehnyanam" (2 sons)
   o. Job 42:15 -- was formed ("nimtsa", Singular), followed by plural
      women ("nasham")
   p. Mk 15:34 -- Jesus calls "Eloi" which is Eloah plus i (Hebrew for
      "my")
Greek has no "th", so it is dropped, also "a" used to introduce the

SUMMARY--The Godhead 13.1.1A.3

4. ECHAD
   "Echad" is Compound Unity for "one" or "unity" (denoting a group
   as "one")
   a. Gen 1:5 -- day and night is one (echad) day
   b. Gen 2:24 -- man and wife to be one (echad) flesh
   c. Num 13:23 -- one (echad) cluster but many grapes
   d. Judg 20:1, 8, 11 -- congregation assembled as one (echad), arose as
      one (echad) man, knit together as one (echad) man
   e. "Yachid" is Absolute unity (NOTE: This word was NOT used)
      a. Gen 22:2, 12, 16 -- thy only (yachid), one son
      b. Judg 11:24 -- she is his only (yachid) daughter
      c. Ps 68:6 -- yachid translated "solitary"
   d. Prov 4:3 -- only (yachid) beloved
   e. Jer 6:26 -- only (yachid) son (Amos 8:10; Zech 12:10)

B. REFERENCES THAT SHOW 2 OR 3 MEMBERS OF THE GODHEAD

SUMMARY--The Godhead 13.1.1A

1. Isa 11:2 -- Spirit (Holy Ghost) on me (Son), and fear of YHVH (Father)
2. Isa 42:1 -- (Father) my Servant (Messiah, Clarke 595) my spirit
   (Holy Ghost) (Ab Elohim, ben Eloheim, ruach Eloheim)
2a. Isa 44:5 -- Thus saith the LORD (YHVH) the King of Israel, and his
   redeemer (ga'al) the LORD (YHVH) of Hosts (tshabbat): I am the first,
   and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.
   (NOTE: The Christian greek philosophers have a problem with this
   reference any way they handle it. Consider the following)
   a. This is the Father speaking, King and Redeemer are only two
different names of his. Then where is Jesus? Is this another
   denial of his deity?
   b. This is the Father and the Son. They are the one God and there
   is none beside them. (1) Then where is the Holy Ghost? (2) Then
   is this the same Godhead after the resurrection? If so then since
   Jesus has a resurrected body of flesh & bones as he testified in
   Lk 24:39, and since they are one God, then according to the
   4th century Athanasian Creed (see 13.1.IV.14) the Father must have
   also a body of flesh and bones! Again this reference seems to prove
   more than hoped that it would!
   c. This is the Son alone. He is the YHVH of the OT, the Redeemer
   of Israel and her King. Then where is the Father? And the Holy
   Ghost? Maybe YHVH is simply not referring to them and their
   Godhood is "assumed" and His not mentioning them isn't a
denial of their existence. Then how many other Gods are there in
   the "Congregation of the mighty" in whose presence YHVH
   stands (Ps 82:1) that He is also not mentioning?

(CONCLUSION: This must then be a denial of YHVH through the Prophet
Isaiah that the gods of the heathen nations are NOT Gods, they are
not mighty, they have no power because they are only made of sticks and
stones or spirit that does not exist. This of course includes the Greeks'
gods, the ones that the 4th century Christians patterned their god after.)
2b. Isa 44:8 -- ...ye are even my witnesses. Is there a God (Eloah) be-
   side me? yea, there is no God (Heb. "taur", a sharp rock, cliff,
   boundary, wall (RSV), I know not any
   (NOTE: This reference has much the same problems to the Greeks
   as the one above. If YHVH is the only Rock, then who is Jesus? or else
   who is the Father? and so forth.)
3. Isa 48:16—The Lord God, His Spirit, me
4. Isa 61:1—Spirit of Lord God, Lord, and me
5. Isa 63:8–10—He (God the Father), Saviour (Son), and Holy Spirit
6. Ps 27:7—thou art my son (Heb. “beni atta”) not “art a son”
7. Prov 30:4—what’s His son’s name (refers to God)
8. The trinity is shown by the Jewish symbol for God, namely the shin, י (shin means, “it is on every messiah, and is not the vav, 1).  
9. Gen 1:1—Gods (Eloheim) created heaven and earth
10. Deu 5:26—living (pl. adj.)
11. Prov 9:10—Holy Ones
12. Job 35:10—my Makers (Who created? All three are indicated)
13. Isa 54:5—Maker is Husbands, YHWH is (their?) name
14. Mal 1:6—if I be Masters
15. Acts 14:15—living God made heaven, earth
16. Jn 1:3—JC created heaven, earth
17. Col 1:12–17—JC created
18. Gen 1:2—Spirit of God brooded on waters
19. Job 36:13—His Spirit garnished heavens
20. Job 33:4—His Spirit hath made me

References showing that the writers of the Old Testament believed there were Gods, and our God was among them. These do not refer to pagans gods for they are not Gods.

A. Matt 28:19; 20: 3:16–17; Jn 14:16; Eph 4:4–6; 2 Cor 13:14; Heb 9:14; Rev 4:8–9
B. Rev 1:1–(1) I am (2) alpha & omega (3) beginning & end, saith (1) Lord (Kurios), (2) God (Theos), (3) the Almighty (Pantokrator), (1) the one Being, (2) the One who was, and (3) the One who is Coming

II. TRINITY TAUGHT IN NEW TESTAMENT:

B. Rev 1:1–(1) I am (2) alpha & omega (3) beginning & end, saith (1) Lord (Kurios), (2) God (Theos), (3) the Almighty (Pantokrator), (1) the one Being, (2) the One who was, and (3) the One who is Coming

III. NAMES OF THE FATHER

A. ELOHEIM

1. Jn 17:3—life eternal to know God
2. Phil 3:10—goal: to know Jesus Christ
3. Jn 17:6—Jesus taught name to 12 (Jn 17:26)
4. Ex 3:13—what name shall I tell children of Israel?
5. ELOHEIM occurs 2570 times in Old Testament
6. Eloheim is from El, mighty, strong
7. El is used 250 times in Old Testament
8. Num 23:22–El brought C of I out of Egypt
9. Deu 10:17–YHWH your Eloheim is God of Gods, Lord of Lords, the El who is great
10. Eloheim expresses creative, governing power

B. JEHOVAH (see 13.1.IIA.1; 13.34)

( NOTE: Jehovah is not a correct rendering of the spelling of the divine name. The Jewish Encyclopedia 9:160 (article “The Word”) says Jehovah is a philologically impossible word. The word LORD (spelled out in capital letters) in the old Testament is used to substitute for the word YAHWH throughout the King James Version.  
1. YHWH occurs 6823 times, first at Gen 2:4
2. Gen 28:13—I am YHWH, the Elohim of Abraham
3. YHWH probably means “to be” (havah) & is similar to “to live, life” (chayah)
4. Isa 45:5–11—I am (YHWH) he, no other Elohim
5. Ex 3:14, 15—tell COFI I AM YHWH, your Elohim of your fathers
6. 2 Chron 14:11—O YHWH, thou art our Elohim
7. Ps 86:10—thou art Elohim alone
8. Ps 42 to 44 use Elohim exclusively, others use YHWH
9. Satan and Eve never mention YHWH, only Elohim
10. Lev 19:2—ye be holy, YHWH your Elohim am holy
11. Jer 31:3—“I loved thee with everlasting love  
12. Lev 1 to 7—(sacrifices) only YHWH mentioned; also Lev 16, Elohim not mentioned
13. Gen 6:22—Elohim commands 2x2
14. Gen 7:5–YHWH commands 7x7 for sacrifice
15. Ex 34:5–7—YHWH merciful, gracious, slow to anger
16. Zech 13:9—YHWH is my God (day of redemption)
17. Isa 45:22, 24—YHWH saved all ends of earth, righteous
18. Ps 89:15–16—joyful sound, walk in light of YHWH
19. Isa 49:7—Thus saith YHWH, the redeemer of Israel and his Holy One to him whom man dispiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth ( NOTE: The Disposed One is Jesus, see Clarke 601: The Prophet Jesajah (Buksasen) 2:382)
20. Isa 6:8—YHWH said whom shall I send to go for US
21. MDD 236—the name YHWH added beside Elohim late in Israel’s history (Gen 2:4—YHWH Elohim, also Gen 3:24)
22. Isa 6:3—Holy, holy, holy is LORD of hosts (YHVH—tsebaoth)
23. Ex 23:20–21—His angel go before, take heed, hearken your voice, be not rebuked, he will not pardon sins, my name is in him
24. New International Ency 13:025—Samaritans pronounced YHWH longer than the Jews (they stopped in 3rd century BC) and pronounced it “labe” or “yave”
25. Univ. Jewish Ency 5:6—Theodorest pronounced YHVH as “labe’ and Origen transcribes it “lais’ (la-ee)
26. Ps 116:1—YHWH said to my (David’s) Lord (Adonai, singular)  
   NOTE: David was king, had no earthly lord (Ps 8:1, 9), no other place afterwards except Ps 110:1 where David calls anyone his “lord” & is therefore referring to YHWH of Ps 8:1, 9 both bear the name YHWH. Also note that this passage is universally applied to the Father (YHVH) and his son (Jesus)
   a. Matt 22:41–45—David called the Messiah my Lord, and so Son of David (MK 12:35–37; Lk 20:41–44; Heb 1:3)
   b. Acts 2:30–36—Jesus to sit at Father’s right hand and be made both Lord and Messiah (the Father is thus YHVH)
   c. Lk 2:11—born in city of David is Christ (Christos) the Lord (kurios)
C. EL SHADDAI

1. Gen 17:1, 2—YHVH appeared to Abram, I am El-Shaddai, be perfect
2. El is translated “God” over 200 times
3. Ps 77:14—thou art the El that doest wonder
4. Ps 68:35—He is the El of Israel that gives strength & might to people
5. Deu 3:24—what El in heaven or earth doth works?
6. Neh 9:32—calls on El to intervene for his people
7. Used as “power”, Gen 31:29—in the power (el) of my hand (see Ps 18:32; Prov 3:27; Micah 2:1)
8. Shaddai used 48 times in OT as “Almighty”
9. Shaddai is very similar to (Heb.) breast “shad”, used thus 24 times
10. El Shaddai is one mighty to nourish, satisfy, supply
11. Gen 49:24-25—Joseph made strong by El of thy fathers & thy Shaddai (also Isa 60:5, 6; 66:10-13)
12. In LXX, Shaddai is translated “ikanos”, all sufficient, self-sufficient. False gods are called “Shedim”, represented as multi-breasted, see Isai, Diana
13. Shaddai means bountiful
14. Gen 28:3—(to Jacob) El Shaddai bless thee
15. Gen 55:11—(to Jacob) I am El Shaddai
16. Gen 48:3, 4—blessings given through El Shaddai
17. Num 24:14—Balaam blesses Israel by Almighty (Shaddai in Job)
18. El Shaddai is used 48 times in Old Testament, 31 are in Job (see Ruth 1:20, 21; Eph 3:19; Job 42:5-6)
19. “Almighty” pours our judgments in Revelation (Rev 16:7, 14; 19:15)

D. ADONAI (Master or Lord)

1. Adonai occurs 300 times as a name of God in the OT, almost always plural and possessive. It is used 215 times of men like in Gen 24:12, 14, etc., “My master (Adonai) Abraham...” used singular (see Ps 110:1, YHVH said to my Lord, Jesus Christ, Matt 23:41; 46; Acts 3:34, 35; Heb 1:13, 10; 12:13)
2. Adonai signifies ownership or mastership. See Deu 10:17—Lord of Lord or Master of Masters, as in Mal 1:6; Job 28:23
3. First used with Abraham, Gen 12:2—1 am Lord God (Adonai YHVH), implying slave or servant (see also Ex 12:43-45; Lev 22:10-11)
4. Other references: Ex 4:10; Judg 6:15; 2 Sam 7:18-20; Ps 8:1; Ps 97:5; Ps 114:7; 135:5; 89:50; 141:8; 109:21-28; Isa 6:8; Jer 1:6
5. Ezekiel used Adonai YHVH over 200 times: Ezek 13:9; 23:49; 24:24; 28:24; 29:16
6. Daniel uses Adonai 10 times in 17 verses of Dan 9
7. Ps 119:125—I am thy servant (slave) Gen 15:2 (LXX—Adonai is a despotic)

E. YHVH-JIREH

1. Gen 22:14—Abraham to offer Isaac at YHVH-jireh
2. “jireh” means “to see or provide” (Provido means foresee)
3. “jireh” similar to “ro’eh” (Heb. seer, prophet) 1 Chron 9:22; 26:28; 2 Sam 15:37; 2 Chron 16:7
4. Sam 9:9—prophet formerly called a Seer (also Isa 30:10)
5. Gen 22:8—God will provide (jireh) a lamb on Mt. Moriah (Moriah in Hebrew means “seen of Jah”—YHVH, from the same root verb as “jireh”) 5.
6. Other references: Isa 40:16; Micah 6:6-7; 2 Chron 3:1; John 3:16; Rom 8:32; 4:25; 1 John 4:9; 1 John 1:29; 1 Pet 1:18-19; Rev 5:11-13; 6:8-9

F. YHVH-ropeh (heals)

1. 1 Cor 10:6—examples for us (1 Cor 10:11)
2. Ex 15:22-26—YHVH healed the water, YHVH ropeha (at Marah)
3. “ropeh” used 60-70 times to mean restore, heal
4. “tree cast in” in a type of the cross; Num 12:13 (heal Miriam); Ps 103:2, 3; Jer 30:17; 61:1; Jer 5:46; Isa 61:1; Lk 4:18; Mal 4:2; Rev 22:17

G. YHVH-nissi (banner)

1. Ex 17:15—Moses called altar YHVH-nissi
2. Cof I went to Elim, rest (Ex 15:27), then to Zin (Ex 16), no food & manna provided, then to Rephadim, no water (Ex 17), Amalek fights (Ex 17:8)
3. Gen 36:12—Amalek grandson of Esau (see also Num 24:20; Ex 17:14-6; Deu 25:17-18; 1 Sam 15:3; 2 Sam 1:1-16; 1 Chron 4:43
4. Isa 19:2-4—Lord’s people upon Mt. as banner (Jer 51:12, 27)
5. 1 Sam 2:14—Jesus as a serpent by Moses (as a banner)

H. YHVH-m’kadadsh (sanctifies) Lev 20:7-8

1. Gen 2:3—sanctify Sabbath, sin not on that day (Ex 20:8, 11)
2. 2 Cor 13:1, 2—sanctify first born (Ex 4:22)
3. “sanctify” used 700 times in OT
4. ‘sanctify’ feasts (Lev 23; Lev 25:10—set at liberty)
5. “sanctify” places—temple “mikdash”, Zech 8:3
6. “sanctify” persons—Jer 1:5; Ex 13:2; 28:36; Deut 7:6
7. YHVH is Holy—Deu 4:35; Isa 44:6, 45:21; 1 Sam 2:2; Isa 6:3, 8:13
8. Lev 10:3—1 will be sanctified in them that come nigh to me
9. See also. Rom 3:23; Ps 90:17; 2 Pet 1:4; Lev 19:2; 20:7; 1 Pet 1:15, 16; Heb 4:5; 10:10

IV. UNITY OF FATHER AND SON

1. Jn 10:30—Father and Son are one
2. MDD 151—Christian Fathers argued that unity was harmony not same substance
3. Jn 5:15-18—Jews tried to kill Jesus for breaking Sabbath & making himself equal with God
4. Jn 17:23—Jesus prays that 12 & those that convert will be one as he and the Father are one
5. Hindu Nirvana is unity with God & annihilation of body & spirit, very similar to the Christian god (MDD 154-155)
6. Ps 82:1—God stands in congregation of mighty & judges amongst Gods
SUMMARY—Names of The Father 13.1.IV.7

7. Deu 32:29—I alone am, no other God besides me
8. Matt 19:17—(Jesus) none else good but one, God the Father
9. 1 Cor 8:6—there is none other God but one, God the Father and one Lord (kurios) Jesus, there be Gods (theos) many and Lords (kurios) many, but to us there is but one God (theos)
   (NOTE: see (L.38); TPUS 371; Clarke 1130; MDD 156)
10. Ps 82:6—I say ye are Gods, all you are children of Most High
11. Jn 10:33—Jesus is not it written ye are Gods, and scripture cannot be broken (see Clarke 929)
12. Ex 4:16—he (Aaron) to be to thee as mouth, thou (Mosen) instead of God (Eloheim)
13. Ex 7:1—Moses a God (Eloheim) to pharaoh, Aaron a prophet
14. TPUS 376—I believe those Gods that God reveals as Gods, to be the sons of God, & all can cry "Abba, Father"
15. Ps 82:6—man made lower (inferior) to angels (Eloheim, LXX "angels")
16. Heb 2:7—man made lower than angels (angels)
17. Heb 2:9—Jesus made lower than angels (vs. 10-11)

V. FORM OF GOD

1. Jn 4:24—God is spirit (pneuma, Gk) and must worship Him in spirit (Gk. "en pneumatik")
   (NOTE: These are both the same words so flesh & bones cannot worship only, "in Spirit" even as He is "in spirit" according to present Christian interpretation. But flesh & bone can & must worship Him, so another interpretation of this must be found)
2. Lk 24:36-37,39—(Jesus) spirit (pneuma, Gk) does not have flesh & bones AS YOU SEE ME HAVE, HANDLE ME AND SEE. Therefore Jesus after the resurrection was "not a spirit!" (as Christians oftentimes think) but he, as His Father, have bodies or we must deny the resurrection
3. Heb 1:1-3—Jesus is express image (Gk "charakter") of his person (hypostaseos, Gk substance)
   (NOTE: (a) "charakter" denotes engraving tool, coin stamp, complete similarity, Jesus is "personally distinct from & yet literally equal to" perfect, though Jesus is called "eikon" in Col 1:15.
    --Vine Expository NT Words p. 587; Thayer 665)
   (b) note that "charakter" was used NOT "eikon" meaning image, representation but not perfect, though Jesus is called "eikon" in Col 1:15.
   (c) also "charagma" was not used meaning "mark, impressed but without special characteristics of that which produced it, see Rev 13:16-17; Acts 17:29;--Vine Expository..., p. 588)
   (NOTE: "person" is an anachronism, not so used until 4th Century, should be "substance"—Vine Expository ... p.1111; Thayer 665)
4. Heb 1:1—If God is spirit, spirit hath not flesh & bones (as Jesus has), then it would follow that Jesus is not a God. The conclusion being false necessitates that the hypotheses is false, namely that God is spirit without a body. THEREFORE, if Jesus is a God, and is a Spirit, then He must be a Spirit clothed in flesh & bones, even as His Son Jesus who is the revelation of God to man
5. Phil 3:20,21—Jesus to change our vile bodies to be like His
6. 1 Jn 3:2—when Jesus appears we'll be like him
7. 2 Cor 3:17—Lord is that spirit
8. Heb 12:29—our God is a consuming fire (Ex 4:24)
9. Ex 9:3—thy God is as a consuming fire
10. 1 Jn 1:5—God is light
11. 1 Jn 4:7, 16—God is love
   (NOTE: It seems obvious that God is all of these things, even as His Son Jesus is. They are light, love, fire, understanding, goodness, the

SUMMARY—Form of God 13.1.V.11

12. It is argued often that perfection cannot be attained in a body and therefore God could not have a body (this is the ancient monastic premise and the doctrine of depravity). Wisdom 9:15 and Rom 6:24 are often quoted to justify this philosophy. The basic conclusion is that spirits are more perfect than minds with bodies, which really says that angels (good and bad) are superior to Jesus who had a body after his resurrection and will still be in possession of it at His Second Coming (Acts 1:11, "come in like manner" as he left to go to heaven, i.e. with a body of flesh & bones)
13. Heb 1:3—Jesus purged our sins, from that is after his resurrection set at the right hand and was better than angels & the Father said to the Son (Jesus) "thy throne, O God (Gk "kurios") is forever" (quoting Ps 45:6-7 where the word "God" is "Elohim")
14. Athenian Creed—"Such as the Father is, such is the Son;" The substance of the Father & the Son is one & not divided. We worship one God in Trinity. (see a copy in The Great Apostasy by J.E. Talmage, p. 104)
   (NOTE: Since with the resurrection Jesus received and still has a body of Flesh and Bones, then this Creed says that all of God is in Jesus' resurrected body, and therefore God has a body of flesh & bones. This Creed thus proves more than is intended by those who profess belief in it, for if He is not raised their faith is in vain (1 Cor 15:17)

INVISIBILITY OF GOD

15. Heb 11:27—Moses saw he who was invisible
16. 1 Jn 4:12—no man hath seen God at any time (Jn 1:18; see IT)
17. 1 Tim 6:16—no man hath seen or can see the King of kings (see IT)
   (NOTE: Since Jesus is the King of kings (Rev 17:14), then when he appears (1 Jn 3:2) we won't really see Him? Nonsense! Also verse 16 says He alone hath immortality. If this is strictly true without further qualification, then "we are of all men most miserable." (1 Cor 15:19)
18. Ex 33:18-23—Moses in cleft of rock, see my back parts, not face
19. Ex 24:9-11—Moses & 72 see God
20. Isa 6:1-5—Isaiah saw YHVH-Isabbaoth
21. Jn 6:45-46—he which is of God hath seen the Father (LJN 1:18; JN 6:45-46)
22. Acts 7:55-56—Steven saw Jesus on right hand of God (Ps 110:1)
23. D&C 84:19-21—no man hath seen face of God & lived without M.P. and its ordinances (except those that stand at the head of a dispensation)
24. Gen 32:23-32—Jacob wrestled with God, I have seen God ( Heb. "Eloheim") face to face and lived (he called the place Peniel (face of R)
25. Gen 18—one of the angels to Abraham was called YHVH (the Lord) and he "did eat"
26. Apostles Creed—believe in God, Jesus, Holy Ghost... (This is a good expression of basic belief about the Godhead which was corrupted in the fourth century by Romans using Greek philosophers. see MDD 17)

GOD IS NOT A MAN

27. Num 23:19—God is not a man, nor son of man
28. 1 Sam 15:29—LORD will not repent or lie, for he is not a man
29. TPUS 548—start at bottom, arrive at top great while after death, a great work, even beyond the grave
30. Matt 5:48—he perfect as the Father (Gen 17:1)
31. Ps 101:25-27—Thou art always self-same
SUMMARY—God Is Not A Man 13.1.V.32

32. Mal 3:6—Father of lights, no change or shadow of alteration (NOTE: this implies that God is always one person & the same, which contradicts Jesus as follows:)
33. Lk 2:52—Jesus increased in wisdom & stature & favor with God & man
34. Jesus is a God, yet he was a pre-existent spirit (accepted by all Christian doctrine), then incarnated which was new to him.
35. Matt 28:18—all power given to Jesus in heaven & earth (didn’t have this before)
36. Col 1:19—pleased the Father that in Jesus should all fullness dwell

GOD’S SIMPLICITY IS PAGAN

37. MDD 114—God is most simple not compound
38. The OT and NT teach anthropomorphism, human form & qualities
39. 1 Tim 3:16—Jesus is God manifest in flesh
40. Col 1:16—image of invisible God
41. Jn 1:1-14—Word was God & made flesh, dwell among men
42. Plato Timeaus—we say “he was, he is, he will be”—was and will be refer only to generations of time. He is always the same, uncreated, indestructible, never receiving or giving, invisible & imperceptible, seen only by intelligence (MDD 115)
43. Mosheim Hist. Comment. on State of Christianity 1:37—Plato considered deity highest wisdom & totally unconnected with any material substance (MDD 115)
44. Justin Martyr—Plato also taught God seen only by mind
45. Athanasius Contra Gentes chap. 2—quotes Plat o, God always & no beginning (MDD 116)
46. Shedd Hist. of Christian Docct. 1:56—better pagan writers agreed with Christians about one supreme God
47. Ency. Brit “Theism”—conception of Trinity from Nice, etc. not expressed in NT terms, but in terms of Greek & Roman metaphors, on a Platonic foundation (MDD 117)
48. Shedd Hist. of Christian Docct. 1:52—Platonism & Aristotelianism exerted more influence on early Christian Fathers than all other systems combined (MDD 118)
49. For ideas of God being infinite and unchangeable, compare Plato’s Republic Books 6 & 7 with Augustine’s Confessions Book 7.

VI. FATHER ALONE IS GOD

1. Matt 19:17—one is God
2. Lk 10:27—thou shalt love thy God
3. Jn 8:54—my Father whom you say is your God
4. 1 Sam 2:3—Lord is God of all knowledge
5. Matt 24:36—no man knows day or hour, only the Father
6. Lk 10:22—no man knoweth who Son is but the Father
7. Jn 5:20—Father loveth Son & sheweth him all things he doeth.

VII. PLURALITY IN BOM

1. Alma 11:44—before bar of Christ, Father & Holy Ghost, which is one eternal God
2. 3 Ne 11:24-27, 32, 35—baptize in name of Father, Son, & Holy Ghost, they are one
3. Morm 7:7—Father, Son & Holy Ghost are one God
4. Alma 12:31—transgressed, became as Gods, knowing good & evil
5. 3 Ne 27:27, 28:10—be just judges, be even as I, Father & I are one
6. 1 Ne 11:5-11—Spirit of the Lord was in the form of a man, & spoke as a man

SUMMARY—Plurality in BOM 13.1.VII.7

1. Ether 3:8-16—Moriancumr see Jesus who calls himself the Father and the Son, they shall become my sons and daughters—Jesus created man after the body of his spirit.

VIII. PLURALITY IN PoGP

1. Abraham 3:19—Lord more intelligent than others
2. Abraham 4:1—Gods organized and formed heavens and earth

IX. PLURALITY IN D&C

1. D&C 20:17-28—God, unchangeable, created man after his own image & gave his Only Begotten Son—Father, Son & Holy Ghost infinite & eternal
2. D&C 59:1-35—Father & Jesus are one, Jesus is Father & Son, John’s record to be given later, Word was messenger of Salvation, world made by him, men were made by him
3. D&C 130:22—Father has body of flesh & bones, Son also, Holy Ghost not have a body, a personage of Spirit
4. D&C 76:54-59—Father makes them Priests & kings, they are Gods, sons of God (first published in Even. & Morn. Star, July 1832)
6. D&C 132:17, 19, 20—they are not Gods, but angels—become Gods

GENERAL REFERENCES—The Son

13.2 There are two personages who constitute the great, matchless, governing, and supreme power over all things, by whom all things were created and made, that are created and made, whether visible or invisible, whether in heaven, on earth, or in the earth, under the earth, or throughout the immensity of space. They are the Father and the Son—the Father being a personage of spirit, glory, and power, possessing all perfection and fulness, the Son, who was in the bosom of the Father, a personage of tabernacle, made or fashioned like unto man, or being in the form and likeness of man, or rather man was formed after his likeness and in his image; he is also the image and likeness of the personage of the Father, possessing all the fullness of the Father, or the same fulness with the Father; being begotten of him, and ordained from before the foundation of the world to be a propitiation for the sins of all those who should believe on his name, and is called the Son because of the flesh, and descended in suffering below that which man can suffer; or, in other words, suffered greater sufferings, and was exposed to more powerful contradictions than any man can be. But, notwithstanding all this, he kept the law of God, and remained without sin, showing thereby that it is in the power of man to keep the law and remain also without sin; and also that by him a righteous judgment might come upon all flesh, and that all who walk not in the law of God may justly be condemned by the law, and have no excuse for their sins. ———Lectures on Faith 5:24, 35

13.3 What did Jesus say? (Mark it, Elder Rigdon!) The scriptures inform us that Jesus said, as the Father hath power in himself, even so hath the Son power—to do what? Why, what the Father did. The answer is obvious—in a manner to lay down his body and take it up again, Jesus, what are you going to do? To lay down my life as my Father did, and take it up again. Do you believe it? If you do not believe it you do not believe the Bible.——DHC 6:364* (TPJS 345*)

13.4 We say it was Jesus Christ who was married, to be brought into the relation whereby he could see his seed, before he was crucified. “Has he indeed passed by the nature of angels, and taken upon himself, the seed of Abraham, to die without leaving a seed to bear his name on the earth?” No. But when the secret is fully out, the seed of the blessed shall be gathered in, in the last days; and he who has not the
blood of Abraham flowing in his veins, who has not one particle of the Savior's in him, I am afraid is a hypothetical case, who will be neither gathered in the last days; for I tell you it is the chosen of God, the seed of the blessed, that shall be gathered. I do not despise to be called a son of Abraham, if he had a dozen wives; or to be called a brother, a son, a child of the Savior, if he had Mary, and Martha, and several others, as wives; and though he did cast seven devils out of one of them, it is all the same to me.

Well, then, he shall see his seed, and who shall declare his generation, for he was cut off from the earth? I shall say here, that before the Savior died he looked upon his own natural children, as we look, upon ours; he saw his seed and immediately afterwards he was cut off from the earth; but who shall declare his generation? They had no father to hold them in honorable remembrance; they passed into the shades of obscurity, never to be exposed to mortal eye as the seed of the blessed one. For no doubt had they been exposed to the eye of the world, those infants might have shared the same fate as the children in the house of Jerusalem in the days of Herod, when all the children were ordered to be slain under such an age, with playing the infant Savior. They might have suffered by the hand of the assassin, as the sons of many kings have done who were heirs apparent to the thrones of their fathers.

---JD 2:32, 83*, Oct 6, 1864, OH

13.5 When the time came that His first-born, the Saviour, should come into the world and take a tabernacle, the Father came Himself and favoured that spirit with a tabernacle instead of letting any other man do it. The Saviour was begotten by the Father of his spirit, by the same Being who is the Father of our spirits, and that is all the organic difference between Jesus Christ and you and me. And a difference there is between our Father and us consists in that He has gained His exaltation, and has obtained eternal lives. The principle of eternal lives is an eternal existence, eternal life, eternal eternity. Endless are His kingdoms, endless His thrones and His dominions, and endless are His posterity. He is to multiply from this time henceforth and forever.---JD 4:218*, Feb 8, 1857, BY

13.6 I will venture to say that Jesus Christ were now to pass through the most pious countries in Christendom, and visit a train of women, as can be said to follow him, fondling about him, combing his hair, anointing him with precious ointment, washing his feet with tears, and wiping them with the hair of their heads and unmarried, or even married, he would be mobbed, tarred, and feathered, and rode, not on an ass, but on a rail. What did the old Prophet mean when he said (speaking of Christ), "He shall see his seed, prolong his days," &c. Did Jesus consider it necessary to fulfill every righteous command or requirement of his Father? He most certainly did. This he witnessed by submitting to baptism under the hands of John. "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," said he. Was it God's command to man, in the beginning, to multiply and replenish the earth? None other than the Father that it was a righteous command; for upon an obedience to this, depended the perpetuity of our race. Did Christ come to destroy the law or the Prophet, or to fulfill them? He came to fulfill it. Did he multiply, and did he see his seed? Did he honor his Father's law by complying with it, or did he not? Others may do as they like, but I will not charge our Saviour with neglect or transgression in this or any other duty.

At this doctrine the long-faced hypocrite and the sanctimonious bigot will probably cry, blasphemy! Horrid perversion of God's word! Wicked writ of He is not fit for life! & c. & C. But the wise, and reflecting will consider, read, and pray, and see if the Father, his Father in reality, in deed and in truth, why are we taught to say, "Our Father who are in heaven?" How much soever of holy horror this doctrine may excite in persons not impressed with the blood of Christ, and whose minds are consequently dark, and benighted, it may excite still more when they are told that if none of the natural blood of Christ flows in their veins, they are not the chosen or elect of God. Object not, therefore too strongly against the marriage of Christ, but remember that in the last days, secret and hidden things must come to light, and that your

GENERAL REFERENCES--The Son 13.6 life also (which is the blood) is hid with Christ in God.---JD 4:259-260*, OH

13.7 JD 9:150*BY (see 13.27: 19.7)

13.8 ...The idea that the Son of God, who never committed sin, should sacrifice his life, is unquestionable, preposterous to the minds of many in the Christian world. But the fact exists that the father, the Divine Father, whom we serve, the God of the universe, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Father of our spirits, provided this sacrifice and sent his Son to die for us; and it is also a great fact that the Son came to do the will of the Father, and that he has paid the debt, in fulfillment of the Scripture which says, "He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Is it so on any other earth? On every earth. How many were there? I observed this morning that you may take the particles of matter composing this earth, and it would be so voluminous that the sun might be extinguished, and if it was not so, I would like some philosophers to let us know how people can be exalted to become sons of God, and enjoy a fullness of glory with the Redeemer. Consequently every earth has its redeemer, and every earth has its temple; and every earth, and the people thereof, in their turn and time, receive all that we receive, and pass through all the ordeals that we are passing through.---JD 14:71-72*, July 19, 1879, BY (Partly quoted in DBY, p. 59)

13.9 He is the perfect embodiment and expressions of the eternal principles of right. He has won that position by His own exertions, by His own faithfulness, by His own righteousness. Jesus Christ, the only begotten son of God in the flesh, but His first-born in the spirit, has climbed His way up in a similar manner. He loved righteousness and hated iniquity. He kept every law and every commandment. He knew that one had found in His mouth He loved not His own life as He saw in this earth; that ever was created, and if it was not so, I would like some philosophers to let us know how people can be exalted to become sons of God, and enjoy a fullness of glory with the Redeemer. Consequently every earth has its redeemer, and every earth has its temple; and every earth, and the people thereof, in their turn and time, receive all that we receive, and pass through all the ordeals that we are passing through.---JD 22:24*, Nov 16, 1864, Charles W. Penrose

13.10 ...If these things (that Adam is our Father and God) have power to disturb the pure mind, we apprehend that even greater troubles than these may arise before mankind learn all the particulars of Christ's incarnation--how and by whom he was begotten; the characteristics of the relationships forms by that act; the number of wives and children he had, and all other circumstances with which he was connected, and by which he was tried and tempted in all things like unto man. Whatever may prove to be the facts in the case, it certainly would exhibit a great degree of weakness on the part of any one to indulge in fears and anxieties about that which he has no power to control. Facts still remain facts, whether kept or revealed. If there is a way pointed out by which all beings who come into this world can lay the foundation for rule, and a never-ending increase of kingdoms and dominions, by which they can become Gods, we are willing the Lord Jesus Christ should enjoy them all as any other being, and we believe the descendants of such a sire would glory in ascribing honour and power to him as their God. The Apostle informs us that those who are redeemed shall be like Jesus, not to say, however, that they shall be wiseless and childless, and without eternal affections. It should be borne in mind that these wonderful mysteries, as they are supposed to be, are only mysteries because of his ignorance of men and when men and women are trouble in spirit over those things which come to light through the proper channel of intelligence, they only betray their weakness, ignorance, and folly. This expels the enlightening influence of the Spirit of truth, the devil then takes possession, and leads captive at his will.---M3 15:625-626*, Dec 17, 1853

13.11 Jesus Christ never omitted the fulfillment of a single law that God has made
known for the salvation of the children of men. It would not have done for him to have come and obeyed one law and neglected or rejected another. He could not consistently do that and then say to mankind, "Follow me."—MS 62:97*; JFS (Ballard-Jenson, 88*) (cf TPJB 308)

13.12 (Gen. 12:7 angel to Abraham at Mamre) In what way this appearance was made we know not; it was probably by the great Angel of the Covenant, Jesus the Christ.----Commentary on the Bible 94*, Adam Clarke

13.13 (Gen 12:13 sister) Abram did not wish his wife to tell a falsehood but he wished her to suppress a part of the truth. From Chap. 20:12, it is evident she was his step-sister, i.e. his sister by his father, but by a different mother.----Commentary on the Bible 94*, Adam Clarke

13.14 (Gen 16:7, angel of the LORD appears to Hagar) That Jesus Christ, in a body suited to the dignity of His nature, has frequently appeared to the patriarchs, has been already intimated. That the person mentioned here was greater than any created being is sufficiently evident from the following particulars: (1) From his promising what God alone could know: "I will multiply thy seed exceedingly," v. 10; "Thou shalt hear the voice of laughter and the voice of weeping," v. 11; "He will be a wild man," v. 12. (2) Hagar considers the person who spoke to her as God, calls him El, and addresses him in the way of worship, which, had he been a created angel, he would have refused. see Rev 19:10: 22:9. (3) Moses, who relates the transaction calls this angel expressly Jehovah; for, says he, she called _shem Yehovah_, the name of the Lord that spake to her. v. 13 (4) This person, who is here called _malach Yehovah, _is the same who is called the "redeeming Angel" or "the Angel of the Redeemer," Gen 48:16; the Angel of God's presence, Isa 63:9; and the Angel of the Covenant, Mal 3:1.----Commentary on the Bible 93*, Adam Clarke

13.15 (Gen 18:13) So it appears that One of these three persons was Jehovah, and as this name is never given to any created being, consequently the ever-blessed God is intended; and as He was never seen in any bodily shape, consequently the great Angel of the covenant. Jesus Christ, must be meant.----Commentary on the Bible, p. 49*, Adam Clarke

13.16 (Gen 18:22) That is, the two angels who accompanied Jehovah were now sent towards Sodom; while the third, who is called the Lord or Jehovah, remained with Abraham for the purpose of teaching him the great usefulness and importance of faith and prayer.----Commentary on the Bible 49*, Adam Clarke

13.17 (Gen 20:12 sister) I have not told a lie; I have suppressed only a part of the truth. In this place it may be proper to ask, What is a lie? It is any action done or word spoken, whether true or false in itself, which the doer or speaker wishes the observer or hearer to take in a contrary sense to that which he knows to be true. It is, in a word, any action done or speech delivered with the intention to deceive, though both may be absolutely true and right in themselves.----Commentary on the Bible 45*, Adam Clarke

13.18 (Gen 22:11 angel of LORD to Abraham) The very Person who was represented by this offering; the Lord Jesus, who calls himself Jehovah, v. 16, and on His own authority renews the promise of the covenant. He as ever the great Mediator between God and man.----Commentary on the Bible 49*, Adam Clarke

13.19 (Gen 32:24 Jacob wrestling) This was doubtless the Lord Jesus Christ, who, among the patriarchs, assumed that human form which in the fulness of time He really took of a parent and thirty-three years among men.----Commentary on the Bible 54-55*, Adam Clarke
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13.20 (Ex 3:2 angel in bush) Not a created angel certainly; for He is called Jehovah, v. 4, and has the most expressive attributes of the Godhead applied to Him, v. 14, etc. Yet He is an _angel_, _malach_, "a Messenger," in whom was the name of God, chap. 33:21; and in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, Col. 2:9; and who, in all these primitive times, was the Messenger of the covenant, Mal 3:1. And who was this but Jesus, the Leader, Redeemer, and Savior of mankind?----Commentary on the Bible 93*, Adam Clarke

13.21 (Ex 14:19 angel of Lord before Camp) It has been thought by some that the angel, i.e. "messenger," of the Lord and the pillar of cloud mean here the same thing. An angel might assume the appearance of a cloud; and even material cloud thus particularly appointed might be called an angel or "messenger" of the Lord, for such is the literal import of the word _malach_, "an angel". It is however most probable that the Angel of the covenant, the Lord Jesus, appeared on this occasion in behalf of the people; for as this deliverance was to be an illustrious type of the deliverance of man from the power and guilt of sin by His incarnation and death, it might have been deemed necessary, in the judgment of divine wisdom, that He should appear Chief Agent in this most important and momentous crisis.----Commentary on the Bible 114*, Adam Clarke

13.22 (Ex 23:20-1) Some have thought this was Moses, others Joshua, because the word _malach_ signifies an _angel_ or "messenger"; but as it said, vs. 21, "My name is in him" ( _keleth_, "intimately, essentially in him"), it is more likely that the great Angel of the Covenant, the Lord Jesus Christ, is meant, in whom dwelt "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." ...He is not like a man, with whom ye may think that ye may trifle; were He either man or angel, in the common acceptance of the term, it need not be said, He will not pardon your transgression, for neither man nor angel could do it. _My name is in him_. The Jehovah (YHVH) dwells in Him; in Him dwelt "all the fulness..."; and because of this He could either pardon or punish.----Commentary on the Bible 152*, Adam Clarke

13.23 (Josh 5:13 Joshua faces angel) It has been a very general opinion, both among the ancients and moderns, that the person mentioned here was no other than the Lord Jesus in that form which, in the fulness of time, He was actually to assume for the redemption of man.----Commentary on the Bible 242*, Adam Clarke

13.24 (Psalms 82:6 ye are Gods) Or, with the prefix of ke, the particle of similitude, keelohim, " _keelohim_," (Nke, the Messeretic text gives no such warrant, but simply states " _Eloheim atem_" p. 1046).----Commentary on the Bible 506*, Adam Clarke

13.25 (Ps 110:1 to my Lord) That David's Lord is the Messiah is confirmed by our Lord himself and by the apostles Peter and Paul.----Commentary on the Bible 519*, Adam Clarke

13.26 SUMMARY--The Son

1. MERIDIAN OF TIME

A. D&C 20:26—he came in the meridian of time (also D&C 39:3; Moses 5: 57; 6:57, 62, 7:46).

B. This phrase is not found in the Bible

C. Webster's Dictionary Meridian (is from the Latin "meridians", meaning "of noon"), or southerly, which is from "medidies" which is from "Medius" meaning "middle" plus "dies" (day) means (1) of or at noon, or esp. of the position in the north and south positions on the equator and the hour in which He dwelt among men, (2) of or passing through the highest point in the daily course of any heavenly body.

Therefore, when Jesus came in the meridian of time, it refers not to the
midpoint of time between Adam and the end of the millenium as some have postulated, the highest time, or most important, vortex of human history.

II. NAMES OF JESUS

A. GENERAL

1. Jn 5:43--I am come in my Father’s name
2. JD 9:24 (HCK)—“it is my duty to think more of Jesus, the Son of the living God, than of his Father”

B. YESHUA

1. Yeshua ha Meshiahi—(Heb) Jesus the Christ
2. Yeshua is Hebraic for Joshua, actually a contraction for “Yehoshua”
   Other contracted names in Bible: Joram (Jehoram) 2 Kg 9:14, 15
   Jozef (Jozaw), 1 Sam, Josiah (Jehosah) 2 Kg 12:20-1
   Matt 1:21—call his name Jesus (Gk “‘Iesous”) equivalent to Hebrew
   “Yeshua” meaning Salvation of the Lord (Num 13:16; 1 Chron 7:27)
   Num 13:16—Moses changed Oshea’s name to “Yehoshua”, other forms
   of this name are Hoshea, Yeshua, Joshua, Jesus
4. The NT refers to Joshua the son of Nun twice as “Jesus”, see Acts 7:45; Heb 4:8

5. Gen 49:18—I have waited for thy salvation (yeshua)
6. Ps 91:4—rejoice in yeshua (Isa 52:16; Lk 4:6)
7. Hab 3:13 (Heb. translation)—went with Yeshua of thy people, with
   Yeshua they Messiah
8. Jn 4:25—26—I (Jesus) am he (Messiah)
9. Ex 15:2—YHWH is become Yeshua
10. see also: Jer 23:6; Isa 56:1; Lam 3:26; Ps 62:2
11. Isa 12:2, 3—Behold, mighty one is my Yeshua (Jn 1:1) I will trust
   for Yahu—YHWH is my strength, he also is become my Yeshua
   (Jn 1:14) draw water from wells of Yeshua (Jn 7:37-39)

III. OTHER NAMES OF JESUS

1. “goel!” (Heb.) redeemer
2. On Friday night and evening of holy days, Jews pray: “Shake thyself from the dust, arise, put on thy garments of thy glory, O my people! Through the Son of Jesse the Bithlehemite, draw thou nigh unto my soul, redeem it!” (This is not referring to David, see 2 Sam11:1-27; 12:1-23)
3. The Daily Prayer Book by Rabbi Hertz, p. 357: “The Rabbis put the meaning of the word ‘bethlehemite’ thus—the Messiah is a descendant of David, the son of Jesse, of Bethlehem.”
4. Gen 49:10—Shiloh is Messiah, sceptre is “shavet” (Heb.) tribe.
   Some interpret this that Jews not to lose identity as tribe until after the coming of Jesus.
5. Mashiach ben David—Messiah son of David
6. Matt 1:23—his name is Emmanuel, God with us
7. Rev 19:13—His name is “The Word of God”
8. Jn 1:1—word made flesh & dwell with us
9. Jer 23:6—his name is “the Lord (YHVH) our righteousness
   Baba Batha 75b—Messiah name is “The Lord our righteousness”
10. Isa 61:12—i.e. Zion, thy salvation (Yeshua) cometh, his reward with
him, they shall call them thy Holy People, the Redeemed
11. Zach 9:9—thy king cometh, he is just & having victory (Heb. Yeshua)
12. Servant of the Lord (Isa 42:1; 52:13)
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13. The Shepherd (Ezek 34:23; 37:24; Jn 10)
15. Stone, Rock (Isa 8:14)
16. Corner (Isa 28:16)
17. Nail (Isa 22:21-26; Ezra 9:6)
18. Battle Bow (Zech 10:4)
19. Shiloh (Gen 49:10) (Edersheim Life & Times of Jesus 2:712-3; Gen 50:24 (IV))
20. Star (Num 24:17)
21. Yonin (Ps 72:17)—His name as long as sun continues (in Hebrew,
   “Before the sun was, His name (was) Yonin”)
   (NOTE: This is the only occurrence of “Yonin”, in the Bible. Ancient
   Jews said it was Messiah (see Clarke 498 Edersheim 2:719)
   YINON
   Genesis 632: from verb “‘man” meaning to propagate, increase
   i.e. “let his name have increase (or if niphel “be propagated,
   spread”), but dubious, old versions perhaps “‘ikon” meaning
   to be established, endure
   LXX : “Let his name be blessed forever: his name endure longer
   (Gk. “before”)” than the Sun
22. Moses—Moše (see Edersheim Life & Times of Jesus 2:719) Messiah—
   Mashiach (In Hebrew the consonants are almost identical (see
   Deu 18:18)
23. Branch—Messiah was known as “The Branch”
   NOTE: “Behold” used often in conjunction with the “Branch”
   a. BRANCH as King (Matthew)
      Jer 23:5-6—Behold, raise unto David a righteous Branch & a king
      shall reign (Jer 33:15)
      Zech 6:9—Behold, thy king cometh
   b. BRANCH as Lord (Marc)
      Zech 3:8—Behold 1 will bring forth my servant the Branch
   c. Branch as Son of Man (Luke)
      Zech 6:12, 13—Behold the man whose name is Branch
   d. Branch as Son of God (John)
      Isa 40:9—Behold your God
      Isa 4:2—in that day shall the Branch of the LORD be beautiful &
      glorious
   (NOTE: Ancient Chaldean paraphrase of Isa 4:2 translates “the
   Branch of YHVH as “Moshicha d’Jah” or “the Messiah of YHVH”)
   e. Isa 4:2—branch of YHVH (Heb. “isemah—YHVH) Tsemah means gr–
      owth vegetation, or sprout
   f. Isa 11:1—isemah—YHVH (Messiah)
   g. Jer 33:5—branch of David, Lord our Righteousness (Heb. YHVH
      taidkenu) (Jer 33:15)
   h. Zech 3:8—bring forth branch (Zech 6:12)
24. Adonai
   a. Ps 110:1—David refers to his Lord (Jesus) (See 13.III.B.25)
   b. Mal 3:1—YHVH to send his messenger, and the Lord (Adon) whom
      ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even messenger of the
      covenant
   (NOTE: The “messenger” to prepare the way usually understood
   to be John the Baptist (Matt 11:10. Mk 1:2; 1 Ne 11:27; D&C 35:4).
   The “Lord” whom ye seek is Jesus (Matt 12:6)
25. Elohim
   a. Ps 45:6—Thy throne, O God (Elohim)
   b. Heb 1:8—The Father (theos) said unto the Son, Thy throne O
      God (referring to Jesus)
IV. 1 AM

1. Ex 3:14—God told Moses, I AM (eimi) that I AM, I AM hath sent you
2. YHVH means I AM, I AM that I AM. "The Eternal Self Existing One" Jesus applied this to himself continually (see Jn 5:43, he came in the father’s name) (see 13.1.III.B)
3. Jn 4:26—am, the one speaking unto thee (correct translation)
4. Jn 6:30—am be not afraid!
5. Jn 6:41—am the bread which came down (Jn 6:48,51)
6. Jn 8:12—am the light of the world
7. Jn 8:18—I AM (eimi) (the) One witnessing concerning myself (lit. translation)
8. Jn 8:23—am from above
9. Jn 8:24—If ye believe that I AM (eimi), ye shall not die (Jn 8:28)
10. Jn 8:58—Before Abraham was, I AM (eimi)
11. I AM (eimi): the door (Jn 10:7), the good shepherd (Jn 10:11,14), the resurrection and life, the way, truth, life (Jn 14:6)
12. Jn 13:19—...ye may believe that IAM
13. Jn 18:4—whom seek ye? Jesus, then saith “I AM” (Jn 18:6,8)

V. ANGEL OF THE LORD

(The following references show that an Angel of the Lord throughout the Old Testament dealt with men and women and he possessed the name and attributes of Deity, calling himself YHVH at times yet referring to another YHVH who was concurrently in Heaven.)

1. See (13.1.III.25) Ps 110:1, 2 Lords speaking, one YHVH (The Father) and the other The Messiah
2. Gen 19:24—YHVH calls fire from YHVH out of heaven (Sodom & Gomorrah)
3. Gen 31:11—Messenger of Lord (YHVH), I AM El
4. Gen 26:13—am Eloheim (to Jacob at Bethel)
5. Ex 3:4—Moses called YHVH (Deu 6:13)
6. Ex 23:20, 21—Messenger, my name is in Him (to Moses)
7. Gen 16:7, 13—angel, Hagar called him YHVH (Clarke 39)
8. Gen 22: compare 11 & 12—angel, Abraham feared God (Eloheim) and not withhold son from me (the angel?)
9. Gen 32:24—Jacob wrestled with man (ish, common Heb. word for “man”), who blessed him, changed his name, and Jacob said, “I have seen Eloheim” (the angel?) (Clarke 94)
10. Gen 48:15—cf. vs. 16 God (Eloheim) who fed me, the angel (malak, the common OT word for angel) who redeemed me (Clarke 83)
11. Ex 14:19—cf. vs. 24 angel (malak) before camp, YHVH looked out of the pillar (Clarke 114)
12. Num 22:20—(cf vs. 34, 35) God (Eloheim) came to Balaam, angel of YHVH appeared before his ass
13. Josh 5:13—(cf vs. 5:2) man (ish) stood before Joshua, YHVH said to Joshua, angel was captain of hosts of YHVH (tsabboth YHVH), Joshua fell on face and worshipped him & told to take off shoe.
14. Judg 2:1-3; 6:11-12—(cf 6:14,16) angel had brought Coft out of Egypt, appeared to Gideon & said “YHVH is with thee”, Gideon said, My Lord (Adoni), and YHVH said...
15. Judg 13:9, 13, 16—(cf vs. 17-22) angel of Eloheim to wife, angel of YHVH to Manoah, his name was secret (Heb. “pily” means “wonderful”), Manoah said “we have seen God (Eloheim)”

VI. THE OFFICE OF MESSIAH

A. MESSIAH AS THE SON OF YHVH

1. Ps 2:7—thou art my YHVH’s son, ask & I’ll give nations, break
2. Isa 9:5—unto us a Son is born and government to be on his shoulders, and his name will be:
   NOTE: Isa 9:6 (LXX) “...and his name is called the Messenger of great counsel: for I will bring peace unto the princes, and health to him.
   a. Wonderful Counsellor. Heb. “Pele Yoetz” (Pele means A Wonder) Judges 15:17-18, 22—To Manoah, what is your name, Why ask it, is secret (Pele)
   b. Mighty God—El Gibbor
   Ps 88:11—heide wonders (Pele) in Egypt & Zaan (Ps 88:12)
   Isa 8:29—Lord of Hosts is wonderful (Pele) in council & great in deliverance
   c. Everlasting Father—Abbi ad, “father of eternity”
   Isa 63:16—thou O YHVH art our Father (Abhem), our redeemer (Heb. “ga’tal”), next of kin, marry widow, etc., from everlasting is thy name (Ps 103:13)
   d. Prince of Peace—Sar Shalom (shalom is perfect state, harmony)
   Alma 13:18-19—Melchizedek called the prince of peace

B. MESSIAH AS THE SEED OF WOMAN

1. Gen 3:15—seed of woman to bruise head of serpent
   NOTE: This has no reference to the so-called “womanly fear of snakes.”
It was addressed to Eye alone, and the ancient rabbis considered this a Messianic reference, the Jerusalem Talmud paraphrasing it as the "heirs of the Messiah" quoted in Edersehmi's Life & Times...2:711. (See also Clarke 22 and probably is referred to in Matt 10:34-36)

2. Gen 3:15--Seed in Hebrew is "zera" (as in "Zerahmi!", see Reynolds A Dict of BOM 325) which word "seed" in the KJV always comes from (except in Joel 1:17) and means seed, fruit, or offspring

C. MESSIAH as the Seed of Shem

1. Gen 9:26(RSV)--"blessed be YHWH, the God (Eloheim) of Shem
2. Gen 9:27--God (Eloheim) enlarges Japheth & dwell in tents of Shem (NOTE: there is no "be" in the Hebrew as shown in KJV & RSV)
3. Gen 9:27 (Chaldee of Onkelos, paraphrase)--"make His glory dwell in the tabernacles of Shem."
4. Jn 1:14--God made flesh & tabernacled (Gk "skeneo") amongst us (NOTE: "skeneo" means temporary residence, like a body, or as God did in the Tabernacle of old, see Strong G66, word #6257)
5. Lk 1:38-39--Jesus was of Shem through Abraham (Matt 1:1-16;Gen 11:10-27)

D. MESSIAH as Seed of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Judah

1. Gen 12:1,3,7--land given to Abraham & "seed" (Gen 17:1-8, 15-19; 22:16-8)
2. Gal 3:3, 16--Gospel preached to Abraham & one seed, Jesus, to bless all the nations (also see Edersheim Life & Times...2:712)
3. Gen 17:19--Isaac called (Gen 21:12; Heb 11:18; Rom 9:7)
4. Gen 26:3-4--land given to Isaac & one seed to bless all the earth
5. Gen 28:13-14--land to Jacob & one seed bless all earth
6. Num 24:17, 19--I see him, but not now, a Star out of Jacob, Scepter of Israel and shall have dominion (Edersheim Life & Times...2:714)
7. Deu 18:18--YHWH raise up a prophet like Moses "of thy brethren" (of the 12 tribes)
8. Rom 9:5--flesh of Christ to come through Israelites
9. Ps 78:27-9--he refused tabernacle of Joseph and chose the tribe of Judah
10. 1 Chron 5:2 (Heb)--Judah prevailed over brethren, of him is to come the chief ruler (nagil) (Dan 9:25)
11. Gen 49:8-12--crown not depart from Judah till Shiloh come, unto him shall the gathering be (Matt 23:36)
12. Heb 7:14--Jesus of Judah (Rev 5:5)

E. MESSIAH as Seed of Jesse and David

1. Isa 11:1-2--rod out of stem of Jesse, branch from his roots, Spirit rest on him (NOTE: D&C 113:1-6--Stern (Christ) Rod (a servant of Ephraim & Judah) Root (descendant of Jesse & Joseph), holds keys of kingdom and Priesthood as ensign and gathering of people in last days (also JS 2:40)
2. 2 Sam 7:2-13--seed of Jesse, build house, establish his throne forever (1 Chron 7:11, 14; Ps 89:36-37; Jer 23:5-6)
3. Ps 132:11-12--fruit of David's body to sit upon throne forever, sworn by YHWH to David
4. Matt 1:1--Jesus was seed of David (also Rom 1:3; 2 Tim 2:7, 8;Rev 5:5-6)

5. Matt 9:27; 15:22-Jesus was son of David (Matt. 20:30-31; 21:9, 15; Mk 9:10; 16:47-8; Lk 18:38-9, people knew he was son of David)
6. Matt 14:1-46--Pharisees knew Messiah would be of David
7. 2 Sam 7:14--(Heb. could be rendered) "For iniquity committed (not by Him, but by men) I will chasten Him with the rod due to men, and with the stripes due to children of men." This would agree with Isa 53:6 and Messianic. If KJV is correct, then reference is to Solomon (1 Chron 17:10-14; Ps 132:17)
8. 1 Chron 7:1-14--all Israel reckoned by genealogy ( Neh 7:5, 6--public) (NOTE: Nowhere is Jesus' genealogy disputed in his time)
9. 2 Chron 8:5--of all David's sons, Solomon chosen to sit on throne
10. Matt 1:1-Jesus was through Solomon (cf 1 Chron 2:4)
11. Ps 89:28, 35-37--my Firstborn highest of kings, David's seed endure forever (NOTE: Prophecy speaks of a David to be raised in the latter-days: Jer 30:9-10; Hes 3:5; Ezek 34:24-34; 37:24-26)
12. see (13:6-11) Jewish prayer for Son of Jesse the Bethlehemite
13. Jer 23:29-30--Jecohiah not to have descendants to rule Judah (NOTE: Jecohiah was an evil descendant of Solomon, but Messiah was to inherit the throne of David, see Isa 9:7; Jer 33:15-17; Ps 132:11; 1 Chron 17:11, 14
14. Matt genealogy of Jesus (Matt 1:11) is Joseph's line, the REGAL line, through Jecohiah (also called Coniah) and Solomon, though not his blood line. This was the throne rights (1 Chron 28:5-6)
15. Luke's genealogy is Mary's (Lk 3:23-38) line and is the ROYAL line and is of David through Nathan (vs. 31).

F. MESSIAH as a Seed from Bethlehem

1. Micah 5:2--out of Bethlehem came forth ruler of Israel, known from of old, everlasting (see parallel usage of "old" and "everlasting" in Prov 6:22-23)
2. Matt 2:4--chief priests & scribes say Messiah to be born in Bethlehem
3. Matt 2:1--Jesus was born in Bethlehem (Jn 7:42)

( NOTE: 3 tax collections of Caesar Augustus, 2nd was 4 years before Jesus' birth, third several years after his birth. Jews protested the 2nd collection, failed, and collectors slowly worked their way through Palestine. Sir William Ramsay found a Roman temple inscription in Turkey in 1923 telling of the three collections.)

( NOTE: In Search of Historic Jesus 33 says there is a problem in placing this collection thatinvolved Joseph & Mary at the 2nd one if associated with Quirinus

4. Micah 5:2--use of "quedem" (anciently, of old) and "olam" (everlasting) implies Deity. See quodem: Deut 33:27; Hab 1:12; Prov 8:33; Gen 1:1; Ps 68:34 and olam: Ex 15:18; Deut 32:40; Gen 21:33;Ps 90:2)

5. Hosea 11:1--call son out of Egypt
6. Matt 2:23--of Nazareth (probably from Is 11:1, Branch "nazir")
7. Matt 2:23--Jesus from Egypt to Nazareth not Bethlehem
SUMMARY—Seed from Bethlehem 13.26.VI.F.8

one & Jesus was, he lived in Galilee as Joseph was also separated (nazared) from his brethren (Gen 49:26) Jesus was not a nazarene, however.

G. MESSIAH as the Seed of the Virgin

1. Isa 7:14--a Virgin (Heb. "almah") conceive and bear son named Immanuel
   a. Isa 7:14 (LXX) --translated "almah" as "parthenos"
   b. Matt 1:1--(quotes Isa 7:14) refers to Mary & calls her "virgin" and even used the Hebrew article "ha" (the), "ha-parthenos" for "ha-almah"
   c. see 2 Kg 18:1-8; 2 Chron 22:2, 2, 23 for background of Ahaz
   d. Isa 7:2-11--Ahaz asked to choose a sign (Heb. "'oth"), refused
   e. Isa 7:14--give you (plural) a sign ("oth") (NOTE: 'OTH' often supernatural, see Ex 4:8-9 (signs given to pharaoh through Moses); Isa 38:7-8 ("oth is turning shadow back 15 degrees). (See Ex 3:12 for another sign fulfilled in future)
   f. ALMAH used to mean "virgin"
      Gen 24:43--Rebekah called virgin (almah)
      Song of Solomon 1:3--alamot (virgins) (see also Song of Sol 6:8)
      Ex 2:8--Miriam called a virgin (almah) (Josephus says 10-12 years)
      LXX "parthenos." Also Ps 65:25; Prov 30:15; Jer 31:21
   g. Opponents argue that "bethulah" ought to be used for virgin
      Gen 24:15--Rebekah called "buthulah", but is followed immediately by "neither had any man known her". If "bethulah" meant virgin, why the necessity of being modified with the phrase?
      Joel 1:8--lament like a virgin (bethulah) for her husband
      (NOTE: In deed, "bethulah" appears to be "young woman" and of "almah" is a "virgin" according to ancient usage. If Isa 7:14 had used "bethulah", then Matthew's interpretation would have been strained.)
   h. "Almah" is derived from ne'elam meaning "hidden" & is a composite of "sa'ali" (to close) & "elam" (a youth) and is a young girl who is sheltered & unviolated
   i. "Immanuel" means "God (El) with us"
   j. Isa 7:15--Immanuel to eat butter & honey, i.e. will be mortal
   k. Prophecies that refer to woman & not man: Isa 49:1, 5; Jer 31:22; Ps 22:9; Mic 5:5;
   l. Jer 1:12 (RSV)--YHVH watch over word to perform it

H. MESSIAH at the Right Time

1. Gen 49:10--sceptre in Judah until Shiloh, not loose identity
   Ezra 1:5, 8--Jehud had tribal identity & lawgivers thru Exile
   3. Hag 2:7-9--shake nations, desire of nations come, fill house with glory, latter house greater than former
   4. YHVH to come before temple is destroyed
   Mal 3:1--Lord suddenly come to temple
   Zech 11:13--Messiah to temple before destruction, 30 pieces inhouse of Lord
   Ps 118:26--blessed be he who is out of the House of YHVH (see also Matt 21:9,14,15; Ps 8:2; Matt 21:16)

SUMMARY—Time of Messiah 13.26.VI.H.4

5. Dan 9:25-26--From command to rebuid, to be 7 weeks & 62 weeks.
   After 62 weeks Messiah cut off (not for himself)
   a. Artaxerxes command 444 BC (Neh 2:1-8)
   b. "weeks" means "sevens" or "heptads" used for years (Lev 25:8; Gen 29:27-28)
   c. March 14, 444 BC is command & ends at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Lk 19:53-54; Zech 9:9)
   444 to 32 AD is 476 years, 479x365 is a173,740 days. March 12 to April 6 (entry) is 24 days, add 116 days for leap years, totals 173,880 days.
   A prophetic year is 360 days. 60x7x360 is 173,880 days!
   (NOTE: Mark 1:15--Jesus said "time is fulfilled, Kingdom is at hand". This information in #5 was copied from a pamphlet about the Last Days and is included only for interest)

I. PARADOXES ABOUT THE MESSIAH NOT ALREADY COVERED CORNERSTONE OR STUMBLING STONE

1. Ps 118:22--Stone rejected by builders become the head of the corner (see also Isa 28:16; 8:14--rock of offence, stumbling stone)
2. 1 Pet 2:6-8--stumbling depends on obedience (Rom 9:3-23)
3. Matt 21:42--Jesus applies Ps 118:22 to himself

REJECTED BY ISRAEL

4. Isa 53:3--despised and rejected of men
5. Isa 49:5-6--a light to the Gentiles
6. Messiah to be a Jew (Isa 11:10, and Gentiles to seek him (Isa 11:10), and animosity between Jew & Gentile done away by Messiah (Eph 2:14-15)
7. Isa 25:7--veil over Gentiles to be removed
8. Isa 6:10--Israel's heart, ears heavy, eyes shut
9. 49:6--servant restored & preserved of Israel, light to Gentiles salvation (yalshu) of the end of the earth
10. 2 Cor 3:14-5--veil on Judah after crucifixion

DOUBLE ANointing (As Saviour and judge)

12. Isa 61:1-2--anointed (meuschahu) me to preach good tidings toemeek, bind broken hearted, proclaim liberty to captive, open prison, proclaim acceptable year (1st advent, quoted by Jesus to here, Lk: 17-21) and day of vengeance of God (Elohim)
13. Rabbis thought there were 2 Messiahs, one of Judah and one of Joseph
14. Dead Sea Scrolls taught of 2 Messiahs, the Messiah of Israel (David) and the Messiah of Aaron (priest), see The Dead Sea Scrolls, Burrows 1961, pp. 350, 356, 361, 363; Dead Sea Scrolls & the NT, La Sor 1972, 98-103

15. 2 advents are mentioned in: Isa 53; Isa 11; Ps 22, 72; 69, 89; 1 Pet 1:11; Jn 3:16-17 to Rev 19:11-21; Lk 9:56 to Jude 14, 15; Lk 19:10 to 2 Thess 1:7-10

CHOSEN SERVANT

16. Isa 42:1 (pleasing to YHVH) & abhorred by Israel (Isa 49:7)
SUMMARY--Chosen Servant 13.26.VI.I.17
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17. Isa 40:5--Messiah, Coming One, glory of YHVH, all flesh see
18. Isa 53:1--despised, rejected, no beauty
19. Matt 17:5--Jesus beloved Son, well pleased
20. Matt 20:37--Jesus tried to gather, would not, killed prophets
21. Ps 69:4--hated him without cause, numerous (Jn 15:28)
22. Jn 1:11--Jesus came to own & they knew him not

30 PIECES
23. Zech 11:12--YHVH said MY price is 30 pieces, cast to potter in House of the LORD
24. Matt 26:15--chief priest convened for 30 pieces of silver
25. Matt 27:3--Judas cast silver in temple, chief priests bot potter's field
26. Ex 21:32--30 pieces of silver is price for killed servant (slave)

REJECTED BY GOD, Suffer & Die
27. Ps 22:1--who forsaken me? (Matt 27:46)
28. 2 Cor 5:21--God made Jesus so he might be made righteous
29. Ps 22:4--5--fathers who trusted God were delivered

MESSIAN TO BE CUT OFF
30. Cut off (Dan 9:26; Isa 53:8) pour out soul to death (Isa 53:12), yet exalted & extolled & be very high (Isa 52:13)
31. Days prolonged by YHVH & prosper (Isa 53:10) & divide portion among the Great (Isa 53:12)
32. Phil 2:9--11--Jesus humbled self, obedient to death, & God exalted him, gave him a name, every tongue confess
33. Men despised (Isa 53:3) but in time God would make him higher than kings (Ps 69:27). Many prophets have enquired and searched about him (1 Pet 1:10-11)

J. TWO MESSIANIC CHAPTERS
1. Ps 22
   1--forsaken me (Matt 27:46)
   2--periods of dark & light (Matt 27:45)
   3--fathers trusted YHVH & were delivered
   6--8--laugh to scorn (Matt 27:39-44--priests mock "let God deliver")
   13--they gaped on me (Matt 27:36--they sat down & watched)
   14--I am poured out like water, strength gone, tongue cleave to jaw (Jn 19:28)
   14--bones out of joint, heart melted in my bowels (Jn 19:34--soldier pierced Jesus)
   15--brought into dust of death (lymphatic fluid of blood comes from "lympha (Latin for "water")
   16--pierced my garments, cast lots (Jn 19:23-4; Matt 27:35)
   16--pierced my hands & feet
   19--helped 20--delivered 21--saved, answered me (RSV)
   22--new section after resurrection, I will declare thy name, praise thee (Acts 2:23-24--God raised up Jesus)
2. Isa 53 (NOTE: The last verses of Isa 52 are an introduction to Isa 53
   Acts 8:34--who does he (Isaiah) speak of? Messiah
   Some (mostly Jews) say Isa 53 refers to Israel, but it in no way describes Israel. Consider the following points:
   1. speaks of an individual throughout; (vs. 2 the grows up) vs. 3 (he is despised, man of sorrow) vs. 4 (he wounded)

SUMMARY--Messianic Chapters 13.26.VI.J. 2.2 GODHEAD 151

2. speaks of innocent; vs. 7, 9 (NOTE: Israel never considered innocent by YHVH, on the contrary always very guilty)
3. speaks of a volunteer: Vs. 12 (Israel never suffered willingly)
4. speaks of unresisting; vs. 7 (oppressed not mouth, not the Jews)
5. speaks of vicarious suffering; vs. 8 (in fact here he is said to be suffering for "my people" (Israel), did Israel suffer for Israel?)
   Isa 52:13--YHVH's servant prosper, exalted, extolled, raised very high (Heb 1:3; Phil 2:5-11; Matt 26:5,6; Acts 1:3,3; Eph 1:20-23)
   52:14--astonished at him, disfigured, not look human (Jn 19:1-2; Matt 26:67-68; 27:27-30)
   52:15--be stature nations, king shut mouths
   53:1--Israel disbelieves (Jn 12:37-38)
   2--no form of comeliness, tenor plant, root out of dry ground (this isore-shadowing of virgin birth, Lk 2:40)
   3--despised, rejected, we hid face (this implies rejection by men of high rank (Jn 7:47-48; 1:11)
   4--we esteemed his stricken, smitten of God (Gal 3:13 (NOTE: "stricken" has a connotation of leprosy) man of sorrow (Heb. "pains")
   bore our griefs, carried our sorrows
   5--wounded for our transgressions, our iniquities, with his wounds (stripes) we are healed
   6--laid on him our iniquity
   8--he stricken for transgressions of my people
   10--his soul an offering for sin
   11--be his iniquities 12--be his bare sin of many
   7--be oppressed, afflicted, not open mouth, dumb before shearers (Matt 26:58-63; 1 Cor 15:3; 2 Cor 5:21; 1 Pet 2:24; Lk 23:34)
   8--taken (Heb. snatched away, hurried away) from prison, who declare his innocence (not done at trial, Matt 26:56--12 (fed) Matt 26:55 (beheld afar off), Matt 26:47 (mob arrested Jesus) also 26:55, 56), Matt 26:59 (false witnesses), Matt 27:25 (cry for blood of Jesus), Jn 19:1--(Pilate found no fault, Isa 53:9)
   9--they appointed grave of wicked, he with rich (Matt 27:57-60; Joseph buried Jesus)
   10--when made offering, see seed, prolong days, prosper (Isa 42:4--to Israel & Gentiles; Acts 2:41; 4:4; Isa 11:9; Heb 2:10)
   11--see travail of his soul, be satisfied by His knowledge, make many righteous
   12--with transgressors, bear sin of many ("transgressors") not anor-dinary sinner, but Heb. "poshmin" criminals, (see Lk 23:37-43),
   Bore for many sin, Heb 9:26, 28; 1 Pet 3:18

K. OFFICE OF MESSIAH
1. Christ (Greek)=Messiah (Hebrew) means "annointed one" (Lev 4:3,5; Dan 9:25; 1 Sam 2:10)
   a. Messiah often used for High Priest (Lev 43:5, 16; 6:22) who is a type of Jesus. It occurs 13 times in 1 Sam, not always of Jesus.
   Also 10 times in Psalms, not always of Jesus (Ps 2:3; 20:6; 28:8; 84:9; 89:51; 132:10,17 are of Messiah, also Dan 9:25)
   b. Oil anointed prophets (1 Kg 19:16), priests (Lev 8:12; Ex 29:21) and kings (1 Sam 10:1; 16:12-13)
2. MESSIAH as a PROPHET
   a. Deu 18:15, 18:19--YHVH raise up prophet like Moses
   b. There was none like Moses, a prophet, priest, & king (Deu 34:10-12; Num 12:7-8)
   c. Jn 1:14--Jesus revealed Father (Jn 14:9-10)
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SUMMARY—Office of Messiah 13.26.VII.2.d

d. Jn 1:21—Jesus as a prophet (Jn 6:14; Heb 3:5–6, 2; Acts 3:22–23; Isa 61:1; Lk 4:18)

e. Matt 24—prophecy of last days by Jesus (Jn 3:1)

3. MESSIAH as a PRIEST

a. In the OT, priest represented people to God, offered sacrifices for their sins (Heb 5:1–4)
b. Heb 5:3; 7:26; 9:7—priest offered for their own sins also

c. Heb 10:4—blood of bulls & goats don't take away sins

Jesus was the perfect high priest
e. Isa 53:5, 10—offered body & soul, as a leper "Smitten", (2 Cor 5:21) "stricken", "smitten of God", "afflicted" imply leprosy & terrible punishment

Lev 14:15–20—leper in OT "cleansed" was first anneointed

f. Jesus was a Melchizedek Priest (Heb 9:17; Ps 110:4; Heb 6:5, 7, 13)

g. Ps 110:3, 4—Melchizedek Priest forever

h. Lev 16:14–19: 17:11—blood maketh atonement for soul, HighPriest administers

i. 2 Chron 6:36—no man which sinneoth not (Ps 53:2; 4; Isa 53:6)

j. Isa 53—righteous Servant led to slaughter, wounded, for iniquity of our boses our sins (see Lev 17:11–14—life (nephes, soul is blood) Bare soul means shed blood

k. Isa 1:4–25—Israel sinful, laden in iniquity, Commorah, murders (Heb. "merachethrim", professional murderers,killers for hire)

l. Isa 53:10—prolong days, see seed impiles resurrection

m. Ps 16:1–9:11—thou not abandon my soul in hell nor suffer Holy One of Israel to see corruption

n. Gen 14:18—Melchizedek administers bread & wine (priest) (Matt 26:26–28)

o. Ex 26:30—Moses built tabernacle like one he be saw on Mt. (Num 8:4; 1 Chron 28:11, 12, 19)

p. Ps 110:1–2 on throne, YHVH and David's Adonai (Master)

4. MESSIAH as a KING

a. Ps 2:6—1 I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion, God gave captains (Moses, Joshua, then judges, then kings)

b. Jer 23:5—David, righteous branch, king to reign

 ischemia (9) 1 Chron 17:11–14; 2 Sam 7:12–17; 23:1; 8: Num 24:17

c. Moses (prophet), Melchizedek (priest), David (king)

d. "Messiah" used 18 times in Samuel, Hannah first (1 Sam 2:10)

el. Messiah as king usually at Second Coming (Isa 11:1–9; Micah 4:1–5 etc; Ps 2; 45; 47; 72)

Ps 2—coronation on Mt. Zion, inheritance of heathen nations

Ps 45—majesty & beauty of King & glorious Bride

Ps 47—Messiah as God, coronation as king of Earth

Ps 72—Messiah is King's Son, perfect righteousness, wholesome reign, universal dominion, divine compassion, martial & spiritual prosperity, praise of God during reign

f. Zech 6:11, 3; 1 of more than man, Branch, sit & rule—priest king

g. Jer 30:21—rule & draw men to God, priest king

h. Heb 7:22–28—Lion of Judah & David has Priesthood

i. Rev 1:5—Jesus faithful witness (prophet), prince of kings (king), and washed us from our sins in his blood (priest)

j. Heb 7:1, 2—Priest & king (Heb 7:8–9)

VII. JESUS THE MESSIAH AS DEITY

A. Heb 1:6—(1–2) Jesus is Son, not only a prophet, (2–3) Jesus creator Glory (fulfilment, brightness) of God, express image (impress, character) of God, upholds universe, by himself purged our sins, highest office & sits on right hand of God on throne (singular), (4) better than angels, (vs. 5) angels worship Jesus though only God to be worshipped (Matt 4:10)

B. Heb 1:8—Father says to Jesus, "Thy throne, O God (Theos) is forever" (Ps 45:6, where it says "Thy throne O God (Eloheim) is forever")

C. Heb 1:8—God calls son "Thou, Lord (kurios)" quoting Ps 102:25–27—"Thou LORD (YHVH)" says, Son laid foundation & heavens are work of his hands (Jn 1:3)

D. Heb 1:12—Son is the same, thy years shall not fail

E. Heb 1:13—Son sit on right, till he makes his enemies his footstool

F. Jn 8:24—if not believe I AM he (the Lord YHVH), ye shall die in your sins (Ex 3:14)

G. Zech 13:7—awake sword against my shepherd & against man who is my fellow

Jn 10:30—"I & my Father are one

Phil 2:6—Jesus equal with God

H. Isa 53:6—child is born (human), Son is given (Son of God), called the Mighty God (Heb. El Gibor, Gen 17:1), the Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace

I. Isa 49:9–10—to cities of Judah, Behold you God (Eloheim) Behold the LORD God will come with strong hand

J. Ps 47:7–8—For God (Eloheim) reigns over the whole earth, God (Eloheim) reigns over the nations (Rev 11:15; 19:16; 1 Cor 15:24–25)

K. Zech 2:10—YHVH says, "I will come & dwell in the midst of thee"

L. Ps 47:2—(a Messianic Psalm) Lord YHVH is king over all earth

M. Jer 23:5–6—Messiah called YHVH our Righteousness

N. Ps 102:16—Lord YHVH hath appeared in His Glory

O. Zech 13:9—YHVH shall be king over all earth

P. Zech 14:3–4—YHVH go forth & his feet shall stand in that day upon Mt.

Q. Zech 18:10—they shall look upon me (YHVH) whom they have pierced

R. Isa 40:3—voice in wilderness, Prepare way of YHVH, hiway of our God (Eloheim) (Matt 3:1–3)

S. Zeph 3:14–15—YHVH is Holy One who is midst of thee, king (Isa 12:6)

T. Isa 6:1–3—Messiah is YHVH of Hosts (Jn 12:4; Isa 8:13–14; 1 Pet 2:5–8)

DIETY SHOWN IN JESUS

U. Jesus forgives sins: Mk 2:10

V. Jesus is worshipped: Matt 2:11; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33

W. Has supernatural power: Mk 2:11; 3:5, 10, 11 etc

X. Jesus is sinless: Heb 7:26; 1 Pet 2:22; 1 Jn 3:5; Lk 18:19

Y. His atonement: Heb 2:9

Z. His resurrection: Rom 1:4

AA. His promises only fulfilled by deity: Matt 11:28–29; 28:19–20; Jn 14:23

BB. Men trust him as they do Father: Jn 14:1–3

CC. Creator & sustainer of universe: Jn 1:1–3; Col 1:16–17

DD. Has characteristics of Deity: Matt 28:20; Jn 14:23; Jn 3:13; 16:30; Matt 25:18 etc; Rom 9:5; Jn 20:28; Col 1:14, 17; 1 Cor 2:8; 1 Tim 6:14–16; Titus 2:13

VIII. OLD TESTAMENT TYPES OF THE MESSIAH

A. Passover Lamb—(Ex:1–13; spit was thrust lengthwise through Body & shoulder to shoulder, in the form of a cross)

B. Brazen Serpent (Num 21)—not on a pole, but a banner staff (i.e. cross)
SUMMARY--Types of Messiah 13.26.VIII.B

this is a type of deliverance from destruction (Jn 3:14-18)
C. Adam (1 Cor 15:45-49)—To give mankind life
D. Noah & his Ark (Gen chapters 6-8)—To save all of mankind alive
E. Isaac (Gen 22)—A sacrifice by the Father who dearly loved him
F. Joseph (Gen chapters 37-47)—He was hated, rejected by brethren, beloved of Father, sent to Gentiles, obtained a bride, fed multitudes, saved men from destruction (fed men while all others were starving spiritually), reveals himself to brethren and saves many (Zech 12:10; Rom 11:25-26).
G. Moses (Exodus)—Shepherd is youth, rejected by brethren, fled to Gentiles (Jethro so-called), gets bride, returns to liberate Israel, accepted as leader, leads them out of bondage (Acts 7:22-37)
H. David—Shepherd in youth, rejected by Saul, sought to kill him, then accepted by nation, anointed king
I. Aaron & Melchizedek—Types of High Priests
J. Jonah (Matt 12:40)—Type of death and resurrection, preach to Gentiles, after 3 days & 3 nights arise
K. Tabernacle (Ex chapter 25-31, 35-40)—A type of Messiah
   1. Brazen Altar atonement by blood
   2. Altar for cleansing, sanctification through washing
   3. Table Showbread Messiah as food and strength
   4. Golden Candlestick 7 branches, Jesus as light of world
   5. Altar incense prayers & supplication that ascend (Rev. 8:3)
   6. Mercy Seat In holy of holies, Jesus only justification, access to God (Lk 18:13)
   7. Ark of Covenant In holy of Holies, Jesus as our representative & mediator, Made of wood and covered with gold, (Ex 25:10-11, shows Jesus' humanity and deity), It also contained:
      a. Golden Pot of manna, Messiah as bread of life
      b. Aaron's Rod, Resurrection of Messiah
      c. Table of Law, Scriptures, keeping of the whole law
   8. Holy of Holies Inaccessibility to greatest spirituality and ordinances to all but chosen few
   9. Tabernacle itself, Incarnation of Messiah, dwelling among his people (Jn 1:14; Zech 2:10)

IX. JESUS THE MORTAL MESSIAH

A. NOT A LAW BREAKER
   1. Matt 21:12-16—Jesus drove out of the temple, Jesus in authority (Mk 11:15-18; Lk 19:45-47; Jn 2:14-17)
   2. Lev 19:9-10; 20:23—leave produce on vine for traveler
   3. Mk 3:1-6—Sabbath healing
   4. Jn 18:21-23—answer refuses—High Priest wouldn't answer Jesus
   5. Matt 23:2-3—disciples told to obey Pharisees

B. SUBJECT TO CIVIL AUTHORITY AND PARENTAL AUTHORITY
   1. Acts 5:29—obey God rather than man
   2. Rom 13:1-7—subject to higher powers not in conflict with God—pay tribute
   3. 1 Cor 9:15-18; Gal 1:12-18—Paul taught by Jesus
   4. 1 Tim 2:1-2—pray for civil authorities
   5. Matt 8:13; 13:1; 23:1—Jesus taught multitudes (Lk 6:17; Matt 21:11)
   7. Lk 7:10-11—Jesus healed Roman servant
   8. Matt 5:41 Jesus taught submission & acquiescence

SUMMARY--The Mortal Messiah 13.26.IX.B.10

10. 1 Pet 2:21-24; Lk 4:16-21—Jesus showed love and culture
11. Jn 18:36—Jesus kingdom not of this world
12. Jn 17:6, 8, 14, 16; 1 Jn 2:15; Rev 18:4; 2 Cor 6:14-17; 1 Cor 5:11—come out of world (politics)
13. Isa 48:2—Jesus voices notes to be heard in street—tried to leave crowd, left most of crowd at Sermon Mount (Matt 5:1; Jn 6:15)

GROWTH OF JESUS
14. Lk 2:51-52—Jesus subject to parents, increased in wisdom & favor with God & man
15. Heb 5:8—though son, he learned obedience by the things he suffered
16. Matt 5:48—be perfect as Father is perfect
17. Matt 19:16—only one good: the Father
18. 3 Ne 12:48—be perfect as Father & I are perfect (after resurrection)
19. Jn 17:5—glorify me with glory I had with thee
20. Matt 28:18—all power given to Jesus

C. DIDN'T DISTURB SPIRITUAL BLINDNESS
   1. Matt 13:10-15—mysteries not for multitude (Mk 4:11-12)
   2. Isa 6:9-10—people hear and not understand

D. JESUS AND THE UPPER CRUST
   1. Lk 7:36-39—Jesus into Pharisees house
   2. Lk 5:27-29—Jesus called a Levite, publican
   3. Lk 19:1-6—Zacchaeus (rich) sought Jesus—Jesus stayed with him
   4. Matt 27:57—Joseph of Arimathea (rich) was disciple
   5. Clark Commentary—Joseph of Arimathea was a councilor of Sanhedrin
   7. Jn 2:11—Can wedding a wedding of wealth
   8. Lk 7:1-10—Centurion servant example of wealth
   9. Acts 10:34—Jesus no respecter of persons

E. JESUS PAID TAX
   1. Matt 22:15-22—render to Caesar Caesar's
   2. Matt 17:24-25—Jesus paid tax

F. JESUS STAYED IN DWELLINGS (Mk 2:15—JESUS SAT IN HIS HOUSE)
   1. Lk 9:51-56—disciples go to Jerusalem to get room for Jesus
   2. Matt 21:7—Jesus lodged in Bethany
   3. Mk 2:1—Jesus in a house ("at home")—Greek Bible in Capernum
   4. Mk 5:22-43—ruler of synagogue spoke to Jesus in his house
   5. Mk 7:17—Jesus entered into house
   6. Lk 9:57-58—Jesus had no lodging on that occasion

G. JESUS AVOIDED MULTITUDES
   1. Mk 4:1—got on boat to escape
   2. Matt 13:34—Jesus spoke to multitude only in parables (Matt 21:34 IT; Mk 4:12; Matt 13:13-15)

H. JESUS HAD A HOME
   1. Matt 8:14—Jesus in Peter's wife's house (1 Cor 9:5)
   3. Matt 13:36—went into the house
   4. Matt 13:53-57—not honor in own country or house
   5. Matt 14:15, 23—Jesus prayed in mountains
   6. Matt 13:57—not honor in own country or home
   7. Jn 13:17—Jesus washes feet of disciples—clean
8. Matt 17:25—Jesus in a house

I. JOSEPH AND JESUS' HOUSEHOLD
1. Matt 1:18—Mary espoused to Joseph
2. Lk 2:51—Jesus was subject to his parents
3. Lk 2:41—there is no reference to Joseph, only Mary—Joseph dead
4. 1 Tim 4:1—3—in latter times, depart from faith: forbidding to marry
5. 1 Ne 13:24—29—plain & precious parts of Gospel taken away, men stumble

JESUS' BROTHERS & SISTERS
6. Matt 1:25—Joseph knew not Mary till she brought forth first born
8. Matt 1:18—23—JC conceived of HG
9. Lk 1:31—35—conceived of HG come upon thee, power of Highest over shadow
10. Lk 1:32—called son of Highest
11. Matt 12:42 (Jn 7:5)—brethren didn't follow Jesus, stand without
12. Acts 1:13—15: 21—4—Mary & his brothers, & women & all in upper room
13. 1 Cor 12:9,5—I lead sister & wife like Apostles & Lord's brethren
14. Lk 2:41—50—unnoticeable absence of JC shown other bro & sis.
15. Jn 19:26—27—Jesus had Jn takecare of mother, brothers not yet believe
16. Jerome argued "adolphos" means bro. also nephew, neice, half-bro, cousin
17. If other than blood brothers, NT could have used "synggenon" for relatives, like Mk 6:4—save among home country, own relatives, own house
18. Lk 14:12, 21:16—...not call friends, or brother, or relatives...
19. 1 Cor 7:3,4—doesn't deprive spouse marital due
20. Matt 27:56—Mary mother of James & Joses at crucifixion
21. Jn 19:25—by cross was JC mother's sister, Mary, wife of Cleophas
22. Matt 13:54—56—JC mother was Mary, brother James, Joseph, Simon, Judas, & all (not both) his sisters with us (at least 8)
23. Gk "adolphos" is brother, cousin is "aneptios" (Col 4:10 KJV, RSV) and "suggenes" for general kinship. Acts 23:16 talks of a sister's son. "Adolphos" can refer to a spiritual brother, but there is no evidence that it meant cousin
24. Jn 12:2—JC to Capernaum with mother, his brethren, his disciples for "not many days"
25. Jn 7-3,5—brother of JC did not believe him
26. Gal 1:18—19—Paul saw Peter & James, the Lord's brother was Peter the Lord's brother?
27. Eusebius Eccl. Hist II, 1, p. 48—James, JC brother, leader of Church
29. Lk 2:7—JC was Mary's firstborn (protokolos) not only child (mono-
genous)
30. Matt 12:46—50—Mother & brothers stood outside, disciples were his mother & brothers & sisters—(if he had no bro. & sis, then he had no mother)
31. Ps 69:8—(refers to JC) have become a stranger to my brethren, an alien to my mother's sons.
32. Rom 8:16—17, 29—refers to adopted children of God

J. HAIR OF JESUS

SUMMARY—Jesus had a Home 13.26.IX.H.8

K. RABBI JESUS
1. Gen 49:10—sceptre will not depart from Judah
2. Deu 18:15—Moses said a great prophet would come among them
3. Ex 19:10—12, a Jewish male child was taught by the wisest teachers who also taught at gatherings and feasts
3a. CR April 4, 1880, p. 8 (JT)—Jewish law required a man to be 30 before officiating in the Priesthood
4. Lk 4:27—when Jesus went in, it was he who taught
5. TPHS 392—not always wise to tell all the truth, Jesus also had to refrain
6. Matt 23:2,3—Jesus to disciplines: obey Jewish laws
7. Jn 1:38—Jesus called Rabbi (Mk 9:5; 11:21; Matt 26:34-59; Jn 1:29, 38; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2; 11:8; Jesus was Married 13, 15-27—Rabbi were ord. & married
8. Matt 23:3,5—Jesus warned disciples to avoid prestige, honors, & titles that go with office of rabbi

GOSPEL LAW
10. Orson Spencer's Letters 224—wives and children of Jesus
11. Phil 4:3—mentions apostles family (1 Corn 9:5, 13; JD 2:22; JD 4:260)
12. MS 62:97 (J. F. Smith)—Jesus never failed to fulfill a single law of God. (see 15.11)

THE CANA MARRIAGE (see Jesus Was Married by Ogden Kraut)
13. Jn 2:1—12—story of Cana Marriage
14. Jesus the Christ p. 144—marriage was for a member of Mary's immediate family (see 13.6)
15. Life of Christ by (Farrar) p. 123—one of bridal pair was of holy family; it is also implied that disciples were invited for the sake of Jesus
17. JD 2:79, 82 (OH) talks of Jesus marriage at Cana (see 13.6)
18. Journal of WW, July 22, 1833—J. F. Smith said Jesus was the Bridegroom and Mary, Martha the brides (Lk 10:35-42; Jn 2:2, 12:15)
19. Jn 19:25—Mary Magdalene wife of Jesus (Matt 27:61; Mk 15:47; Lk 23:55; Mk 16:1; Matt 28:1; Mk 16:2; Jn 20:14; Matt 28:5; Jn 20:14-15, 17 IT)

AN EVERLASTING COVENANT
20. 2 Thess 2:3—there was to be a falling away and restitution (2 Tim 1:5; Gal 1:6-7; Acts 3:21; Eph 1:10
21. Thelvorphora 1:212 by Rev. Martin Madan—at Wittenberg It was decided that a man could have 2 wives at same time (see 27:15)
22. Hist & Philos. of Marriage 69-71 by James Campbell—the New Testament made no change in marriage as it had always been
23. D&C 132:3-5—all those who hear law must obey the same
24. D&C 132:40—Jesus Christ and His posterity.

25. TPJS 59–60—ordinances always the same, but can be added to (Heb 4:2; Gal 3:19).

26. D&C 132:29, 32, 33—if we enter law we will receive promise of the Father.

27. The Serer 187–188 (OP)—justifies Abraham living plural marriage.

28. TPJS 310, 309, 328—plural marriage has always brought persecution, even to Jesus (see JD 1:345–346).

29. TPJS 306, 308—must live all the commandments and ordinances.

30. Ex. 34:11—Israel to kill lamb.

31. Ps 45—from the Geneva Bible, London 1599 AD, this reference to plural marriage was taken out (see TS 169–172).

32. The Great Controversy 53 (Ellen G. White)—true church should be persecuted.

33. TPJS 181—every principle from God is eternal, if not eternal it is of the devil.

34. Max 8, 6—plural marriage necessary.

35. APPF 420—plural marriage lived by Jesus and God (see Glory of Mormonism 86).

36. TS 172—if offended by plural marriage, stay away from kingdom of God.


3. Mk 15:44—Pilate sent centurian to see if Jesus was dead.

4. I Cor 5:7—Jesus was Passover.

5. Ex 12:46—Passover eaten in house, no broken bread.


7. Ex 12:6—Israel to kill lamb.


9. Lev 7:24; 23:8; De 14:21—not eat animal that dies of itself.

10. Is 53:7—like lamb to slaughter, cut off, stricken.

11. Acts 8:32–35—Jesus is lamb to slaughter to shearer.


13. Lev 17:11—life (nephesh) is in blood.


17. Matt 27:49–50—"...to save Him! But another taking a spear pierced His side, when blood and water came out. Jesus, however, having again called out with a loud voice, resigned His spirit." (Fenton translation)

One of them ran off at once and took a sponge, which he soaked in vinegar and put on the end of a stick, to give him to drink. But the other said, "Stop, let us see if Elijah does come to save him!"

(Seizing a lance, another pricked (Greek, "nausoo") means pierced) his side and out came water and blood.

( NOTE: Above the part of verse 49 that is deleted from the King James version is found in manuscripts, some not available to the KJV translators. It is found in the Vaticanus MS 300 AD; first published 1589; also in the Sinaiticus MS, Ephraemi, L, 1019, 5, 48, 67, 115, 127, and Vulgate MSS (these are all designations for difference NT codices and manuscripts.)

Zechariah 12:10—look on me whom they pierced (Rev 1:7).

18. Codex Vaticanus—"...and another took a spear and pierced his side and there came forth water and blood."


(Note: "pierced" in Greek is in the aorist sense which means either just did it or had already been done before, no difference grammatically.

21. Acts 2:31—Jesus should not be left in hell or body see corruption.

M. THE MESSIAH'S CROSS OF OFFENSE

1. Cross (Greek "stauron") means upright stake.

2. Romans used a cross with a crossbeam.

3. Only traitors, slaves, and others crucified.

4. Titus 2:5—Jesus equal to God, took form of servant, made in likeness of man, obedient to death of the cross.


6. Matt 27:18–19—Jesus to be betrayed to chief priests, condemned, delivered to Gentiles to mock, scourge, and crucified, rise 3rd day.

7. 909 of Gospels about Jesus' 3 year ministry—1/3 of that about last week of his life.

8. Jewish tradition: cursed is everyone that hageth on a tree (public display of dead or dying man a great degradation)


10. Num 15:36—stoning is the lowest form of criminal prosecution to the Jews, was done outside the city.

11. Matt 27:32—Simon of Cyrene compelled to carry Jesus' cross.

12. Shame of death by crucifixion made many doubt Messiahship of Jesus—Thomas doubted, Peter went fishing (Jn 21:3).

13. Matt 20:22–23—disciples to drink cup Jesus was baptized with.
SUMMARY—When Slain 13.26.1X.N.2.r

r. Ex 12—story of passover, prototype of Jesus' sacrifice, delivery from sin
s. Num 28:16-17—14th day of Abib is passover (passover lamb killed)—15th is feast
t. 1 Cor 5:7—Jesus is passover sacrifice for us
u. Mk 16:9—Jesus was risen
v. Lk 24:21-—3rd day since things were done (vs. 18-20; Matt 27:62-66)
w. Matt 28:1—end of Sabbath in Greek 'Sabbath' is plural
x. Mk 16:1—Mary bought spices after Sabbath (Abib 15) (Lk 23:56)
y. Acts 10:40—Jesus rose on 3rd day
z. See also MS 49:63-68 "How Long was Christ in the Tomb"
13.28 Brigham Young also visited me after his death. On one occasion he and Brother Heber C. Kimball came in a splendid chariot, with fine white horses, and accompanied me to a conference that I was going to attend. When I got there I asked Brother Brigham if he would take charge of the conference. "No," he said, "I have done my work here; I have come to see what you are doing and what you are teaching the people." And he told me Joseph Smith had taught him in Winter Quarters, to teach the people to get the Spirit of God. He said, "I want you to teach the people to get the Spirit of God. You cannot build up the Kingdom of God without that."

That is what I want to say to the brethren and sisters here today. Every man and woman in this Church should labor to get that spirit. We are surrounded by those evil spirits that are at war against God and against everything looking to the building up of the kingdom of God; and we need this Holy Spirit to enable us to overcome these influences. I have had the Holy Ghost in my travels. Every man has that has gone out in to the vineyard and labored faithfully for the cause of God. I have referred to the administration of angels to myself. What did those angels do? One of them taught me some things relating to the signs that should precede the coming of the Son of Man. Others came and saved my life. What then? They turned and left me. But how is it with the Holy Ghost? The Holy Ghost does not leave me if I do my duty. It does not leave any man who does his duty. We have known this all the way through. Joseph Smith told Brother John Taylor on one occasion to labor to get the Spirit of God, and to follow its dictation, and it would become a principle of revelation within him. God has blessed me with that, and everything I have done since I have been in this Church has been done upon that principle. The Spirit of God has told me what to do, and I have had to follow that. ——DWN 53:643*, No. 21, Nov. 7, 1896, WW

13.30 The Holy Ghost is a personage in the Godhead, and is not that which lighteth every man that comes into the world. ——Imp. Era II:362*, pt. 1, March 1908, JS

13.31 This leads us to believe that as the Christ was an immortal personage of tabernacle and therefore, of form, so also is the Father; while the Holy Ghost, we are told, is a personage of spirit; and these three personages constitute the Godhead. ——Seventies Course in Theology, No. 6, B. H. Roberts

13.32 The Prophet Joseph used this term ('Personage') always in the sense of meaning an individual, including bodily form, with all that belongs to it. ——5th Year Seventies Course, p. 58*, B. H. Roberts

13.33 But it should be held as a most positive dogma of revelation that the Holy Ghost is a spiritual personage. Going out from him, however—radiating from him, is a universal influence and power that permeates all the works of God..." ——The Gospel, p. 189* B. H. Roberts (1966 ed)

13.34 SUMMARY—Holy Ghost, see page 602.
INTRODUCTION

Doctrine in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is introduced only by the Priesthood, and specifically through the President. Usually it is not voted upon, only taught by him and then left to the members to accept or reject. Joseph Smith's "King Follett Discourse" is a prime example. It was accepted as doctrine from the day it was delivered, to this day, and as yet has not been voted upon at any conference (BYUS W78:216). "As man is God once was, ..." is a familiar couplet, but not doctrine according to opinion of some men.

The Doctrine that places Adam as the spiritual and temporal head of mankind was presented through the proper channel: The President of the Church, Brigham Young, announced it at April Conference and addressed it to "Saint and sinner" and gave it in answer to controversy that then existed among the Elders in order to put an end to such contention.

After teaching this Doctrine at Conference, President Young then instructed that it be taught throughout the Church extending even into the foreign mission fields. This is evidenced in the June 1854 Special Mission Conference in London, England as Elder Franklin D. Richards was being made the new mission president, relieving Elder Samuel W. Richards who acted as President over that mission during the time when the Adam Doctrine was first taught there. This most interesting missionary conference included several district reports mentioning reactions among investigators who had been taught that Doctrine. This is the occasion when Elder Franklin D. Richards instructs them to have members who were struggling with the Doctrine to "roll it aside," and the elders were to tell them that objected to the Doctrine that "...the Prophet and Apostle Brigham has declared it, and that it is the word of the Lord." (see 1:83)

An apostle in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was trying diligently to dissuade an Elder and his wife from pursuing their path in the Fulness of the Gospel, and that they ought to return back into the Church. He stated that the Church does not interpret many of the revelations and doctrines the same way they used to. After he had finished, the Elder told the Apostle that he had given him good advice and it was precisely what he would like to do if it were possible. And then he said to the Apostle "Would you raise your hand to the square, in the sign of the Priesthood, and as an apostle of the Lord witness that what you said of the Church position is true. That we no longer have to live plural marriage and the higher laws." The Apostle turned in his chair and was silent for some time. Then he turned to the Elder and stated that he could not, as he had not prayed about that.

A man must do what he must do, but the principle that I am illustrating in connection with the subject of Adam is that in books written against this Doctrine, the approach is always intellectual, there is not testimony. In Elwood Norris' *Be Not Deceived* he mentions how he "flirted" with the Doctrine intellectually and with the interest of a curiosity seeker. With further "searching" and "re-searching", he then states he "realized" it was a false concept. Absent is any appeal to answers to his prayers through the Holy Ghost (*Deceived* 16). I mention this only because the absence
proves that he has fallen..."

I will preach on the plurality of Gods. I have selected this text for that express purpose. I wish to declare I have always and in all congregations when I have preached on the subject of the Deity, it has been the plurality of Gods. It has been preached by the Elders for fifteen years. I have always declared God to be a distinct personage, Jesus Christ a separate and distinct personage from God the Father, and that the Holy Ghost was a distinct personage, and a Spirit, and these three constitute three distinct personages and three Gods. If this is in accordance with the New Testament, lo and behold! we have three Gods anyhow, and they are plural; and who can contradict it?...

Paul says there are Gods many and Lords many. I want to set it forth in a plain and simple manner; but to us there is but one God—that is pertaining to us; and he is in all things through all. But if Joseph Smith says there are Gods many and Lords many, they cry, "Away with him! Crucify him! Crucify him!"

Mankind verily say that the Scriptures are with them. Search the Scriptures, for they testify of things that these apostates would gravely pronounce blasphemy. Paul, if Joseph Smith is a blasphemer, you are. I say there are Gods many and Lords many, to us only one, and we are to be in subjection to that one, and no man can limit the bounds or the eternal existence of eternal time. Hath he beheld the eternal world, and is he authorized to say that there is only one God? He makes himself a fool if he thinks or says so, and there is an end to his career or progress in knowledge. He cannot obtain all knowledge, for he has sealed up the gate to it.

Some say I do not interpret the Scriptures the same as they do. They say it means the heathen's gods. Paul says there are Gods many and Lords many; and that makes a plurality of Gods, in spite of the whims of all men. Without a revelation, I am not going to give them the knowledge of the God of heaven. You know and I testify that Paul had no illusion to the heathen gods. I have it from God, and get over it if you can. I have a witness of the Holy Ghost, and a testimony that Paul had no illusion to the heathen gods in the text....

Baner signifies to bring forth; Eloheim is from the word El, God, in the singular number; and by adding the word heim, it renders it Gods. It read first, "In the beginning the head of the Gods brought forth the Gods," or, as others have translated it, "The head of the Gods called the Gods together." I want to show a little learning as well as other fools—

A little learning is a dangerous thing.

Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring.

There shall draughts intoxicate the brain. (Poem omitted in TPJS 371)

And drinking largely sober us up again.

All this confusion among professional translators is for want of drinking another draught.

The head God organized the heavens and the earth. I defy all the world to refute me. In the beginning the heads of the Gods organized the heavens and the earth. Now the learned priests and the people rage, and the heathen imagine a vain thing. If we pursue the Hebrew text further, it reads: "Bereshit bara'ah Eloheim sit aushanayen vehou amni"—"The head one of the Gods said, Let us make a man in our own image."...

In the very beginning the Bible shows there is a plurality of Gods beyond the power of refutation. It is a great subject I am dwelling on. The word Eloheim ought to be in the plural all the way through—Gods. The heads of the Gods appointed one God for us; and when you take (that) view of the subject, it sets one free to see all the beauty, holiness, and glory of the Gods. All I want is to get the simple, naked truth, and the whole truth....I want to read the text to you myself—"I am a God, and the Father and the Father is agreed with me, and we are agreed as one." The Greek shows that it should be agreed. "Father, I pray for them that Thou hast given me out of the world, and not for those alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be agreed, as Thou, Father, art with me, and I with Thee, that they also may be agreed with us," and all come to dwell in unity, and in

GENERAL REFERENCES—Joseph Smith's Teachings 1.10

all the glory and everlasting burnings of the Gods; and then we shall see as we are seen, and be as our God and He as His Father. I want to reason a little on this subject. I learned it by translating the papyrus which is now in my house. I learned a testimony concerning Abraham, and he reasoned concerning the God of Heaven, "in order to do that," said he, "suppose we have two facts: that supposes another fact may exist—two men on the earth, one wiser than the other, would logically show that another who is wiser than the wiser may exist. Intelligences exist one above another, so that there is no end to them."

If Abraham reasoned thus—If Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and John discovered that God the Father of Jesus Christ had a Father, you may suppose that He had a Father also. Where was there ever a son without a father? And where was there ever a father without first being a son? Whenever did a tree or anything spring into existence without a progenitor? And everything comes in this way. Paul says that which is earthly is in the likeness of that which is heavenly. Hence if Jesus had a Father, can we not believe that He had a Father also? I despise the idea of being scared to death at such a doctrine, for the Bible is full of it. I want you to pay particular attention to what I am saying. Jesus said that the Father wrought precisely in the same way as His Father had done before Him. As the Father had done before? He laid down His life, and took it up the same as His Father had done before. He did as He was sent, to lay down His life and take it up again; and then was committed unto Him the keys. I know it is good reasoning. I have reason to think that the Church is being purged. I saw Satan fall from heaven and the way they ran was a caution. All these are wonders and marvels in our eyes in these last days. So long as men are under the law of God, they have no fears—they do not scare themselves.... When things that are of the greatest importance are passed over by the weak-minded men without even a thought I want to see truth in all its bearings and hug it to my bosom. I believe all that God ever revealed, and I never hear of a man being damned for believing too much; but they are damned for unbelief.----DBC 6:473-7, *TPJS 369-74, June 18, 1856

"THE FIRST MAN"

1.11 I do know most definitely that unless we are one we are not Christ's; and I also know that if we are not one with brother Brigham, our leader, we are not one with Christ. Yes, I know this, and my feelings are and have been with brother Brigham all the time.

I have learned by experience that there is but one God that pertains to this people and He is the God that pertains to this earth—the first man. That first man sent his own Son to redeem the world, to redeem his brethren; his life was taken, his blood shed, that our sins might be remitted.----JD 4:11, *HCK, June 29, 1856

1.12 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.

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.----Gen 2:5, 7, 8

1.13 And he beheld that they did contain the five books of Moses, which gave an account of the creation of the world, and also Adam and Eve, who were our first parents;----1 Nephi 5:11

1.14 That you may come up unto the crown prepared for you, and be made rulers over many kingdoms, saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Zion, who hath established the foundations of Adam-ondi-Ahman;----D & C 78:15

1.15 And from Enoch to Abel, who was slain by the conspiracy of his brother, who
received the priesthood by the commandments of God, by the hand of his father Adam, who was the first man... D & C 84:16

1.16 From Adam to Seth, who was ordained by Adam, at the age of sixty-nine years, and was blessed by him three years previous to his (Adam's) death, and received the promise of God by his father, that his posterity should be the chosen of the Lord, and that they should be preserved unto the end of the earth... D & C 107:42, 1835

1.17 And the first man of all men have I called Adam, which is many... Moses 1:34

1.18 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 spirit only were they created and made according to my word... Moses 3:7, * (Moses 1:34)

1.19 It (Priesthood) was conferred upon me from the fathers; it came down from the fathers, from the beginning of time, yea, even from the beginning, or before the foundations of the earth to the present time, even the right of the firstborn, on the first man, who is Adam, our first father, through the fathers unto me... Abraham 1:3

1.20 Commencing with Adam, who was the first man, who is spoken of in Daniel as being the 'Ancient of Days,' or in other words, the first and oldest of all... DHC 4:207, * TDJS 167, 186, MS 18:164, Joseph Smith, 5 Oct 1840 * (also (1.3))

1.21 It is true that we read in the Bible with regard to the twelve tribes of Israel, that they will be gathered together tribe by tribe, and that when they are so gathered they will hear the sentence of the Ancient of Days... JD 11:328, * BY, Feb 19, 1867

1.22 They will come up tribe by tribe, and the Ancient of Days, He who led Abraham and talked to Noah, Enoch, Isaac, and Jacob, that very Being will come and judge the twelve tribes of Israel He will say, 'You rebelled, and you have been left to the mercies of the wicked'... JD 11:327, * BY, Feb 10, 1867 (MFG 6)

1.23 Adam is the first man. He was placed in he Garden of Eden, and is our great progenitor... MS 57:556, * WW * (PA 70)

1.24 Doctrines of Salvation 1:92--MEANING OF "FIRST FLESH", Adam was first flesh on the earth and the first man; 'flesh' means mortality

1.25 JD 1:50 CORRELATION

INTRODUCTION: After studying the appendix in Prophecy Key to the Future, where Joseph Smith's "White Horse Prophecy" was cross reference, I thought it would be instructive to see if Brigham Young's 1852 discourse on Adam thought would stand up to a similar analysis. The results are as follows:

My next sermon to both saint... 1. Compendium, 1884, p. 193--"see JD 1:46-51"

...and sinner 2. MS 16:534 (SDFR) --AD is "thru prophet & apostle BY and is word of Lord!" (1.83)

...remains 3. MS 24:100 (AML) --men cut off for rejecting AD (1.87)

mystery 4. MS 16:482 (Cafall) --investigator trouble because they couldn't accept AD (1.80)

JD 13:263(HY)--veil over LDS minds about Adam (19.56)

SUMMARY--JD 1:50 Correlation 1.25

...Elders have 4. HLR 62--some believe, some can prove, others disbelieve (see AOG/SCENT, minutes of School of Prophet) (1.160)

...Adam came 5. JD 1:556 (CCKW) we don't go to earth where Eloheim, Jehovah, or Adam came from (1.43)

...conflicting view JD 4:217-8 (BY) Father after res. partook of fruits, children mortal (also JD 6:275) (1.48)

...into the JD 7:209 (BY) we are products of parents born from another planet given power to propagate (1.56)

...garden... JD 8:244 (BY) Adam brot seeds & animals from earth where he lived with his Father (1.60)

...with a JD 10:235 (CCKW) Adam & assoc. came to people (1.63) Gospel 266-9 Adam & plants from older earth (1.109)

...celestial body... WWJ 4-9-52 Father brot celestial body (quote BY) Father begt all spirits, came, partook (1.165)

...of his wives... JSWR 63 & 64 BY taught Adam & Eve res. before coming to earth (1.138)

...Eve, 7. JD 2:6(BY) I do not believe Adam made of this earth (1.43)

...he helped 8. JD 3:319 (BY) made on another earth like you & I (1.45)

...to make & JD 11:122-3(BY) Father is Father of spirits & creator of bodies, organize this world (1.66)

...He is our 9. JD 17:143 (BY) Father of our spirits is maker, fmrmr, and producer of mortal bodies (1.73)

...of the JD 18:261(BY) celestial body brot forth spirit (1.74)

...resurrected... JD 6-18-73(BY) we are Adam's children by spirit & flesh, after his res., came here to make bodies for His spirit children--earth like one where he was mortal (1.89)

...procreation... DW 12-29-88(JETALimage) Adam a savior on another world, resurrected (1.90)

Gospel 268-9 (BHR) Adam & Eve brot forth by procreation (1.103)

AF 472-3 (JETALimage) only res. bodies produce spirit offspring (1.179)

DS 1:90-91 (JFS) Adam made of this earth--not res. (1.171)

DS 1:97 (JFS) cel. body means a spirit in celestial world (1.172)

AGK 5:170-1 (JFS) Adam came here as spirit so we do as we do (1.178)

HLJR 62 rev. in Nauvoo Adam had many wives (1.160)

WWJ 4-9-52 (quote BY) Father brot 1 of his wives 91,165

JJLJ 2-7-77 (BY) Eve bore spirits of all living (1.156)

JD 3:312 (BY) Adam brot a wife (1.45)

JD 8:208 (BY) if faithful, women become Eves (1.59)

JD 12:97 (BY) faithful women to become an Eve (1.70)

KTT 55-2(PPT) a son of God comes from sun with spouse (1.106)

TS 172 (OPF) Father has plurality of wives (1.135)

DN 6-18-73 (BY) Adam brot one of his wives (1.89)

JD 3:319 (BY) Adam was chief manager in creating earth (1.45)

JD 10:335 (CCKW) Adam & Assoc. Organ. earth not Eloheim (1.69)

DN 6-18-73 (BY) Adam told by Eloheim to go & make earth, it was in chaos, got in shape with help of brethren (1.89)

Gibbs 18-9 God head of procreation, father of spirits and bodies (1.102)

MS 17:735-6 (FDR) God the Father is Adam or michael (1.85)

JD 4:218(BY) Father created all spirits (JD7:290) (1.45)

JD 13:178, 150 God is Father (1.27d)

JD 14:11 children of God (Adam)

JD 14:16 (BY) children of Adam literally, spiritually, etc.

HLRR 10-6-64 BY taught Adam is natural Father of every spirit & is God & eternal Father (1.160)

JIBY Adam is father of all spirits (JWJ 12-11-69) (1.159)
...only God...2.9.10 God with whom we have to do.

...every man...11.9.11 Adam will know it.

...brot...2.12.14 Adam's first mortal was...brot seeds...

...began...4.14.14 by first of human family...

...tell you...5.15.16 more blasphemy.

...told you the truth...5.15.16...overrighteous...

...ADAM|ONDI|AHMAN

1. ADAM = man, mankind, human
Bible Dictionary. 2) difficult to decide how far "adam" is used as a proper noun 2, (J) two heads--Adam and Jesus Christ (MPC 119). Gen 5:1-3 called their name Adam (Moses 6:9; Gen 6:9 IT).

2. JC called 1.) Son of God 45 times in NT 2.) Son of man 80 times (AGQ 1:10-12 this shows dignity). Eph 3:4-5 bow my knee to Father of JC 3. of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, is family of man - family of Adam.

Moses 6:57 (Gen 6:60 IT) in language of Adam, Man of Holiness is His name, and son is Son of Man - JC

JD 2:342 (OP) name of God "Ahman" Son of God "Son Ahman", name of men is "Sons Ahman", angels "angloman" (MFG 121; T 11:213; Deceiv 86, 105).

3. D&C 107:53-6 = 3 years before death, met at Adam-ondi-ahman (3-28-1835) 7 High...
7 High Priests met (MFG 122: Decease 83-4)
D&C 116 (LHCX 222) - Ahman is in Spring hill, Davies Co. Missouri
Michael - "one like God" - prince - "taking 1st place" "archangel" - chief angel
4. JD 12:188 (HCK) - I have been to the altar where Adam offered sacrifice, blessed his sons & left them & went into heaven
5. JD 17:372 (JT) - Adam before he left the earth, called his people together
6. ADAM-ONDI-ADMAN
Adam - first man
Ondi - in presence of God (This name seems to apply to the event at 3094 BC when Adam, a mortal office and messenger, and Israel's father, stood before him, Yahovah, Christ, and at 3000 AD when same scene will be repeated. To say that Adam cannot be a God because while on earth he prayed to God, is like saying Jesus can't be considered a God because he also prayed to a God!)
7. D&C 78:11, 15, 16 - Holy One of Zion established Adam-Ondi-Adman, appointed Michael your prince, established his feet, set him on high, gave Him the keys of the government under council & direction of Holy One
Holy One - Christ office
D&C 29:26 - Michael to sound trump, dead arise
2 Thess 4:16 - Christ descend with voice of archangel dead rise
TPJS 156-9 - I saw Adam in valley of Adam-ondi-ahman, gave patriarchal blessings, Lord appeared & Adam blessed for he wanted to bring them into presence of God
TPJS 159 - Moses sought to bring Coif into presence of God, couldn't (D&C 84: 23-5)
MS 15:801 - Adam calls key holders, they acknowledge him sovereign of all (also MS 17:194-5 (1.78, 85)
9. BYUS F78:83 - Ahman is God's name, when you call on him think of Adam (1.101)

1.27 MICHAEL, AN ARCHANGEL
1. Bible Enc 1:159-62
a. Greek "angelou" and Hebrew "milachim" (pl), both mean any kind of person or offices sent forth (original sense in Bible: Job 1:14; 1 Sam 11:3; Lk 9:52) and earthly also (Ps 104:4 he maketh winds, and also Heb 1:7). See also 1:13: Mal 3:1; Isa 42:19; Mal 2:7; Eccl 5:4-6.
b. angels of heaven: Matt 26:46; 13:11; Jn 1:51; Matt 22:30
c. angels of darkness: Matt 25:41; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6
d. THE ANGEL: Bible Enc 1:160 ' Finally, there is the angel, by way of eminence-one who, appears to be infinitely raised above all besides who bears the name of angel-designated sometimes 'the angel of the Lord's presence'; 'the angel in whom his name is,' 'the angel of the covenant and lord of the Temple.' 'Michael the archangel,' (Isa 63:9; Ex 23:21; Mal 3:1; Jude 9, 12, and represent as offering up the prayers of God's people, disappointing their enemies, and symbolically taking possession of the whole world as his proper heritage. (Rev 8:3; 12:7; 10:2). It is uniformly but one being to whom such peculiar acts and designations are ascribed; they are never spoken of as belonging to a company, or as shared by one in common with some others; and, as they clearly imply divine properties, and performances strictly mediatiorial and redemptive, they can be understood of none but the Lord Jesus Christ.' (NOTE: Although the above quote does not entirely coincide with the revelations through Brother Joseph, it does illustrate that Greek and Hebrew scholars see no objection philologically for ascribing the appellation of "angel!" to a member of the Godhead.)
2. Strong H64: KJV "angel" is always 'malach", #4397 in the OT from an unused root meaning to despatch as a deputy, a messenger) and "angels"

SUMMARY -- Michael, an Archangel 1.27.2
#32 (Strong OT) meaning to bring good tidings in NT.
a. "Angel" in OT is always #4397 except in Ps 8:5--a little lower than the "Elohim" #430 and in Ps 68:17--thousands, even thousands of "shamim" #8136, charges, repetitions
b. "Angel" in NT is always #92 except in Lk 20:50--are equal unto the "aggelos" like-angels
c. "Angels" appears in Ps 78:26--man did eat food of mighty ones #47 "abyr"
d. "archangel" appears only on 1 Thess 4:16--voice of archangel and Jude 9--the archangel. "Archangel" is "archeggalois" #743 which prefix (arch) comes from #747 "archeo" meaning 1st in rank or political power, to rule over. (see Mat 22:9; Lk 8:41; Jn 3:1; Acts 23:5; Lk 12:50) (NOTE: Even as Heavenly Father rules over mankind and yet is not a man, so also Michael presiding over angels does not necessarily imply that he himself is an angel)
3. Deceived chapter 7--Adam is Michael - archangel - angel therefore not a God.
4. JD 13:187* (OP)--"According to the revelations which God has given, there are different classes of angels. Some angels are Gods, and still possess the lower office called angels. Adam is called an archangel, yet he is a God. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, no doubt, have the right to officiate in the capacity of angels if they choose, but still they have ascended to their exaltation, to a higher state than that of angels--namely, to thrones, kingdoms, principalities and powers, to reign over kingdoms and to hold the everlasting Priesthood."
5. NOTE: The principle of one in a higher Priesthood office officiating in a lesser office is thoroughly understood by every modern LDS Priesthood holder.
D&C 107:17. So it can be easily perceived that the argument that Adam cannot be God because he preides over angels is a pretty good sounding one, but as Brother Joseph said in similar circumstances: "It is not true." FMP 2:223
6. BE 1:158-3-"ANCIENT OF DAYS," an expression applied to Jehovah twice in a vision of Daniel, ch. 7.9, 13, 22, apparently much in the same sense as 'Eternal.' (NOTE: Bible Scholars find no difficulty in applying this term to Deity.)
7. TS 145 (OP) -- no office of Priesthood so low that glorified men won't officiate in, so high they can't reach and control (Doc of K 405-6)

1.28 BLOOD
1. TPJS 367 - no blood in resurrected body (TPJS 326)(14.2)
2. TPJS 326 - no flesh & blood, only flesh & bones quickened by spirit
3. JD 2:302-32 - Adam ate & fell, no other way
4. JD 4:217-8 (BY) - Father, created tabernacles by partaking of coarse elements, system changed & his children were thus formed (1.48)
5. JD 6:250 (BY) - Adam ate grosser matter to produce mortal bodies for his spiritual offspring (1.54)
6. JD 7:163 Jesus had another element in veins after resurrection, blood formed by what we eat & drink
7. JD 7:257 - restored to condition of Adam before fall, immortal (1.55)
8. JD 9:283 (BY) - so much children of God, Heavenly Father, as our mortal progenitors; for Adam's flesh, bone of his bone
9. JD 12:186 (HCK) - I have been to altar where Adam offer sacrifice, blessed sons & then left & then went into heaven
10. CHMR 5 - Adam's body had spiritual element, no blood until fall
11. Liahona 633 - Adam had spiritual body when put in Eden, resurrected and no blood, fell made him mortal & created blood (MK 23)(1.94)
12. WOM 198-9 - forbidden tree had elements of death, eat it & blood diffused into tabernacles - basis of mortal generation is blood, without blood no mortal can be born (1.146)
SUMMARY—Blood 1.28.13

13. JLN 1:21--Adam didn't lay body in dust, returned to spirit world (1.156)
14. MDOP 336--fall of Adam was death of an immortal tabernacle (1.117)
15. WOM 189--they ate mortal fruit to become mortal (1.42)
16. Sem. Lecture 1921--fruit changed Adam's blood, modified resurrected body
   made subject to death--Church doesn't teach but authorities do (MK 106)
   (1.132)

1.29 FALL AND REDEMPTION
1. TPFS 52--Adam was made to open the way of the world
2. DHC 5:26--Father had power in self, so has Son--so Father hath some day laid
   his body down & taken it up (1.8)
3. J 2:302 (BY)--Adam partook, "no other way!"
4. J 7:158 (BY)--man partook so he could know & discern good & evil, come in
   contact with evil
5. J 9:103, 305 (BY)--Adam given laws by his Father & God, brought in contact
   with enemy, not deceived
6. J 10:235--Adam imitated in holy endowment (1.65)
7. J 10:312 (BY)--Adam not in direct opposition to God, transgressed command-
   ment
8. J 12:70 (BY)--Devil has truth, Adam partook or would be separated--it opened
   his eyes
9. J 13:145 (BY)--it was economy of Heaven to have Adam partake--don't blame
   Eve
10. J 23:125 (WW)--Adam performed exactly his part--some said Adam not under
    necessity of falling
11. Gen 5:5--Adam died ("yaveom") could easily have been ("yavom") he
    changed, see Genesisus 558-9 (T 13:300; 39:56)
12. John 3:16--God so loved the world that he gave his Son
13. J 26:300 (OFW)--Adam to die in day he ate fruit - 1000 years
14. J 26:262 (OFR)--tree of life to be transplanted once more to Earth

1.30 GLORY

(NOTE: A major objection "Christians" have against the Mormon concept that man
can become a God, is that they view it as a blasphemous equating of man to God.
Obviously this is a rhetorical oversimplification dishonestly made for polemical reasons.
Such an equation has never been taught. What has been and is taught is that man,
through the atonement of the Messiah, can become a joint-heir with Christ and
through obedience to the laws of God can arrive at the station of Abraham and Noah
where God can pronounce a man perfect in his generation. A major difference be-
 tween God and man, (in his present condition) is that God possesses, among his
many attributes, GLORY. The following reviews the usage of the word "glory" in
the scriptures in relation to man.)

1. Strong G24--"glory" #1391 'doxan' from #1380 'Dokeo' to think to seem
   (Doxia is the most common word for 'glory")
2. Lk 2:9--the glory (#1391) of the Lord shone round about
3. Lk 3:14--glory (#1391) to God in the highest
4. Lk 2:32--Jesus the glory (#1391) of the people of Israel.
5. Matt 4:8--Satan offered Jesus the glory (#1391) of the world
6. Matt 16:27--Jesus to come in glory (#1391) of Father with his angels (also
   Matt 24:30; 25:31; Mk 8:38
7. Heb 1:3--Jesus in brightness of God's glory (#1391)
8. Ps 8:4--man made little lower than angel, crowned him with glory (#3519)
    and honor (see Heb 2:7, 9 Jesus bring men to glory, call them "Brethren")
9. Strong H584 #3519--"tabach" splendor, copiousness (in good sense), heavy
   weight, from verb "tabah" to be heavy, burdensome (#5519) is the common

SUMMARY—Glory 1.30.9

OT word for "glory")
Ex 16:7--see the glory (#3519) of the Lord (also Ex 24:16; Dn 5:24; Isa 6:3;
Mal 2:2; etc.)
10. Heb 2:5-8--(quotes Ps 8:4-6) made man lower than angels, crowned him with
    glory (#1391) and honor
11. Heb 2:9-11--Jesus made lower than angels, crowned with glory (#1391) and
    honor & he brings many sons unto glory (#1391)--they that sanctified and
    are sanctified are one, and he calls them "brethren"?
11. 1 Pet 5:1--be partakers of the glory (#1391)
11. 1 Pet 5:4--you shall receive a crown of glory (#1391)
11. 1 Pet 5:10--hath called us unto his eternal glory (#1391)

1.31 YHVH (see also 13.1.III.B; 13.34)

(NOTE: Among Christians it is taught that Jesus Christ is the same as the Father and
therefore the creator of all things. Modern Mormons separate the two but continue
to maintain Jesus as the Creator. But such was not the teaching of early Mormonism.
(See 28.15, 28.16)

1. Matt 23:9--IT can say no man your creator or Heavenly Father, for your creator
is Father in heaven
MS 15 (Suppl) 63--the Great Jehovah, the Everlasting Father, the creator of
the heavens and the earth (27.193)
2. 2 Ne 9:41--Holy One of Israel is keeper of gate, employes no servant there
   JD 9:41 (HCK)--Adam opens gate & conducts faithful to throne by one (37.10)
3. MS 51:278 (GQC)--God is being who walked in Garden & with prophets (1.88)
   JD 11:326 (BY)--Ancient of days lead Abraham, Enoch, Isaac, Jacob (1.21)
4. DHC 3:385--Adam received keys before creation, not ordained as mortal (1.1)
   TPFS 308--Jesus obtained Priesthood by keeping all the commandments (11.5)
5. JD 13:187 (OP)--different classes of angels, Adam an archangel & yet a God--
   Abraham, Isaac, Jacob can function as an angel yet are at higher state of
   exaltation (1.274)
6. MS 17:194-5--Adam commissioned to put all things under his will when done
   will fulfill JD 1:50 (see Gen 1:26, 28; Moses 2:26, 30) (1.84; 1.37)
   Matt 6:19--Jesus prayed that the Father's will be done in earth and heaven
7. MS 15:802-4 (SWV)--Adam accounts to Yahovah who presents his to Eloheim, this
   doesn't detract from Adam or Jesus (Mk 77:9) (1.78)
   JD 1:356 (HCK)--won't go to earth where Adam, Eloheim, or Jehovah came
   from (see LHC 460) (1.42)
8. MS 57:555 (WW)--don't ask who God, Adam, Christ, Jehovah are (1895; MK 100)
   (1.97)
9. MS 17:785 (OP)--one of these is God the Father, Michael, or Adam (1.85)
8. DN 6:18-1873 (BY)--Adam came & formed earth, got it into shape for business,
   called Adam because he was first man on it & was the framer & maker--
   his brethren helped bring it into existence (1.80)
   JD 3:319 (BY)--Adam helped make this earth & was chief manager (also JD
   8:343, HCR) (1.45)
   JD 18:259--Adam prepared an earth after receiving crown & dominion
9. MS 17:195 (FDR)--Adam controls destiny of posterity (MK 63-4) (1.84)
10. JLN 19-21--(BY, endowment) Adam lived, resurrected, exalted, begot spirits
    before he came to this earth (MK 64) (1.165)
   JD 4:271--you will hold every son & daughter responsible when you are an
   Adam
12. JC 4, 32 (JET)--Jesus was and is Jehovah, the creator (1.180, 181)
   Heb 1:1-4; Moses 1:2-6)
14. Isa 53:1-12--YHVH will send his suffering servant
15. JD 11:327 (BY)--tribes come to Ancient of Days who led Abraham, talked to
   Noah, Enoch, Issac, Jacob (1.22)
SUMMARY---OFFICES AND ROLES 1.33

1. PA 30---BY viewed the Godhead as roles (1.120)
2. TPJS 346---Father exclaimed (JC 1.84) (his place (1.9))
3. D&C 107:17---M.P. can officiate in all lesser offices
4. D&C 29:34---Adam whom I created
   a. DS 1:100, D&C 29:34---shows Adam is under JC’s direction (1.175)
   b. Adam Who? 24---JPS uses D&C 29:34 to show Adam created by JC
   c. Adam Who? 25-6---Bible not a myth, didn’t manipulate people nor do Presidents of Church
   d. Deceive 134---Norris doesn’t support this modern interpretation or comment upon it
   e. If Jesus is Holy One, then he created Adam (D&C 29:34), he created the heavens & earth (D&C 14:9; 38:3), has an only Begotten Son (D&C 128:42; 46), is the Great I Am, Alpha & Omega who took Zion of Enoch into his bosom (D&C 38:1-4; Alma 11:39) his works have no end nor beginning (D&C 29:33), is from everlasting to everlasting (D&C 61:1), thru Him worlds were created & inhabitants are begotten sons & daughters of God (D&C 76:24), he created worlds without end (Moses 1:33), he is without beginning of days or end of years (D&C 76:16).
   f. If he is each of these, then he is above Adam!
   g. But Jesus Christ couldn’t 1.) create spirits (himself being a pre-existent spirit), nor 2.) create Adam’s body (for Jesus had not an immortal body in 4004 BC.

5. Use of Titles in Scripture
   a. Matt 16:16---Thou art Christ, son of Living God
   b. Moses 13:1---am Lord God Almighty, endless is name, without beginning of days or end of years
   c. Alma 11:39---He (son of God) is very Eternal Father

TITLES

ELOHEIM---head God, God Almighty, Council, Father, Grandfather (JC called God ‘Eloheim’) by Father see Ps. 45:6-7; Heb 1:8
YAHVH---Son, Jehovah, Christ, Jehovah Christ, Father, Creator
MICHAEL---one like God, Prince, Archangel, Angel of Days, Adam, Organizer
ADAM---first man
EVE---first woman
Other mortal offices---Elijah, Elias, Lucifer, Adversary, Satan (Matt 16:23; Blessed (Matt 16:17; 26:34; etc.), Jehovah (he that is qualifying to a future Yahovah Christ).

P&DOT 616---hard to differentiate between the person and the office of “Eliash”

1.34 ADAM’S OFFSPRING
1. D&C 130:20—"law irrevocably decreed before world
2. JD 1:50 (BY)—seeds from another sphere to earth by Adam (1.38)
3. TPJS 237—God had a Father and Grandfather
4. TPJS 198—bear after own kind—bring forth on no other principle (JFS Jr. footnote), includes all creatures
5. Moses 2:5—creation story spiritual
6. JD 2:6 (BY)—Adam made of dust of this earth a baby story, BY doesn't believe—Adam not made of this earth, "made as you and I are made", no other way, if made of dust, still be a baby (1.44)
7. JD 2:160 (HCK)—Lord brought seed with him (144)
8. JD 4:217-8 (BY)—God is same species as us—Adam took of coarse elements so he would produce tabernacles (1.48)
9. JD 4:334 (HCK)—God came here & helped organize this earth, had created others, and had power to propagate the human species or he couldn't have done what he did (1.48)
10. JD 6:101 (HCK)—God produced us on "same principle we produce one another" (1.53)
11. JD 7:285 (BY)—adobe story idle tale—no such thing in all eternity, mankind offspring of parents from another planet (1.56)
12. JD 8:243 (HCK)—Adam brot seeds from planet where he lived with his Father (1.60)
13. JD 9:286 (BY)—HCK said JS not worship God without a Father, nor without a mother
14. JD 10:235 (HCK)—Adam & associates came to people this earth (1.63)
15. JD 11:122 (BY)—God created man as we create our children, no other process of creation in Heaven (1.66)
16. JD 11:262 (BY)—we are flesh of God's flesh, bone of his bone
17. JD 11:156—God is scientific character, obedience to law made him God, we are His children—He set the machinery in motion
18. JD 16:127 (DHW)—Father in Heaven means more to LDS than just spiritual Father (1.72)
19. TS 109—Father begat Jesus—before God's children were spirits (MK 67) (1.134)
20. Cont 10:265 (BHR)—Adam brot forth by natural laws of procreation (rib story) on some other world (Gospel 268-9) (1.103)
21. Cont 10:267 (JT)—man is offspring of God who propagates his species (1.98)
22. DN 36:676 (QGC)—we are literal descendants of Eternal Father and are like Him by heredity (MS 51:278; MK 37) (1.93)
23. KTT 50-52—Brick story conceals procreation (1.106) (1.103)
24. Cont 10:265 (BHR)—man produces his own kind (MA 164)
25. MDCP 366 (GF)—in first resurrection get immortal body like Adam before he ate of fruit—death introduced thru the fruit (1.117)
26. WOM 179—Adam & Eve cam by regeneration (1.141)
27. Light Unto World 4, 6 (BRM)—immortal body is a resuscitated body (1.107).
28. JLSN 19-21—Adam made like you and I but on another earth (1.156)
29. TS 37:136—Fallen beings beget morasts (flesh & blood)—celestial beings beget spirit children with spiritual fluid in vein (1.133)
30. AF 4:172—only resurrected beings beget spirit offspring (F. P. 1618) (1.179)
31. JD 18:259—after men are crowned, they frame an earth like ours and people it in the same manner as we have been brot forth by our parents, by our Father and God.

1.35 ADAM’S ORIGIN

1. JD 1:150—Adam came to this earth from another sphere--sprots seeds (1.38)
2. JD 3:319—Adam made of dust of an earth, not this one, like you & I (1.45)
3. JD 4:217-8—Father, after ascension, created physical bodies for his spirit offspring (1.48)

SUMMARY—Adam’s Origin 1.35

4. JD 6:275 Adam after his exaltation created physical bodies for spiritual children he had (1.54)
5. JD 1:356 (HCK)—earth where Adam came from (LHCK 460) (1.42)
6. JD 8:244—Adam brot seeds & animals from earth where he dwelt with his Father (1.60)
7. JD 7:285—adobe tale is idle tale (1.56)
8. MS 20:543-5 BY—declared Adam is God and it is the word of the Lord (FDR) (1.63)
9. DN June 18, 1873—Adam made earth, brot wife, created bodies for his spirit children (1.63)
10. DNW December 29, 1888—Adam, as a Savior, receive a resurrection (1.90)
11. KTT 50-2—planter came from older planet—transfers seeds & animals (1.105)
12. Gospel 268-9—Adam brot vegetation & animals from older planet—Adam peopled earth with his children—rib story hides procreation (p. 269-70) (1.103)
13. JLSN 19-21—Adam made on another planet, rec. resurrection there (1.155)
14. Gibbs 18-9—JS taught Adam was head of procreation, father of spirits (1.102)
15. JAHF 16—Adam is father of JC, came from another planet (1.149)
16. JSSW 53-4—Adam made of dust of another planet, he resurrected there (1.159)
17. JLHR 62—Adam father of spirits (1.150)
18. Liahona 6:33—Adam came to earth with resurrected body (1.94)
19. Cont 8:215—before Adam fell he was a resurrected being (1.97)
20. ACRQ 5:170-1—Adam made of this earth, not resurrected or translated (1.178)
21. Fallacy 152-3—Adam not father of Jesus
22. Soi & Morm 100-101—(quotes JD 3:319) BY expressed his opinion (1.131)
23. FTTY 31, 33—Kouslen quotes JD 3:319 without comment
24. DS 1:90, 91, 97, 98, 100, 101, 105—Adam’s body made of this earth, came to earth as spirit, not resurrected before, Jesus redeemed Adam, is subordinate to Jesus—Adam gets revelation from Jesus (1.21-177)
25. JD 2:6—BY didn’t believe Adam was made of dust of THIS earth, baby story (1.43)
26. MFPS 4:205 (JFS)—Adam took an appropriate body, body of a man
27. MFPS 5:289 (HLC)—Adam not resurrected before coming to earth
28. MFPS 4:206—all revelation from heaven is harmonious with each other
29. MFPS 4:206—what is revealed is our duty to receive & retain
30. MFPS 4:206-32 (JFS)—Jesus begotten like you & I were—Father created this world—grandfathers can’t conceive truth—Mary married to Joseph for time, Eternal Father is father of Jesus—nothing not founded on truth to stand

1.36 SOURCES OF ADAM DOCTRINE

1. BYUSS 79:399—"many of the teachings & practices formalized during BY’s administration can be traced to private counsels where JS taught in detail about the affairs of the kingdom" (24.4)
2. PA 48, 49—two sources of AD 1.JS 2. God (1.123)
3. DN June 6, 1877 (BY)—I treasured JS words (19.63)
4. JD 6:279 (BY)—received principles from JS
5. DN June 27, 1860 (BY)—BY’s guilt (if any) is revealing too much about God
SUMMARY—Adam’s Origin 1:36.15

15. DN June 6, 1877 (BY)—when I speak by power of God it is scripture (19.62)
16. JD 4:218 (BY)—I know the Father, am acquainted with Him (1:48)
17. JD 13:262 (BY)—my approved sermons are scriptures (DN January 29, 1889) (15.57)
18. JD 16:46 (BY)—I have had many revelations, received from heaven (19.58)
19. JD 8:8 (BY)—I may have revealed too much about God (19.52)
20. JD 13:263 (BY)—don’t teach something you don’t understand—veil over minds (1.156)
21. Helen Whitney—PM JS originated AD (MFG 50–5) (1.164)
22. WOM 178–81—JS taught AD in Nauvoo (WOM 187, 193–4, 200; MFG 78) (1.140)
23. MS 15:824—folly to hear AD—true through proper channel (1.79)
24. WWJ (1876, BY)—JS taught Adam was God & Father of Jesus (1.169)
25. JD May 14, 1876—JS said Adam was our Father & God (1.165)
26. HJLR 62—Spirit told JLR Adam had several wives (revealed in Nauvoo) (1.160)
27. CN October 9, 1976 (SWK)—AD is false doctrine (1.216)
28. Adam Whorf—AD is ridiculous, pretextous, obviously mistaken, false, fable (1.126)
29. Decree 18, 18, 34, 36, 37—AD is false, has failed its cause, no valid, discarded, disfetched (1.137)
30. MD 18 AD true (consistent) when understood fully (1.152)
31. JS American Prophet 213—JS came for BY at death (MK 93)
32. JD 19:235 (HCK)—JS spoke of these things in endowment but LDS generally couldn’t understand (1.63)
33. (24.4 BY did only what JS instructed him to do (see also BYUS F79:5)
34. COMPARISON: AD—Plurality

ADAM DOCTRINE—BY Discourse 1852

a. became doctrine at Conference (1.37)
b. there was speculation before (1.37)
c. journals show speculation (JLR) (1.37)
d. Elders taught missions (1.37)
e. official status never voted on (1.37)
f. BY told Elders not to speculate (1.37)
g. BY said Elders would cry blasphemy if he taught more (1.37)

1.37 THE WILL OF THE FATHER

The following is a summary of the usage of the NT word “will” (see MS 17:194–5) (1.84)

1. MS 17:194–5—Adam to put all things under his will (1.84)
2. Strong G36 #2307—“thelemia” a determination, choice, decree, inclination, will: from #2309 #2309 “thele” to determine, choose, prefer, to delight in
3. Matt 6:10—the Father’s will (#2307) be done on earth
4. Matt 7:21—doeth the will (#2307) of the Father (Matt 12:50)
5. Matt 28:19—I will (#2309) have money not sacrifice (Matt 12:7)
6. Lk 22:42—not my will (#2307), but thine
7. Jn 1:13—Jesus not born by the will (#2307) of flesh, but of God

GENERAL REFERENCES

1.38 My next sermon will be to both Saint and Sinner. One thing has remained a mystery in this kingdom up to this day. It is in regard to the character of the well-beloved Son of God, upon which subject the Elders of Israel have conflicting views. Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and Sinner! When our Father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial
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body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael, the Archangel, the ANCEINT OF DAYS about whom holy men have written and spoken—He is our FATHER and our God, and the only God with whom WE have to do. Every man upon the earth, professing Christian or non-professing, must hear it, and will know it sooner or later. They came here, organized the raw material, and arranged in their order the herbs of the field, the trees, the apple, the peach, the plum, the pear, and every other fruit that is desirable and good for man; the seed was brought from another sphere, and planted in this earth. The thistle, the corn, the wheat, and the obnoxious weed did di, appear until after the earth was cursed. When Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden fruit, their bodies became mortal from its effects, and therefore their offspring were mortal When the Virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the Father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the Father? He is the first of the human family; and when he took a tabernacle, it was begotten by his Father in heaven, after the same manner as the tabernacles of Cain, Abel, and the rest of the sons and daughters of Adam and Eve; from the fruits of the earth, the first earthly tabernacles were originated by the Father, and so on in succession. I could tell you much more about this; but were I to tell you the whole truth, blasphemy would be nothing to it, in the estimation of the superstitions and overrighteous of mankind. However, I have told you the truth as far as I have gone.

It is true that the earth was organized by three distinct characters, namely, Eloheim, Yahovah, and Michael, these three forming a quorum, as in all heavenly bodies, and in organizing element, perfectly represented in the Deity as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the garden of Eden, and who is our Father in Heaven. Now, let all who may hear these doctrines, pause before they make light of them, or treat them with indifference, for they will prove their salvation or damnation.——JD 1:50–51, BY, April 9, 1852

1.39 (The minutes of the general conference of which this meeting was a part, read as follows: “Friday, April 9 (1852), 6 p.m. The Elders and brethren assembled in the Tabernacle, which was completely crowded. After the usual introductory exercises, President Young preached several sermons on various subjects, the Holy Ghost resting upon him in great power, while he revealed some of the precious things on the kingdom.”——MS 14:356) (This sermon was republished in MS Nov 26, 1853 with no changes. JD Vol I was published in 1854, still no change.)

1.40 And whatsoever they shall speak when moved upon by the Holy Ghost shall be scripture, shall be the will of the Lord, shall be the mind of the Lord, shall be the word of the Lord, shall be the voice of the Lord, and the power of God unto salvation.——D&C 68:4

1.41 The God Mr. B. believes in, is without body, parts, and passions. The God that his ‘brother Mormon’ believes in, is described in the Bible as being a personage of tabernacle, having eyes to see, for he that made the eye shall he not see? Having ears to hear; for his ear(s) are open to hear the prayers of the righteous. He has limbs that he can walk, for the Lord God walked in the garden of the cool of the day. He conversed with His children, as in the case of Moses at the fiery bush, and with Abraham on the plains of Mamre. He also ate and drank with Abraham and others. That is the God the ‘Mormons’ believe it.——JD 1:288, BY, July 24, 1853

1.42 You are talking about heaven and about earth, and about hell, &c. But let me tell you, you are in hell now, and you are here. And you, and they, and we, are here in hell. We shall find it right here where you are on this earth. When we escape from this earth,
we suppose we are going to heaven? Do you suppose you are going to the earth that Adam came from? was it from Jehova? the Lord came from? No. When you learned to become obedient to the Father that dwells upon this earth, to the nature and mind of this earth, and obedient to the messengers He sends—when you have done all that, remember you are not going to leave this earth. You will never leave it until you become qualified, and capable, and capacitated to become a father of an earth yourselves.——JD 3:55*, HC Nv. 14, 1852

1.43 You believe Adam was made of the dust of this earth. This I do not believe, though it is so written in the Bible; but it is not, to my understanding. You can write that information to the States, if you please, that I have publicly declared that I do not believe that portion of the Bible as the Christian world do. I never did, and I never want to. What is the reason I do not? Because I have come to understand and, vanished from my mind all the baby stories my mother taught me when I was a child.——JD 2:5*, BY, Oct. 23, 1853

1.44 God finds us and furnishes us with everything we have, with the breath we breathe, and the earth we stand upon, and the water that we drink. Do you make all these things? No, the Lord made them, and placed them here upon the earth for our use; He made the wheat and organized it; we have the seed. Did you find the seed? No, you did not, the Lord found it; when He came here He brought it with Him, and He told His sons to sow it, and let it increase.——JD 2:160*, HCK Oct. 26, 1854

1.45 Though we have it in history that our father Adam was made of the dust of this earth, and that he knew nothing about his God previous to being made here, yet it is not so; and when we learn the truth we shall see and understand that he helped to make this world, and was the chief manager in that operation. It was a man who brought the animals and birds from other places to this world, and brought a wife with him and stayed here. You may read and believe what you please as to what is found written in the Bible. Adam was made from the dust of this earth, but not from the dust of this earth. He was made as you and I are made, and no person was ever made upon any other principle.——JD 3:31*, BY, April 20, 1856

1.46 Consequently he (Joseph Smith) stood in that position, and hence his familiarity with all these various dispensations and the men who administered in them. If you were to ask Joseph what sort of a looking man Adam was and would tell you at once; he would tell you his size and appearance and all about him. You might have asked him what sort of men Peter, James and John were, and he could have told you. Why? Because he had seen them.——JD 18:326*, Dec. 31, 1876, JT

1.47 ...Orson Pratt lariat out the Gods in his theory; his circle is as far as the string extends. My God is not lariat out. I do not want the old men to think that they have done enough. but towart themselves to the last, and not to believe in a God that is lariat out, nor be lariat out themselves.——JD 4:126-27*, JMG, Oct. 25, 1856

1.48 Whether Adam is the personage that we should consider our heavenly Father, or not, is considerable of a mystery to a good many. I do not care for one moment how that is: it is no matter whether we are to consider Him our God, or whether His Father, or His Grandfather, for in either case we are of one species—of one family—and Jesus Christ is also of our species.

...the Father, after He had once been in the flesh, and lived as we live, obtained His exaltation, attained to thrones, gained the ascendency over principalities and powers, and had the knowledge and power to create—to bring forth and organize the elements upon natural principles. Thus He did after His ascension, or His glory, or His eternity, and was actually classed with the God, with the beings who create, with those who have kept the celestial law while in the flesh, and again obtained their bodies. Then He was prepared to commence the work of creation, as the Scriptures teach...

Things were first created spiritually: the Father actually begat the spirits, and they were brought forth and lived with Him. Then He commenced the work of creating earthly tabernacles, precisely as He had been created in this flesh himself, by partaking of the coarse material that was organized and composed this earth, until His system was charged with it, consequently the tabernacles of His children were organized from the coarse materials of this earth.

When the time came that His first-born, the Savior, should come into the world and take a tabernacle, the Father came Himself and favored that spirit with a tabernacle instead of letting any other man do it. The Savior was begotten by the Father of His spirit, by the same being who is the father of our spirits; and that is all the organic difference between Jesus Christ and you and me.——JD 4:217-18*, BY, Feb. 8, 1857

1.49 Every man that comes into this world is an independent being, upon the same principle that our Father and our God is independent, only he is independent to a greater degree, being further advanced in perfection. He came here, and helped to organize this earth; and having had an experience in organizing earths before He came here, He was capable, and had every principle necessary to create this earth and fill it with inhabitants.——JD 4:334*, HCK June 7, 1857

1.50 Adam, Seth, Enoch, Noah, and the Patriarchs and Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, and every man that has ever written the word of the Lord, have written the same doctrine upon the same subject; and you can never find that Prophets and Apostles clashed in their doctrines in ancient days; neither will they now, if all would all times be led by the Spirit of salvation. If men will so act as to order their lives aright and continually keep the commandments of God, they will be able to administer the blessings of the Kingdom of God.

The principles revealed in the principles revealed in the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the Doctrine and Covenants; and there would be no clash between any of the doctrines taught by Joseph the Prophet and by the brethren now, if all would live in a way to be governed by the Spirit of the Lord. All do not live so as to have the Spirit of the Lord with them all the time, and the result is that some get out of the way.

...so it will be with us. The Lord will not reveal all that we at times wish him to. Just so with our Father: he reveals to us as we are prepared to receive, and I hope to continue to learn.——JD 5:232-330*, BY, Oct. 7, 1857

1.51 Some have grumbled because I believe our God to be so near to us as Father Adam. There are many who know that doctrine to be true. Where was Michael in the creation of this earth? Did he have a mission to the earth? He did. Where was he? In the Grand Council, and performed the mission assigned him there, Now, if it should happen that we have to pay tribute to Father Adam, what a humiliating circumstance it would be; Just wait till you pass Joseph Smith, and after Joseph lets you pass him, you will find Peter; and after you pass the Apostles and many of the Prophets, you will find Abraham, and he will say, "I have the keys, and except you do thus and so, you cannot pass; and after a while, you come to Jesus; and when you at length meet Father Adam, how strange it will appear to your present notions; if we can pass Joseph and have him say, "Here; you have been faithful, good boys! hold the keys of this dispensation; I will let you pass; then we shall be very glad to see the look on Father Adam. But those are ideas which do not concern us at present, although it is written in the Bible. "This is eternal life, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."——JD 5:381-324*, BY, Oct. 7, 1857

1.52 Now brethren, you have got a spirit in you, and that spirit was created and organized—was born and begotten by our Father and our God before we ever took these bodies; and these bodies were formed by him and through him, and of him, just as much as the spirit was; for I will tell you, He commenced and brought forth
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1.61 How has it transpired that theological truth is thus so widely disseminated? It is because God was once known on the earth among his children of mankind, as we know one another. Adam was as conversant with his Father who placed him upon this earth as we are conversant with our earthly parents. The Father frequently came to visit his son Adam, and talked and walked with him; and the children of Adam were more or less acquainted with their Grandfather, and their children were more or less acquainted with their Great-Grandfather; and the things that pertain to God and to heaven were as familiar among mankind, in the first ages of their existence on the earth, as these mountains are to our mountain boys, as our gardens are to our wives and children, or the road to the Western Ocean to the experienced traveler from this source mankind have received their religious traditions.---JD 3:148*, BY, Jan. 12, 1862 (39:30)

1.62 (The Father frequently came to visit his son Adam, and talked and walked with him; and the children of Adam were more or less acquainted with him, and the things that pertain to God.)---DBY 104* (also quoted like this in DS 1:104)

1.63 We have been taught that our Father and God, from whom we sprang, called and appointed his servants to go and organize an earth, and among the rest, he said to Adam, "You go along also and help all you can; you are going to inhabit it when it is organized, therefore go and assist in the good work." It reads in the Scriptures that the Lord did it, but the true rendering is, that the Almighty sent Jehovah and Michael to do the work. They were also instructed to plant every kind of vegetable, likewise the forest and the fruit trees, and they actually brought from heaven every variety of fruit, the seeds of vegetables, the seeds of flowers, and planted them in this earth on which we dwell. And I will say more, the spot chosen for the garden of Eden was Jackson County, in the State of Missouri, where Independence now stands; it was occupied in the morn of creation by Adam and his associates who came with him for the express purpose of populating this earth.

Father Adam was instructed to multiply and replenish the earth, to make it beautiful and glorious, to make it, in short, like unto the garden from which the seeds were brought to plant the garden of Eden. I might say much more upon this subject, but I will ask, has it not been imitated before you in your holy endowments so that you might understand how things were in the beginning of creation and cultivation of this earth? God the Father made Adam the Lord of this creation in the beginning, and if we are the Lords of this creation under Adam, ought we not to take a warouse to imitate our Father in heaven? Is not all this exhibited to us in our endowments?---JD 10:253*, HCK, June 27, 1863

1.64 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. So, in like manner, every faithful son of God, becomes, as it were, Adam to the race that springs from his loins, when they are embraced in the covenants and blessings of the Holy Priesthood; and in the lapse of eternity, and in the progress of eternal lives, every true son of God becomes a king of kings, and lord of lords, and it may also be said of him as it was written of Jesus Christ, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end."---JD 10:355*, BY, Nov 6, 1864

1.65 If our Father and God should be disposed to walk through one of these aisles, we should not know him from one of the congregation. You would see a man, and that is all you would know about him; you would merely know him as a stranger from some neighboring city or country. This is the character of Him whom we worship and acknowledge as our Father and God: when He is disposed to visit a house, a neighborhood, or a congregation. He does it at His pleasure; and although He may be seen by mortals in this character, yet no man can see Him in His glory and live. When the Lord sends an angel to visit men, He gives him power and authority to appear to the

1.53 Did God produce us? He did, and every son and daughter of Adam upon the face of this earth; and he produced us upon the same principle that we produce one another. And so it is with the fruit of creation.---JD 6:61*, HCK, Nov. 8, 1857

1.54 After men have got their exaltations and their crowns—have become Gods, even the sons of God—are made kings of kings and lord of lords, they have the power then of propagating their species in spirit; and that is the first of their operations with regard to organizing a world. Power is then given to them to organize the elements, and then commence the organization of tabernacles. How can they do it? Have they to go to that earth? Yes, an Adam will have to go there, and he cannot do without Eve; he must have Eve to commence the work of generation and to eat and drink of the corporeal world, until this grosser matter is diffused sufficiently through the body to enable them, according to the established laws, to produce mortal tabernacles for their spiritual children.---JD 6:275*, BY, Aug. 28, 1852 (DN Sept. 18, 1852; MS 15 (Supp) 17*; 39:30)

...species in spirit. Power is then given.---DBY 98*

1.55 ...shall we (by the atonement) be restored into the condition Adam was in before he fell? I answer, You will be. What condition was he in? He was an immortal being, and you will be restored to immortality, whether you be Saints or sinners. The decree has gone forth that every man is to be raised to immortality. Then you will be as Adam was in the Garden of Eden before he fell.---JD 7:257*, OP, Sept. 11, 1859 (cf. JD 21:203)

1.56 Here let me state to all philosophers of every class upon the earth: When you tell me that Father Adam was made as we make abodes from the earth you tell me what I deem an idle tale. When you tell me that the beasts of the field were produced in that manner, you are speaking idle words devoid of meaning. There is no such thing in all the eternities where the Gods dwell. Mankind are here because they are the offspring of parents who were first brought here from another planet, and power was given them to propagate their species, and they were commanded to multiply and replenish the earth. The offspring of Adam and Eve are commanded to take the crude elements.---JD 7:255*, BY, October 9, 1859

1.57 Adam and Eve are the parents of all pertaining to the flesh, and I would not say that they are not also the parents of our spirits.---JD 7:290*, BY, Oct. 9, 1859

1.58 When you can thus feel, then you may begin to think that you can find out something about God, and begin to learn who he is. He is our Father—the Father of our spirits, and was once a man in mortal flesh as we are, and is now an exalted Being.

How many Gods there are, I do not know. But there never was a time when there were not Gods and worlds, and when men were not passing through the same ordeals that we are now passing through.---JD 7:333*, BY, Oct. 8, 1859

1.59 Let me here say a word to console the feelings and hearts of all who belong to this Church. Many of the elders grieve because they are not blessed with the offsprng. You will see the time when you will have millions of children around you. If you are truthful to your covenants, you will be mothers of nations. You will become Eves to earths like this: and when you have assisted in populating one earth, there are millions of earths still in the course of creation.---JD 8:208*, BY, Oct. 14, 1860

1.60 The religion of Jesus Christ, of angels, of Brigham, and of all good men is to take of and improve and adorn the earth as Adam did. When he planted the garden, he planted with seeds he brought with him; and he also brought the animals from the earth he lived upon, where his Father dwelt.---JD 9:245*4*, HCK, June 12, 1860
people as a man, and not as an angel in his glory; for we could not endure the presence even of an angel in his glory. No mortal man has ever seen God in his glory at any time and lived. We may have seen the Lord and angels many times, and did not know it. Now, who is this Ancient of days? You may answer this question at your pleasure. I have already told the people.——JD II:40-42*, BY, 1865

1.65 God has made His children like Himself to stand erect, and has endowed them with intelligence and power and dominion over all His words, and given them the same attributes which He Himself possesses. He created man, as we create our children; for there is no other process of creation in heaven, on the earth, or under the earth, or in all the eternities, that is, that were, or that ever will be...I am quite satisfied to be made aware by the scriptures, and by the Spirit of God, that He is not only the God and Father of Jesus Christ, but is also the Father of our spirits and the Creator of our bodies which bear His image as Seth bore the image of his father Adam.———JD II:122-23*, BY, 1865

1.67 The man-Joseph, the husband of Mary, did not, that we know of, have more than one wife, but Mary the wife of Joseph had another husband...That very babe that was cradled in the manger, was begotten, not by Joseph, the husband of Mary, but by another Being. Do you inquire by whom? He was begotten by God our Heavenly Father.——JD II:268*, BY, Aug. 19, 1866

1.68 It is true that we read in the Bible with regard to the twelve tribes of Israel, that they will be gathered together tribe by tribe, and that when they are so gathered they will hear the sentence of the Ancient of Days.———JD II:326*, BY, Feb 10, 1867

1.69 They will come up tribe by tribe, and the Ancient of Days, He who led Abraham, and talked to Noah, Enoch, Isaac, and Jacob, that very Being will come and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. He will say, "You rebellied, and you have been left to the mercies of the wicked."——JD II:357*, BY, Feb 10, 1867

1.70 I ask this question of you, mother Eves, every one of you. If you are not sanctified and prepared, you ought to be sanctifying and preparing yourselves for the blessings in store for you when it will be said of you, this is Eve. Why? Because you own are the mother of all living. You might as well prepare first as last. If you wish to be Eves and mothers of human families you ought to bear the burden.———JD II:327*, BY, Jun 30, 1867

1.71 Understand me now, resurrected parents are the parents not of bodies of flesh and bones, but of spirits the same as we were before we came and took these mortal bodies, that is, when we lived in younger world in the presence of our Father, and in the company of thousands of millions of our brother and sister spirits.———JD II:326*, OP, Jan. 15, 1873

1.72 We have learned that God is our Father, and that we are his children, bonafide his children. Not in a spiritual sense alone, but when we say, "our Father who art in Heaven," we mean just what we say.———JD II:327*, DHW, Aug. 9, 1873

1.73 As for their labor and pursuits in eternity I have not time to talk upon that subject; but we shall have plenty to do. We shall not be idle. We shall go on from one generation to another, step to another, reach far into the eternities until we become like the Gods, and shall be able to frame for ourselves, by the behest and command of the Almighty. All those who are counted worthy to be Gods, even the sons of God, will go forth and have earths and worlds like those who framed this and millions and millions of others. This is our hope, built expressly for us, by the Father, maker, framer and producer of these mortal bodies that we now inherit, and which go back to mother earth.———JD II:343*, BY, July 19, 1874
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1.74 ...spirits were begotten, born, and educated in the celestial world, and were brought forth by celestial bodies.——JD II:295*, BY, Oct. 8, 1876

1.75 ...for death passed upon our first parents, Adam and Eve, through their partaking of the fruits of the earth, their systems became infected by it, and the blood formed in their veins, and composed of the elements of the earth, which they partook, and these contain the seeds of dissolution and decay. And this blood, circulating in their systems, which was made up of the fruits of the earth—those things of which they partook—that formed their flesh, and made the deposits that constituted their muscle, and their bones, arteries and nerves, and every part of the body, became mortal and this circulation fluid in their systems produced friction which ultimately wore out the machinery of their organism, and brought it to decay, that it became no longer tenable for their spirits to inhabit, and death ensued.——JD II:271-272, Erastus Snow, Mar 3, 1878 *

1.76 The first pair placed here was on a farm he had prepared for them; an earth he had organized for them, and where he gave them dominion as gods over it, as rulers over the earth and all things therein.——JD II:274, Erastus Snow, Mar 3, 1878 *

1.77 This book (Discourses of Brigham Young) was made possible because Brigham Young secured stenographic reports of his addresses. As he travelled amongst the people, reporters accompanied him. All that he said was recorded. Practically all of these discourses (from December 16, 1851, to August 19, 1877) were published in the Journal of Discourses, which was widely distributed. The public utterances of few great historical figures have been so faithfully and fully preserved.——Preface to Discourses of Brigham Young, by John A. Widtsoe

1.78 There are two grand principles, by virtue of which all intelligent beings have a legitimate right to govern and hold dominion; these are, by begetting children from their own existence, and by winning the hearts of others to voluntarily desire their righteous exercise of power extended over them...We are a little creature, principle, and analogy, that Adam's watch-case is ever upper mankind; that by his own approbation and direction Gospel dispensations have been revealed from heaven to earth in different ages of the world; that he was the first that ever held the keys of Gospel power upon the earth, and by his supervision they have been handed down from age to age, whenever they have been among men; that under his direction a Deluge once swept the earth of the wickedness which was upon it, and laws were given to Israel, as a nation, to lead them to Christ; and that he will in the end call men to judgment for the privileges which have been extended to them in this world...At this important period, when Adam is reinstalled with full power upon the earth, seated upon his throne, as Daniel saw him—a glorious and an immortal God, one like the Son of Man comes in the clouds of heaven (as oftentimes represented by the Apostles) to the Ancient of Days, and received from him dominion, glory, and a kingdom; or in other words, Michael, having accomplished the work committed to him, pertaining to this world, delivers up an account of his stewardship over the same, to that character represented as Yahovah in the creation of the world, who reigns in unison with those upon the earth, until his work is fully accomplished—till the last great contest with the enemy, who has been released from his prison, is won; then he in turn delivers up the kingdom to the great Eloheim, that in the language of the Apostle, "God may be all in all." This final surrender, we are to bear in mind, does not detract from the God-like power and dominion of our first Parents, nor of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Patriarchal order of government, each and every ruler is independent in his sphere, 1878
ADAM 2b
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the whole family of men.---MS 15:802-3*, SWR (Michael Kraut 77-8; T 3:39;
PA 12.76; ST 3:44; 39.11; 39.12)

1.79 Many of the Saints endure extreme sufferings in their feelings and allow their
peace of mind to be broken up by not guarding against this captivating evil....
Many principles have been revealed from time to time, which have proved
source of trouble to some, not because they were untrue, but because the Saints
would indulge in fears lest those principles might be untrue, while they knew very
well that their anxiety of mind could not affect the results of those principles in the
least degree....
It has been said that Adam is the God and Father of the human family, and
persons are perhaps in fear and great trouble of mind, lest they have to acknowledge
him as such in some future day. For our part we would much rather acknowledge Adam
to be our Father, than hunt for another, and take up with the devil. Whoever is ac-
knowledged Father must have the rights and honor that belong to him. No man may ever
expect to attain to more than he is willing others should enjoy. If these things have
power to disturb the peace of mind, we are bound to consider whether troubles that
these may arise before mankind learn all the particulars of Christ's incarnation--how
and by whom he was begotten; the character of the relationships formed by that act;
the number of wives and children he had, and all other circumstances with which he
was connected, and by which he was tried and tempted in all things like unto man.
Whatever may prove to be the facts in his case, it certainly would exhibit a great
degree of weakness on the part of anyone to indulge in fears and anxieties about
that which he has no power to control. Facts still remain facts, whether kept or re-
vealed. If there is a way pointed out by which all beings who come into this world
can lay the foundation for rule, and a never-ending increase of kingdoms and domin-
ions, by which they can become Gods, we are as willing the Lord Jesus Christ should
enjoy them all as any other being, and we believe the descendants of such a sire would
glory in ascribing honor and power to him as their God. The Apostle informs us that
these who are redeemed shall be like Jesus; not to say, however, that they shall be
wise and childless, and without eternal affections.
It should be borne in mind that these wonderful mysteries, as they are supposed
to be, are only mysteries because of the ignorance of men; and when men and women
are troubled in spirit over those things which come to light through the proper channel
of intelligence, they only betray their weakness, ignorance, and folly.---MS 15:824-5*
(An article entitled "Fear Bringeth Torment," the editor showing the tendency of
people to be troubled in their minds when doctrines are advanced with which they are
unfamiliar (TBE 15:30; 39.13).

ENGLISH MISSIONARY CONFERENCE
(The next four references are important because they contain excerpts of the
missionary conference held in London, England June 26, 27, and 28, 1854. The occa-
sion was the release of President S.W. Richards who was being replaced by Presi-
dent Franklin D. Richards as the President of the British Mission. The sig-
nificance is that it indicates the President was first introduced to the Church by
President Brigham Young April 9, 1852, and by June, 1854 the missionaries were al-
ready teaching that doctrine in the mission fields to all prospective converts. Presi-
dent F.D. Richards at this conference changes the instructions the Elders had received
previously and stated that it is now taught that doctrine before they could be admitted into the Church by baptism. The Elders could "roll it aside" for them and they could at a later time gain a testimony of it.)

1.80 (They in the saints in this conference) are lacking faith in one principle -- the last
"cat that was let out of the bag". Polygamy has been gone on pretty well, that
cloud had vanished away, but they are troubled about Adam being our Father and God.
There is a very intelligent person investigating our principles, and who has been a
great help to the Saints; he has all the works, and can get along very well with every-
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thing but the last 'cat', and as soon as he can see that clearly, he will become a
'Mormon'.---MS 16:482*, Elder Thomas Caffall. (T 16:339-40; PA 14; also (39.15)

1.81 Relative to the principles recently revealed, we have not the least difficulty
if Adam's being our Father and God cannot be proved by the Bible, it is alright.---
MS 16:483*, Elder Joseph Hall (TBE 15:39-40; PA 14)

1.82 I can see no other way of doing the work, than to keep the idea before the mind
that there is a God in Israel, and that we are His servants. I believe in the principle of
obedience; and if I am told that Adam is our Father and our God, I just believe it.
Brethren, I feel well and have felt well all the time.---MS 16:530*, Elder James A.
Little (PA 14; 39.16)

1.83 Concerning the item of doctrine alluded to by Elder Caffall and others, viz.,
that Adam is our Father and God, I have to say do not trouble yourselves, neither
let the Saints be troubled about that matter. The Lord has told us in a revelation
which he gave through the Prophet Joseph, January 19, 1841—'I design to reveal unto
my Church things which have been kept hid from before the foundation of the
world, things that pertain to the dispensation of the fulness of times.' (D & C 124:41;
also 10:32-33) I would like to know where you will find Scripture to prove these
things by, which have never before been revealed. Some seem to feel it their
bounden duty to prove everything which belongs to our faith from the Bible, but I
do not, and I will excuse you from all obligation to prove this from the old Scriptures,
for you cannot, if you try. You may bring much collateral evidence from the Bible
and other revelations that will dissipate objections, and serve to strengthen the
position, but to directly and substantially prove it, as the world require, and as we
can do the first principles, it will puzzle you to do it, and from henceforth we may
expect more and more of the word of the Lord giving us instructions which are
nowhere written in the old Scriptures. If we feel ourselves, or teach the Saints or the
people as a whole are to believe and taught, we are only to believe that which can be proved
from the Scriptures, we shall not know much of the Lord ourselves, nor be able to teach
the children of men to any very considerable extent. If, as Elder Caffall remarked,
there are those who are waiting at the door of the Church for this objection to be
removed, tell such, the Prophet and Apostle Brigham has declared it, and that it
is the word of the Lord. That is vastly stronger proof than Christendom can give for much
that they profess to believe. Tell the Saints that if this stone does not seem to fit into
the great building of their faith just now, to roll it aside. You can help them to roll it
aside out of their way, so that they will not stumble against it while at their daily
duties, and it will be but a very short time till they will find a place in their building
where no other stone will fit, then it will be on hand all right, and will come into its
place in the building without the sound of hammer or chisel.---MS 16:534-35*, Elder
Franklin D. Richards, member of Quorum of Twelve (PA 15; 39.17; 39.18)

1.84 The Mosaic account of the creation states that, after the earth had been pre-
pared, "there was not a man to till the ground." This was not the only, nor perhaps
the greatest deficiency.

There was no one to commence and carry out the order of the higherspheres.

There was no one to partake of mortality, and propagate the race of the Gods in a de-
scending scale, that their spiritual children might become beings of tabernacle, and
receive all knowledge in a school of experience. It is evident that for this great pur-
pose, Adam and Eve were placed upon the earth, from the fact, that the first and most
prominent command given them was to increase and multiply.

After Adam and Eve had partaken of the seeds of mortality, it appears from the
Scriptures that the Gods held a council on the subject. We read in Gen. 3:22: 'And
the Lord God said, behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil.'

It is evident that we learn that Adam was not only in form like unto the Gods, as
previously stated, but that this knowledge of good and evil which he obtained
seemed to us like God among the Gods; and then that his resemblance to the Gods might be complete,
the Lord God bestowed the right to exercise full power and dominion over the earth, and all its creations.

And God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air; and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. (Genesis 1:28)

The Lord God has ever withdrawn from Father Adam the authority here bestowed upon him. He has not seen fit to make it known to the world. While there is nothing to refute, the whole tenor of revelation substantiates, the supposition, that Adam has continued to bear rule in the earth, and control the destinies of his never-ending posterity. From the time he received his commission in the Garden of Eden, he has been laboring diligently to fulfill the instructions there given him by the Lord God concerning his dominions, and to bring them under subjection to his will. This will be fully accomplished when every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that he is the God of the whole earth. Then will the words of the Prophet Brigham, when speaking of Adam, be fully realized—'He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do.' Having now observed how Adam, the first man became God, we inquire why not millions of his children receive the same God-like knowledge and power? The Apostles, Prophets, and Seers, who have lived on the earth since the days of Adam, have been succession of intelligences, who by doing the will of the Father receive of His glory, and become the heirs of His increasing dominions.---MS 17:194-95*, Elder Franklin D. Richards, Mar 31, 1855*; T 15:253; 18:118

1.85 Not only do the Old and New Testament, and other ancient and modern revelations through the Holy Priesthood assert the fact, but mankind of every grade, condition, and religion, whether Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, or Pagan, all believe in leading personalities or influences which are the sources of knowledge. These are the God the Father, Michael or Adam, from whom joins the earth's people, and who is now laboring for the redemption of his children. The great captain of evil is Satan, formerly Lucifer, but now a fallen 'Son of the Morning', who with his followers are diligently laboring to destroy the works of God by reducing them to a like condition with themselves.---MS 17:785-86*. Franklin D. Richards, Dec 15, 1855* (T16:349)

1.86 (After quoting JD:58:51, and 6:275...) GQC continues: President Young, in the foregoing passages, while substantiating the fact of the union of man's pre-existing spirit with a bodily product of the "dust of the ground", enters more particularly into the modus operandi of that union. He unmistakably declares man's origin to be altogether of a celestial character---that not only is his spirit of heavenly descent, but his bodily organization too,---that the latter is not taken from the lower animals, but from the originally celestial body of the great Father of humanity.

Taking the doctrine of man's origin as seen from this higher point of view, and comparing it with the low assumptive theories of uninspired men, such as those who have attempted to, how great the contrast appears! "Look on this picture"—Man, the offspring of an ape! "And on this"---Man, the image of God, his Father! How wide the contrast! And how different the feelings produced in the breast! In the one case, we instinctively shrink with dread at the bare insinuation; while in the other, the heart befits with higher and warmer and stronger emotions of love, of adoration, and of praise; the soul is cheered and invigorated in its daily struggles to escape from the thraldom of surrounding evils and darkness pertaining to this lower sphere of existence, and is animated with a purer and nobler zeal in its onward and upward journey to that for which it originally came.---MS 23:654, GQC, Oct 12, 1861*, italics in original (Michael Kraut 116; MFG 67-8).

1.87 I have heard of a man who was cut off because he would not believe that Adam was our Father and God. "Well, but was it not so?" Its being so does not change the fact that we are sinners and need salvation, and such preaching does not help men and women to repent of their sins. I call all that preaching senseless which cannot be applied.---MS 24:160, AMLyman, Jan 1, 1862* (39.19)

1.88 We believe that we are the literal offspring of Deity. We have descended from the great Being who formed this earth, and from Him we have inherited the glorious aspirations to be like unto Him.....

We believe in a God of revelation, who will give more and more light to us till we can be like Him.

We worship the Being who has revealed Himself to us. It was necessary at the outset of this work to have a revelation from Him. There were many erroneous ideas about God, and the first revelation to Joseph Smith was the appearance of the Father and the Son. I have heard that there are some among us who say that both are one person. This is a fallacy. There are two personages, the Father and the Son. God is the Being who walked in the Garden of Eden, and who talked with the Prophets. This revelation came to us in certainty.---MS 51:278, GQC, Apr 7, 1889 (Michael Kraut 37; MFG 68; PA 68; also (1.93))

1.89 How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latterday Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to them, and which God revealed to me---namely that Adam is our Father and God---I do not know, I do not inquire, I care nothing about it. Our Father Adam helped to make this earth, it was created expressly for him, and after it was made he and his companions came here. He brought one of his wives with him, and she was called Eve, because she was the first woman upon the earth. Our Father Adam is the man who stands at the gate and holds the keys of everlasting life and salvation to all his children who have or who ever will come upon the earth. I have been found fault with by the ministers of religion because I have said that they were ignorant. But I could not find any man on the earth who could tell me this, although it is one of the simplest things in the world, until I met and talked with Joseph Smith..... I told the people that as true as God is, the truth would not have error sent unto them, and they would believe it. What is the mystery of it?

The Christian world reads, and think much about, St. Paul, also St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles. These men were faithful to and magnified the priesthood while on the earth. Now, where will be the mystery, after they have passed through all the ordeals, and have been crowned and exalted, and received their inheritances in the eternal worlds or glory, for them to be sent forth, as the Gods have been for ever and ever, with the command---'Make yourselves an earth, and people it with your own children.'

My brother said that God is as we are. He did not mean those words to be literally understood. He meant simply, that in our organization we have all the properties in embryo in our bodies that our Father has in his, and that literally, morally, socially, by the spirit and by the flesh we are his children. Do you think that God, who holds the eternities in his hands and can do all things at his pleasure, is not capable of sending forth his own children, and forming this flesh for his offspring? Where is the mystery in this? We say that Father Adam came here and helped to make the earth. Who is he? He is Michael a great prince, and it was said to him by Elohim, 'Go ye and make an earth.' What is the great mystery about it? He came and formed the earth. Geologists tell us that it was here millions of years ago. How do they know? They know nothing about it. But suppose it was here, what of it? Adam found it in a state of chaos, unorganized and incoherent. Adam came here and gave it a shape that would suit him to commence business. What is the great mystery about it? I have seen it. The mystery of this, as with miracles, or anything else, is only to those who are ignorant. Father Adam came here, and then they brought his wife. 'Well,' says one, 'Why was Adam called Adam? He was the first man on the earth, and its framaker and maker. He, with the help of his brethren, brought it into existence. Then he said, 'I want my children who are in the spirit world to come and live here.' I once dwelt upon an earth something like this, in a mortal state. I was faithful, I received my crown and exaltation. I have the privilege
of extending my work, and to its increase there will be no end. I want my children that were born to me in the spirit world to come here and take tabernacles of flesh, that their spirits may have a house, a tabernacle, or a dwelling place as mine has," and where is the mystery?—DN June 18, 1873, *BY (ST 2:174; ST 3:72; PA 6, 28, 36, 37; Falling 128; also (1:120) and a photograph in 197; 39:36)

1.90 (After quoting JD 1:50–51, “The question...salvation or damnation.” and TPJS 345–48, “It is the first...inherits what God did before.”

I think these two quotations from such a reliable authority fully solve the question as to the relationship existing between Father Adam and the Savior of the world, and prove beyond question the power that Adam possessed in regard to taking his body and after laying it down—which power he never could have attained unless he had received first a resurrection from the grave to a condition of immortality. We further say that this power was not forfeited when as a celestial being he voluntarily partook of the forbidden fruit, and thereby rendered his body mortal in order that he might become the father of mortal tabernacles, as he was already the father of immortal spirits—thus giving opportunity to the offspring of his own begetting to pass through the ordeals necessary to prepare them for a resurrection from the dead, a celestial glory.

All that Father Adam did upon this earth, from the time that he took up his abode in the Garden of Eden, was done for his posterity’s sake and the success of his former mission as the savior of a world, and afterwards, or now, as the father of a world only added to the glory which he already possessed. If, as the savior of a world, he had the power to lay down his life and take it up again, therefore, as the father of a world which is altogether an advanced condition, we necessarily conclude that the grave was powerless to hold him after that mission was completed. All those who have now for the first time taken upon themselves mortality, must wait for their resurrection through Him who alone possesses the power to bring it to pass. It is these, and these only, whose resurrection we here wish to consider. But we will now resume the consideration of the question, viz., the times when the resurrection did and will take place.——Deseret Weekly, Dec 29, 1888, pp. 20–21, this lecture was prepared and written by Joseph E. Taylor and read in the Logan Temple, June 2, 1888. * (TF:669: PA 68; 39:38; 39:39)

1.91 Now, do not lariat the God that I serve and say that he cannot learn anymore; I do not believe in such a character.—Deseret News Weekly, 22:308–9, *BY June 18, 1873

1.92 In the first place, I will say that the Prophet Joseph taught us that Father Adam was the first man on the earth to whom God gave the keys of the Everlasting Priesthood. He held the keys of the Presidency, and was the first man who did hold

1.93 We believe that we are the literal descendants of our Eternal Father; that we are the offspring of Diety: those aspirations which man has, and which cause Him to perform the mighty works that we see on every hand as we travel throughout the earth, are inherited from our Eternal Father. They come to us by descent, or, to use another phrase, they are hereditary. The doctrine of heredity is manifested in the works of man. We descend from this great Father who formed the earth, and who governs this universe. Therefore, it is natural that man, being His offspring, should have these glorious aspirations which prompt him to attempt these wonderful works and to succeed in carrying them out.

This is the belief of the LDS: and, having this belief, we should have with it a corresponding desire that, when we see our Father, we shall be like him. If we have this hope within us, we will seek to purify ourselves, even as He is pure, that we may be counted worthy to come into His presence.——Deseret News Weekly, Dec 29, 1888, pp. 20–21, this lecture was prepared and written by Joseph E. Taylor and read in the Logan Temple, June 2, 1888. * (TF:669: PA 68; 39:38; 39:39)

1.94 QUESTION: As Adam was an immortal being when placed here on earth and commanded to multiply, would not his offspring have been immortal but for the fall? (A question by M. P. F., Logan, Utah.)

ANSWER: Yes. But they would have had spiritual bodies only, and not bodies of flesh, blood and bone. When Adam and Eve were first placed in the Garden of Eden they had resurrected bodies, in which there was no blood. A spiritual fluid or substance circulated in their veins instead of blood. Consequently, they had not power to beget children with tabernacles of flesh, such as human beings possess. The fall caused a change in their bodies, which, while it rendered them mortal, at the same time gave them power to create mortal bodies of flesh, blood and bone for their offspring. This is a very brief explanation of a very important subject.—Deseret News Weekly, Dec 29, 1888, pp. 20–21, this lecture was prepared and written by Joseph E. Taylor and read in the Logan Temple, June 2, 1888. * (TF:669: PA 68; 39:38; 39:39)

1.95 “The Creation and Growth of Adam” by William Halls

(In the excellent article, “The Philosophy of Faith and Worship,” in the March number of the Era, page 325, the author, Elder William Halls, makes the following statement:

“We would not expect to get a full grown tree, a hundred years old, in a second of time; neither would we expect a full grown man without a natural growth from infancy. Though the creation of Adam and the birth of Jesus may be involved

1.96 in more or less mystery, the fact is, there was no exception in their cases. If Adam could have been created a full grown man with all his faculties fully developed, with a knowledge of good and evil, becoming as the Gods, without having gone through the natural stages of development, than all men might have been created in the same way, and there would have been no need of male and female, the pains of maternity, the care
of infancy, our schools and all our institutions of learning." A correspondent has taken exception to this theory respecting the creation and growth of Adam, as being un-Biblical, concerning which, of course, there can be no dispute. However, Elder Halls was asked to give his reasons for his views, and he replies as follows.-----Editors.)

In answer to your request to give some authority for my theory in regard to Adam, I must confess that I know no direct scriptural authority for it, though there are many passages of scripture from which such theory may be inferred. It is just my belief, which is based on scriptural authority, and as such must be understood.

When a passage of scripture taken literally contradicts a fundamental, natural law, I take it as allegorical; and in the absence of divine authority, put a construction on it that seems to harmonize with my experience and reason. To believe all the scriptures literally we must believe that Satan is a serpent, Jesus is a lamb, Harod is a fox, mankind are wheat and tares, then sheep and goats, some are wolves, some vipers. To accept some parts of the Bible as allegory doesn't impair its authenticity; of such are the parables of the New Testament. To believe that the prodigal son, the widow and the unjust judge are real characters would be childish. Some truths are not susceptible of proof. We say space is boundless, duration is without beginning or end; the attempt to prove it would be ridiculous.

To say that Adam could receive a knowledge of good and evil, and his physical, mental and spiritual powers be developed without experience is to me, the climax of absurdity. That he passed through the stages of development, and learned by the universal law of experience, may not be proved, but may be taken for granted.-----Im- proven Era II:178* (MFG 68-9)

1.96 Having, while on earth complied with the requirements of the Father in relation to Celestial Marriage, he is thus qualified to become a "Father of spirits," and his immortal wives become the mothers of spirits, thus obeying the only and eternal law of reproduction.

In the meantime the burning particles of ether have been accumulating around the nucleus, and by the force of friction it becomes a mass of living fire, and from out of the mass of smoke and vapor emerges a new born system of worlds, and the elements having performed their part in preparing the world for plants and animals, and those also having served the purpose of fitting it for the presence of man, he is placed upon it and with his wives repeats the history of man on this and other planets.

The Being that has organized the world; and placed upon it the germ of animated nature; is the one most entitled to furnish mortal bodies for his spiritual children. And when the great drama of life is finished and he with his children are redeemed and glorified, is he not entitled, as the head of an innumerable posterity, to be recognized as a Father and God to those that will rise up, and call Him blessed? Is there anything inconsistent or unphilosophic in the doctrine that eternal progression will eventually exalt human beings to the godhead? The reverse would be illogical, no other reason for man's existence can be adduced. In this way only can he be of service in increasing glory of his Father and God to whom forever he will be a grateful and venerating son and subject.-----Contributor 6:78*, J. F. Gibson Nov 1844 (MFG 70; PA 68)

1.97 Since our great progenitor, Adam, figures in many phases of life to which none of us have yet attained, the first portion of the parallel, to make it more complete, will be founded upon facts connected with his history.

Adam now lives in an exalted state, where he is, in no manner, subject to the temptations and power of the devil.-----At the close of that period during which the human race, as we are now living, will attain a corresponding state, the next seat below was twelve persons, each of whom was a king, and more in number than the sum of all the kings of the earth, and the sum of the kings of the world, and the sum of the kings of the ages. And that the devil shall have no power over it.

Adam fell from the high estate in which he was once created.-----The loosing of the devil upon the earth for a 'little season' completes the parallel here. The earth, too, shall fail.
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Before Adam fell, he was a resurrected man, that is, his physical body had been disorganized, and then reorganized. The Apostle Peter tells us plainly that this earth is to be dissolved, after which a new world is to be organized. It will be reorganized as Adam was.

Between the time of Adam's resurrection and his fall afterwards, he must have enjoyed a season of rest and peace.-----The Millennium which is to give the earth a rest for a thousand years it is hoped will be in the corresponding state in the world's history.-----Contributor 8:318*, Thomas W. Brookbank (Michael Kraut 72; PA 68)

1.98 ...and if we take man, he is said to have been made in the image of God, for the simple reason that he is the son of God; and being His son, he is, of course, his offspring, an emanation from God, in whose likeness we are told he is made. He did not originate from a chaotic mass of matter, moving or inert, but came forth possessing, in an embryonic state, all the faculties and powers of a God. And when he shall be perfected, and have progressed to immaturity he will be like his Father -- a God, being indeed his offspring. As the horse, the ox, the sheep and every living creature, God, man, propagates its own species and perpetuates its own kind, so does God perpetuate His.-----Contributor 10:267*, JT (quotes Med & Atom 164-5)

1.99 I have read the sermons of Brigham Young published in the Journal of Discourses, and I presume are considered correct as published. They are published by the Church of which I am president. They are correct in so far as every man had a chance to correct his own discourses, or should do so if he has a chance. Sermons reported by G. D. Watts...were considered reported correctly, and when they are found in the Journal of Discourses, they are considered correct. Some of my own sermons are published there, and they are correct.-----Temple Lot Case 360*, WW 1.100 On entering this room, a vast and extensive hall was opened before me, the walls of which were white, and ornamented with various figures which I cannot understand. In the midst of this hall was a vast throne at which white and red and ascended by seventy steps, and on either side of the throne and of the steps leading to it, there were seats rising one above another. On this throne was seated an aged, venerable personage. His hair was white with age, and his countenance beamcd with intelligence and affection inexpressible as if he were the greatest and the people over whom he reigned. He was clad in robes of dazzling whiteness, which a glorious crown rested upon his brow; and a pillar of light above his head, seemed to diffuse light over the whole scene a brilliance of glory and grandeur indescribable. There was something in his countenance which seemed to indicate that he had passed long years of struggle and exertion in the achievement of some mighty revolution, and been a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. But, like the evening sun after a day of clouds and tempest, he seemed to smile with the dignity of repose. In connection with this venerable personage sat two others scarcely less venerable, and clad and crowned in the same manner, on the next seat below were twelve personages, much of the same appearance and clad in the same manner, with crowns upon their heads; while the descending seats were filled with some thousands of noble and dignified personages, all clothed in white and crowned with authority, power and majesty, as kings and presiding among the Sons of God.

"You now behold", said the Angel of the Prairies, "the Grand Presiding Council organized in wisdom, and holding the keys of power to bear rule over all the earth in righteousness. And of the increase and glory of their kingdoms there shall be no end." "...The venerable council which you behold enthroned in majesty and clad in robes of white, with crowns upon their heads, is the order of the Ancient of Days, before whose august presence princes have been cast down, and tyrants have ceased to rule.-----The Angel of the Prairies, PPP, Jan 1, 1844" (c.f. MFG 55-6*, T 12:148, 153)

1.101 If we could see our heavenly Father, we should see a being similar to our earthly parent, with this difference, our Father in heaven is exalted and glorified. He has received His thrones, His principalities and powers, and He sits as a governor, as a monarch, and overrules kingdoms, thrones, and dominions that have been
bequeathed to Him, and such as we anticipate receiving. While He was in the flesh, as we are, He was as we are. But it is now written of Him that our God is a consuming fire, that He dwells in everlasting burnings, and this is why sin cannot be where He is. —JD 4:54*, BY, Sept 21, 1896.

1.102 He (Joseph Smith) taught us that God was the great head of human procreation, was really and truly the father of our spirits and our bodies; that (we) were but parts of a great whole, mutually and equally dependent upon each other, according to condition. —Letter to Gibbs 18-19* (Michael Kraut 52)

(NOTE: "In his old age, Elder Benjamin F. Johnson was asked by the First Presidency of the Church to recount in writing many of his early experiences with the Prophet. This he did, certifying that 'although so many years have intervened, they are still in my mind as fresh as when they occurred.' " --Culham as Practiced by the So-Called Church of the Firstborn of the Fulness of Times 30, Bruce R. McConkie)

1.103 The Prophet Joseph Smith is credited with having said that our planet was made up of the fragments of a planet which previously existed; some mighty convulsions disrupted that creation and made it desolate. Both its animal and vegetable life forms were destroyed. And when those convulsions ceased, and the rent earth was again consolidated, and it became desirable to replenish it, the work was begun by making a mist to rise, that it might descend in gentle rain upon the barren earth, that it might again be fruitful. Then came one of the sons of God 22 (Footnote 22: Lest anyone should doubt that Adam was one of the sons of God, I call attention to the verse of Luke, chapter iii, where in tracing the genealogy of Jesus back to Adam, and coming to Cainan it goes on to say that "the (Cainan) was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.") to the earth—Adam. A garden was planted in Eden and the man placed in it, and there the Lord brought him every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and Adam gave names to them all. Afterwards was brought to Adam his wife, whom, since she was derived from man, he named woman; and she became his helpermate, his companion and the mother of his children. In this nothing is hinted at about man being made from the dust, and woman manufactured from a rib, a story which has been a cause of much perplexity to religious people, and a source of much impious merriment to reckless unbelievers. We are informed that the Lord God made every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb before it grew on our planet. As vegetation was created or made to grow upon some older earth, and the seeds thereof or the plants themselves were brought to our earth and made to grow, so likewise man and his helmpmate were brought from some other world to our own, to people it with their children. And though it is said that the "Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground,"--it by no means follows that he was "formed" as one might form a brick, or form the dust of this earth. We are all "formed" of the dust of the ground, though instead of being moulded as a brick we are brought forth by the natural laws of procreation; so also was Adam and his wife in some other world. And as for the story of the rib, under it I believe the mystery of procreation is hidden. —The Gospel and Man's Relationship to Deity 258-259*, B.H. Roberts

1.104 ... then the sunlight visited the earth, and doubtless higher forms of vegetation, fruit trees and flowers, and grains were brought forth; then came the creatures that abode in the ocean, that fly in the air, and the beasts of the earth. Not by the process of evolution, but by the various species suitable to the coexistence of the earth's development being brought from some other and older sphere, with power to propagate their kind, until the changed conditions of the earth become unfavorable to them, when they were supplanted and were replaced by some other species of a higher type. Then came the mighty convulsions which, for some cause or other, and for some wise purpose, disrupted that planet; and when from its fragments a new world—our present planet—was brought into existence, it was made the abode of man, as de-
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scribed in the second account of the creation in Genesis, which begins by placing man upon the earth, and then the inferior animals.—The Gospel and Man's Relationship to Deity 259-270*, B.H. Roberts

1.105 Is there in the heaven of heavens a Leader? Yes; and we cannot do without one and that being the case, whoever he is may be called God. Joseph said that Adam was our Father and God. —BY, Journal History, May 14, 1876, CHO (Falling 59-60)

1.106 A Royal Planter now descends from yonder world of older date, and bearing in his hand the choice seeds of the older Paradise, he plants them in the virgin soil of our newly created earth. They grow and flourish there, and bearing seed, replant themselves, and thus clothe the naked earth with scenes of beauty, and the air with fragrant incense. Ripening fruits and herbs at length abound. When lo! from yonder world is transferred every species of animal life. Male and female, they come, with blessings on their head; and a voice is heard again, "Be fruitful and multiply." Earth—its mineral, vegetable and animal wealth—its Paradise, prepared, down comes from yonder world on high, a son of God, with his beloved spouse. And thus a colony from heaven, it may be from the sun, is transplanted to our soil. The blessings of their Father are upon them, and by the first law of heaven and earth is again repeated, "Be fruitful and multiply." Hence the nations which have awared our earth.

In after years, when Paradise was lost by sin; when man was driven from the face of his heavenly Father, to toil, and droop, and die; (when heaven was veiled from view); and, with few exceptions, man was no longer counted worthy to retain the knowledge of his heavenly origin; then darkness veiled the past and future from the heathen mind; man neither knew himself, from whence he came, nor whither he was bound. At length a Moses came, who knew his God, and would fain have led mankind to know Him too, and Him face to face. But they could not receive His heavenly laws or the fruit of His precious seed. Thus the holy man was forced again to veil the past in mystery, and, in the beginning of his history, assign to man an earthly origin.

Man, moulded from the earth, as a brick! A Woman, manufactured from a rib! Thus, parents still would find consolal from building manhood the mysteries of procreation, or the sources of life's ever-flowing river, by relating some childish tale of newborn life, engendered in the hollow trunk of some old tree, or springing with spontaneous growth, like mushrooms, from out of the heaps of rubbish. O man! When wilt thou cease to be a child in knowledge?

Man, as we have said, is the offspring of Deity. The entire mystery of the past and future, with regard to his existence, is not yet solved by mortals.

We first recognize him, as an organized individual or intelligence, dwelling with his Father in the eternal mansions. This organized spirit we call a body, because, although composed of the spiritual elements, it possesses every organ after the pattern, and in the likeness or similitude of the outward or fleshly tabernacle it is destined eventually to inhabit. Its organs of thought, speech, sight, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling & c., all exist in their order, as in the physical body; these being the exact similitude of the other.

This individual, spiritual body, was begotten by the Heavenly Father, in his own likeness and image, and by the laws of procreation.—Key to Theology 50-52*, PPD

1.107 Adam and Eve, as immortal beings, were placed on earth and commanded to multiply and fill the earth with posterity.—A Light Unto the World 4, BR McConkie (Michael Kraut 41)

1.108 Accordingly, eternal life is not a name that has reference only to the unending duration of a future life: immortality is to live forever in the resurrected state, and by the grace of God all men will gain this unending continuance of life.—A
Adam planted the Garden of Eden, and he with his wife Eve partook of the fruit of this earth, until their systems were changed with the nature of earth, and then they could beget bodies, for their spiritual children... I tell you, when you see your father in the heavens, you will see Adam; When you see your Mother that bear your spirit, You will see Mother Eve.-----MABY, Oct 9, 1854, CHO (Falling 60-66; also see 1.160)

1.112 But let us turn our attention to the God with which we have to do. I tell you simply, he is our Father; the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the father of our spirits. Can that be possible? Yes, it is possible, he is the father of all the spirits of the human family... I tell you more, Adam is the father of our spirits.------MABY, Oct 8, 1854,CHO (Falling 57; also see 1.160)

1.113 When we come to that great and wise and glorious being that the children of Israel were afraid of whose countenance shone so that they could not look upon him. I say when we get to him whom they could not look upon, to that man, that is I conclude he was a man for it says that he had hands and you know men have hands. And it says that he put his hands out before Moses in the cleft of the rock until his glory passed by and would not suffer Moses to see his face but his parts only. Seeing then that he had parts I conclude that he was a man. When we can see that very character and talk and live with him in our tabernacles, if we are so fortunate as to get there, into his society, then we can say that to us there is only one living and true God and he is the father of our Lord Jesus Christ and of our spirits. And when we get back to him and learn that he is actually our father we shall not feel any anxiety to call upon anybody else for the blessings we are in need of.------MABY, April 25, 1856, CHO (Falling 49)

1.114 See (8.14) Max316-8----JFS eliminated BY's views about Adam from endowment, and God, that will be a curse to many of the Elders of Israel because of their folly. With regard to it, they yet grovel in darkness and will. It is one of the most glorious revealments of the economy of heaven, yet the world hold it (in) derision. Had I revealed the doctrine of baptism for the dead instead of (of) Joseph Smith, there are men around me who would have ridiculed the idea until dooms day. But they are ignorant and stupid like this dumb ass.------MABY Oct 8, 1861, CHO (Falling 56; Unpublished Sermons of BY I)

1.115 See (8.14) Max316-8----JFS eliminate BY's views about Adam from endowment.

1.116 Some of the sectarian ministers are saying that we "Mormons" are ashamed of the doctrine announced by President Brigham Young to the effect that Adam will thus be the God of this world. No, friends, it is not that we are ashamed of that doctrine. If you see any change come over our countenances when this doctrine is named, it is surprise, astonishment, that anyone at all capable of grasping the largeness and extent of the universe--the grandeur of existence and the possibilities in man for growth, for progress, should be so lean of intellect, should have such a paucity of understanding, as to call it in question at all. That is what our change of countenance means--no shame for the doctrine, Brigham Young taught.------Mormon Doctrine of Deity 42-43*, B. H. Roberts

1.117 ...and you will fall asleep in peace, having made sure your salvation, and having done your duty well, like those whose funeral sermons are preaching this morning; and thus you will fall asleep, with a full assurance that you will come up in the morning of the first resurrection, with an immortal body, like that which Adam had before he partook of the forbidden fruit. This is the promise to them that fall asleep in Jesus.----MDOP 366*, OP (Michael Kraut 40)
1.118 Man has descended from God: In fact, he is of the same race as the Gods. His descent has not been from a lower form of life; in other words, man is, in the most literal sense, a child of God. This is not only true of the spirit of man, but of his body also. —Priesthood Course of Study, 1910, subject “The Creation of Man.” (Michael Kraut 43)

1.119 There was no blood in his (Adam’s) body, but he had a spiritual body until it was changed by the fall. A spiritual body is one which is not quenched by blood, but by spirit. Before the Fall, Adam had a physical, tangible body of flesh and bone, but it was not quenched by blood. —Melchizedek Priesthood Manual, 1948, p. 5, “Church History and Modern Revelation” (Michael Kraut 22)

1.120 This address (DN June 18, 1873, 1:89) has been quoted at length to establish the complete context of his remarks, and to better reveal the overall pattern of Brigham Young’s thinking, not only in relationship to Adam as a god, but also in regards to the fall of Adam from that divine status. In the mind of President Young, there was apparently nothing contradictory or “mysterious” in his claim that two heavenly beings, endowed with the glory of God, could, under certain circumstances, and for a pre-arranged purpose, assume an inferior, and in the eyes of many, an almost degraded position. It’s as though he looked upon them as players in some great, and infinitely vital, stage production. Players who had assumed major “roles” for a time, roles which naturally cloaked their identities, but which in no way altered, or deprived them of those identities. Yet these roles, unlike those assumed in an actual play, were not sheer make-believe; they involved a definite sacrifice, a sacrifice made in behalf of those who had been “born” to Adam and Eve in the spirit world. For President Young, it was perfectly simple there was not “mystery” about it. —PA 30*

1.121 Were Brigham Young’s Remarks Misinterpreted? The answer to this question would, of course, depend upon what he actually meant to say. Undoubtedly the answer has been misinterpreted by some persons: the very fact that there exists differences of opinion as to his meaning proves that, for certainly not all of these conflicting interpretations are correct. It is true that the original discourse of April 9, 1852, could be taken in more than one way; and if he had never mentioned the subject again his actual meaning would be a moot point. However, he did mention the subject again, many times. Therefore, the likelihood of misunderstanding him, in view of his subsequent statements the years, becomes more remote. This is borne out in the comments of others, friends and enemies alike, giving expressions to President Young’s words, in obvious instances. The writer was unable to find any reprimand forthcoming from Brigham Young for ascribing such opinions to himself; the significance of this will be manifest presently.

But perhaps it was not so much a matter of misinterpretation as it was of opposition; sometimes opposition assumes the guise of misunderstanding. The concerns expressed by the English missionaries in their special conference of 1853, the assurances of Franklin D. Richards, and the editorials and articles in the Millenial Star defending the doctrine—all these indicate the recognition of an opposition of sorts. The members were puzzled, even alarmed by this shocking new concept. It was contrary to much that they had previously accepted as truth all their lives. And it was for that very reason that F. D. Richards had counseled the missionaries to help the membership “roll it aside” until it could be incorporated into their faith without the sound of hammer or chisel. —PA 36-37*

1.122 Was Brigham Young Misquoted? It is the writer’s opinion that the answer to this question is a categorical no. There is not the slightest evidence from Brigham Young, or any other source, that either his original remarks on April 9, 1852, or any of his subsequent statements were ever misquoted in the official publications of the Church.

1.123 What was the Source of Brigham Young’s Views? In a sense, there were two sources for the revelations which Brigham Young claimed to have received; one of these was the Prophet Joseph Smith, the martyred first president of the Church. (DBY 39 quoted). The second source of Brigham Young’s revelations is, of course, God himself. That is likewise manifest in the foregoing quotations from his addresses. (referring to DN June 6, 1877 and JD 6:279) —PA 48-49*

1.124 These quotations (JD 9:175; 14:111; 13:260; 14:165; 12:99; 3:259-60; 13:231; 13:311) bring us to grips with the apparent contradiction in his statements; for how can he claim that Adam is “our Father and our God, and the only God with whom WE have to do” at one time and yet assert that Adam and Eve heard “our God” walking in the garden, and that they are the “children of our Heavenly Father,” at other times? We may assume that he has contradicted himself, or that he has not. If he has, then one or the other. If not both, his statements must be discarded as being false. If, however, he has not contradicted himself, then we are faced with the task of harmonizing seemingly opposing views. Basing the decision on an application of the rules previously set up, the writer has accepted the second hypothesis as being the more likely—the contradiction is much apparent than real. The general pattern of Brigham Young’s views on the status of the Gods, and the future divinity possible to men, as related in the general concept of LDS cosmology, seems to support this decision.

Brigham Young, like the church today, was polytheistic in his beliefs. He recognized not only three Gods pertaining to this earth 1 (JD 1:50) —the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—but an endless line of Gods pertaining to other worlds and universes as well; (quotations DN May 14, 1862, p. 361). He also believed that these Gods were of one patriarchal lineage, or “species”, as he expresses it here: “Whether Adam is the personage that we should consider our heavenly Father, or not, is considerable of a mystery to a good many. I do not care for one moment how that is; it is no matter whether we are to consider Him our God, or whether His Father, or His Grandfather, for in either case we are one species—of one family—and Jesus Christ is also of our species.” (JD 14:217) Thus Brigham Young implies that to recognize one, is to recognize all; but even do so, he makes it clear in other statements that there is but “one God to us,” 3 (3 JD II:122) and he is “our Father who made us; for he is the only wise God, and to him we own allegiance; to him we owe our lives; he has brought us forth and taught us all we know. We are not indebted to any other power or God for all our great blessings.” 4 (4 DN Oct 26, 1859). Therefore, when Brigham Young says that both Adam and Eve, and all the rest of mankind, are the children of the “highest Intelligence that dwells anywhere that we
have knowledge of," it is the writer's opinion that he is speaking in terms of an ultimate God, or an ultimate source, to which "our fathers who have been exalted for millions of years" owe their rule and existence; and by which the present race of man on this earth has also come into being as children—by virtue of the patriarchal relationship of the "species"—of that "highest intelligence."* (4TPJS 737 etc.) Again, this differentiation between the principle of godhood and the individual personalities comprising and subscribing to that principle will, the writer feels, resolve the seeming conflict in President Young's pronouncements concerning Adam.---PA 55-58*  

1.125 In pointing out that the concept of a "Heavenly Mother" was not revealed to the world until the time of Joseph Smith, he (E. W. Tullidge) says:  

"The oracle of this last grand truth of woman's divinity and of her eternal Mother as the partner with the Father in the creation of worlds, is none other than the doctrine of Godhead. It was revealed in the glorious theology of Joseph and established by Brigham in the vast patriarchal system which he has made firm as the foundations of the earth, by proclaiming Adam as our Father and God...."  

(2 WOM 193-4)  

Such were the views ascribed to Joseph Smith and Brigham Young by Tullidge in 1876. However, such were not the views later claimed for the Prophet. In June 1876, Tullidge referred to Brigham Young as "the fitting successor of the Mormon Prophet, as the modern Moses, and the founder of Utah."* (3LBY by E. W. Tullidge, 1877, p. 456) But in his revised edition of the Life of Joseph the Prophet, published by the Reorganized Church in 1880, his arder had supposedly cooled somewhat.  

(Tullidge like Stenhouse, became involved with the "Godbeites" and was excommunicated from the Church.) For he wrote of him:  

Brigham Young, after the death of the Prophet, for a time confounded the views of the Church by sending forth a "proclamation to the whole world" that "Adam was our Father and God."  

... Wondrous difference between Joseph's revealing of Jesus Christ, the God of all creation, the very Eternal Father; but it truly illustrates the apostasy and perversion which followed the death of the Prophet." (Life of Joseph the Prophet, EWT 439.39)  

This turn about on the part of Tullidge, under "Reorganite" pressure, does much to discredit his claims. Yet the fact that Eliza R. Snow collaborated with him in the preparation of the Women of Mormonism does lend some weight and respectability to the work. She was widely known and loved by the Saints, and remained a faithful member of the Church until her death. Her apparent admiration for Brigham Young may have led her to quite incorrectly identify the Prophet's teachings with those of his successor, although this is quite unlikely.  

It is impossible to accurately determine what, if anything, Joseph Smith revealed that he did not make public. Who can say what may or may not have been said in secret, if it was retained in secret? The public utterances of the Prophet, including his written revelations, are far and away our firmer, and therefore, our safest ground. To go beyond them is to cross into the realm of human speculation, over a bridge upheld by little more than the tenuous strands of possibility.---PA 107-108*  

1.126 A final word.---In concluding this study, the writer quotes from the most recent exposition to be published by the Church on the Identity and position of Adam. It comes from the pen of Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, president of the quorum of the twelve: (quotes 1E July 1953, p. 503)  

Here is the official doctrine of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; here the matter rests.---PA 116-17*  

1.127 Those who comprise the leadership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints stand four-square behind these universal truths which remain the bed-rock upon which the Church is founded. It is to their united pronouncements that one must turn for official doctrine.---PA 123*  

1.128 The doctrine preached by President Young, a few years back where he says that Adam is our God, the God we worship—that most of the people believe this. Some believe it because the President says so; others because they can find testimony in the Book of Mormon and Book of Doctrine and Covenants. Amasa Lyman stumbled on this; he does not believe it. He did not believe in the Atonement of Jesus. Grinn Pratt has also told the President that he does not believe it. This is not the way to act.---Abraham O. Smoot; Minutes of the School of the Prophets, June 18, 1868, Provo, Utah (Michael, Kraut 99)  

1.129 A. F. McDonald—"I thought I would speak in relation to Adam being our God. Since the year 1852 when the President first spoke on this subject, I have frequently endeavored to reconcile what I have read with regard to this matter. I believe what the President says on the subject although it comes in contact with all our traditions. I have not any doubt in my mind but that Adam is our God. Who his God and Father may be, I have no knowledge. President Kimball spoke on this question recently and very plainly illustrated the character and relationship of our Father and God.  

Abraham Smoot—"I have heard President Young avow the truth of Adam being our Father and God but have never heard him argue the question at all.  

George G. Bywater—When I first heard the doctrine of Adam being our Father and God, I was favorably impressed—enjoyed and hailed it as a new revelation. It appeared reasonable to me, as the Father of our spirits that he should introduce us here.---Minutes of the School of the Prophets, Provo, Utah, June 8, 1868, pp. 37, 39, 39, 42 (Michael, Kraut 14)  

1.130 Some have thought it strange what I have said concerning Adam, but the point of the matter is this: when people of faith and influence are willing to accept as their Father, God and Redeemer, Adam as their Prophet, Seer and Revelator and God! but not the father of their spirits, for that was our Father Adam.---WWJ Dec 11, 1869* (c.f. School of the Prophets, Dec 11, 1869; JHBY p. 1313; taken from personal notebook of B. H. Roberts concerning Adam) (see photograph in Michael Kraut 18; see 1168)  

1.131 It is our understanding that Brigham Young himself apparently tried belatedly to recall the sermon in question when it was published in the Millennial Star. In any event there is nothing in the scriptures to support the doctrine and it was never issued to the Church as a revelation. It should be classed, therefore, as pure speculation and its originator honored for the fact that he was not afraid to express publicly his own private opinions though he was the President of the Church and its Prophet.---Science and Mormonism, Cook and Cook, pp. 100-101*, Pub. 1967  

1.132 ...I am going to assume responsibility for making this statement, that man came here, was placed here as an immortal, glorified, resurrected being. I want to make myself clear, because these lectures are going to the brethren, and if they want to correct them they can. I believe it was that fruit that changed and modified Adam's resurrected body, and again made it subject to death. Is that clear? At least, I want you to get my idea. ...and may I say the Church does not teach this as doctrine. Many of the authorities do. Others teach that a body was prepared in some way for Adam and Eve.---Seminary Lectures, BYU, Lecture 10, June 24, 1921, p. 2, 3-4 of Lecture #10*, by John M. Whitaker—"The Fall of Man" (MPG 71)  

1.133 Fallen beings beget children whose bodies are constituted of flesh and bones, being formed out of the blood circulating in the veins of the parents. Celestial beings beget children, composed of the fluid which circulates in their veins, which is spiritual, therefore, their children must be spirits, and flesh and bones.
First, the offspring (of resurrected immortal beings) will be spirits, and not flesh and bones; secondly, these spirits, though male and female, will not marry or be given in marriage while on the New Earth, and consequently will not multiply; and lastly, neither parents nor children will be subject to death.---The Seer 37, 136*, Orson Pratt, 1853

1.134 The fleshly body of Jesus required a Mother as well as a Father. Therefore, the Father and Mother of Jesus, according to the flesh, must have been associated together in the capacity of Husband and Wife; hence the Virgin Mary must have been, for the time being, the lawful wife of God the Father: we use the term lawful Wife, because it would be blasphemous in the highest degree to say that He overshadowed her or begat the Saviour unlawfully. It would have been unlawful for any man to have interfered with Mary, who was already espoused to Joseph; for such a heinous crime would have subjected both the guilty parties to death, according to the law of God. God having created man and woman, had the most perfect right to do with them as they pleased, according to His holy will and pleasure: He had a lawful right to overshadow the Virgin Mary in the capacity of a husband, and beget a Son, although she was espoused to another; for the law which He gave to govern men and women was not intended to govern Himself, or to prescribe rules for His own conduct. It was also lawful in Him, after having thus dealt with Mary, to give her to Joseph her espoused husband. Whether God the Father gave Mary to Joseph for time only, or for time and eternity, we are not informed. Inasmuch as God was the first husband to her, it may be that He only gave her to be the wife of Joseph while in this mortal state, and that He intended after the resurrection to again take her as one of His own wives to raise up immortal spirits in eternity.---The Seer 158*, OP, 1853

1.135 We have now clearly shown that God the Father had a plurality of wives, one or more being in eternity, by whom He begat our spirits as well as the spirit of Jesus His First Born, and another being upon the earth by whom He begat the tabernacle of Jesus, as His Only Begotten in this world.---The Seer 172*, OP, 1853

1.136 We may ask them the question, 'Do you believe in the God of Abraham, Isaac and of Jacob?' So do the Latter-day Saints. If they believe in the God who told Moses to say to Pharaoh, 'He spoke of a man from the high and an outstretched arm!' 'Yes,' say they; and so do the Latter-day Saints. Have you faith, that if necessary, He would again shower manna from Heaven and send flocks of quails to allure your hunger, and cause water to burst from the rock to quench your thirst as He did when the Children of Israel were passions, and so do the Latter-day Saints? They are serving. He is our Father. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—whom the tribe of Judah discard, heaping ridicule upon his name. He is the Father of our Spirits, everyone of us, Jew or Gentile, bond or free, white or black.---Utah Historical Quarterly (1961) 29:68 (Aug 4, 1867, BY: quoted in Falling 47-48)

1.137 Obviously as we have often pointed out on other evidence, the early Christians had a revealed faith and were not interested in things reasoned out by man.---The World and the Prophets (Hugh Nibley) 79*

(NOTE: There is a parallel here to the LDS who forsook the revelations of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young on the Godhead. They now have carefully worked out a new doctrine that squares with the present interpretations and the Gentile philosophies and which thoroughly supports Orson Pratt's contention with President Young that he (Orson) could disprove the Adam Doctrine from the scriptures. He never accepted that doctrine. Notwithstanding this, President Young and other LDS didn't concern themselves with Orson Pratt and his books, for they had a revealed faith and weren't interested in things reasoned out by man.)
that they might become, in the resurrection, like Gods.

When this earth had become an abode for mankind, with its Garden of Eden, then it was that the morning stars sang together, and the sons and daughters of God shouted for joy. They were coming down to earth....

The father and mother were at length in their Garden of Eden. They came on purpose to fall. They fell 'that man might be; and man, is that he might have joy.' They ate of the tree of mortal life, partook of the elements of this earth that they might again become mortal for their children's sake; they fell that another world might have a probation, redemption and resurrection. ---WOM 180*

1.143 The grand patriarchal economy, with Adam, as a resurrected being, who brought his wife Eve from another world has been very finely elaborated by Brigham from the patriarchal vision which Joseph conceived.... The genesis of mortals and immortals....

The Gods are the fathers and the mothers, and the brothers and sisters of the saints.-------WOM 181*

1.144 Joseph endowed the Church with the genius of a grand theology, and Brigham has reared the colossal fabric of a new civilization.-------WOM 187*

1.145 First and noblest of this great family was Jesus Christ, who was the elder brother, in spirit, of the whole human race. These constituted a world family of pre-existing souls.

Brightest among these spirits, and nearest in the circle to our Father and Mother in heaven (the Father being Adam), were Seth, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, Moses, David, and Jesus Christ—indeed that glorious cohort of men and women, whose lives have left immortal records in the world's history; among those the Mormon faith would rank Joseph Smith, Brigham Young and their companions.... These are the sons and daughters of Adam — the Ancient of Days — the Father and God of the whole family. These are the sons and daughters of Michael, who is Adam, the father of the spirits of all our race. These are the sons and daughters of Eve, the Mother of a world.-------WOM 191*

1.146 Moreover, Jesus is one of the grand order of Saviors. Every world has its distinctive Savior, and every dispensation its Christ.-------WOM 192*

1.147 When Brigham Young proclaimed to the nations that Adam was our Father and God, and Eve, his partner, the Mother of a world — both in a mortal and celestial sense — he made the most important revelation ever oracular to the race since the days of Adam himself.

This grand patriarchal revelation is the very key-stone of the 'New Creation' of the heavens and the earth. It gives new meaning to the whole system of theology — as much new meaning to the economy of salvation as to the economy of creation. By the understanding of the works of the Father, the works of the Son are illuminated. The revelation was the 'Let there be light,' again pronounced, 'And there was light.'....

The prime object of man and woman's creation was for the purpose of creation, 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it,' by countless millions of your offspring. Thus opened creation, and womb of everlasting motherhood throbbing with divine ecstasy.... Eve — immortal Eve — came down to earth to become the mother of a race....

How become the mother of a world of mortals except by herself again becoming mortal? How becoming mortal, only by transgressing the laws of immortality? How only by 'eating of the forbidden fruit' — by partaking of the elements of a mortal earth, in which the seed of death was everywhere scattered?-------WOM 196-*

1.166a

1.148 The fall is simple. Our immortal parents came down to fall; came down to transgress the laws of immortality; came down to give birth to mortal tabernacles for a world of spirits.

GENERAL REFERENCES---Women of Mormondom 1.148

The 'forbidden tree,' says Brigham, contained in its fruits the elements of death, or the elements of mortality. By eating of it blood was again infused into the tabernacles of beings who had become immortal. The basis of mortal generation is blood. Without blood no mortal can be born. Even could mortals have been conceived on earth, the fruit of whose life had been but the paradise of a few; but a mortal world was the object of creation then.

Even, then, came down to be the mother of a world. Glorious Mother, capable of dying at the very beginning to give life to her offspring, that through mortality the eternal life of the Gods might be given her sons and daughters. Motherhood the same from the beginning even to the end! The love of motherhood passing all understanding! Thus read our Mormon sisters the fall of their mother.... -------Women of Mormondom 198* (MFG 73-76)

(NOTE: To illustrate that the Adam Doctrine found in the Women of Mormondom was not just that of Tullidge, consider two excerpts from poems penned by Sister Eliza Roxy Snow Smith Young)

1.148a Father Adam, our God, let all Israel exult, and Jesus, our Brother, who died for us all....---MS 17:320, Eliza R. Snow Smith Young (MFG 77)

1.148b Adam, your God, like you on earth, has been Subject to sorrow in a world of sin:...."An Immortal!", Eliza R. Snow Smith Young, Poems of Eliza R. Snow 2:8, 9 (MFG 76)

JOURNALS

(The following quotes are from various journals of men living at the time that the Adam Doctrine was taught by Brigham Young as Church Doctrine. During an interview with a member of the present Quorum of the Twelve, in which he said that the Adam Doctrine was false, I asked him if it was false and never taught by Brigham Young, then why did the men of that day write about that Doctrine in their Journals and say it had been taught and was true? He said, in substance, that if that were so then there is something wrong. The following entries provide ample evidence that there IS something wrong! The original spellings are preserved from the documents where possible.)

1.149 Upon seeing Brigham Young for the first time and while yet some distance away, the Prophet Joseph stopped his chopping on a beach log, straightened up, studied Brigham for a moment, then remarked: "There come the greatest man who ever lived to teach the identity of God to the world, and he will yet lead this people.

---Diary of Charles Walker 124 (Michael Kraut 92)

1.149a Brother Levi W. Hancock bore his testimony to the living oracles of God. Said in the early rise of the church he lived two years with the Prophet Joseph, and one day he was chopping a Beech log with Joseph and Bro. Brigham for the first time Joseph remarked to him before Brigham came within hearing, "There is the greatest man that ever lived to teach redemption to the world and will yet lead this people."---Diary of Charles L. Walker 29* (MS 19:598-600; changing 41; MBY 4; Succession (Durham) 12

1.150 Zedeece Coltrin reported having been with the Prophet and Oliver Cowdery when they "saw the heaven open and in it a great golden throne and on it a man and a woman with hair as white as snow." They were told by Joseph that "the man and woman is Father Adam and (Mother) Eve."----Diary of Oliver B. Huntington, 1847-1900, Part II, p. 207* (c.f. Joseph Smith the Man and Seer, 92*)
GENERAL REFERENCES—Journals 1.151

1.151 The Great God has a Name By which he will be Called Which is Jehovah--also in asking have Reference to a personage like Adam for God made Adam Just in his own Image and likeness (is) a key for you to know how to seek and obtain.---Record of William F. McIntire, CHO; dated 9 March 1841 (c.f. BYU FS 78:83*)

1.152 (Joseph Smith III, first president of the "Reorganized Church," in the Church Advocate Feb. 15, 1847, attacked the doctrine that places Adam at the head of the human family. He asked, "By what authority did Brigham Young teach the Saints that Adam is our Father and our God, etc.? Let the Saints then judge Brigham Young's strange doctrines and practices.")

Answering the inquiry, Rebecka Mar Whitney, daughter of HCK and a plural wife of the Prophet Joseph Smith, in her well-written pamphlet, Plural Marriage, pp. 31, 32, published September 20, 1882, observed:

Brigham Young did not happen to be the author of this doctrine, and to prove the truth of my assertion, I will produce some of the Prophet's teachings, given May 16, 1864. These were written, together with other things, by his clerk, William Clayton, as they were spoken, and as I have the privilege of reading them when quite a young woman, I took the liberty of copying them. The copy I have retained, and this is what the Prophet said upon the subject, commencing with the Priesthood: (then she quotes TP JS 173) "The Priesthood was first given...head of the human family."---Plural Marriage as Taught by the Prophet Joseph by Helen Mar Whitney 20* (MFG 81-2*)

1.153 April 9, 1852: I will now preach to you another sermon. There is onegreat Master and head in all kingdoms and governments; and so with our Father in heaven is a tabernacle. He created us in the likeness of his own image. The Son has also a tabernacle like the Father & the Holy Ghost is a minister to the people but (has) not a tabernacle. Who begat the son of God (?) infidels say that Jesus was a bastard, but let me tell you the truth concerning that matter. Our Father begat all the spirits that are in the tabernacles were made. When our Father & Son were in the Garden, he came with his celestial body and brought one of his wives with him, and ate of the fruit of the garden until he could beget a tabernacle. Adam is Michael or God and all the God that we have anything to do with. They ate of this fruit and formed the first tabernacle that was formed. And when the Virgin Mary was begotten with child, it was by the Father and in no other way, only wise are begotten. I will tell you the truth as it is in God. The world does not know that Jesus Christ our Elder brother was begotten by our Father in heaven. It matters not if you are pleased. It will either seal the damnation or salvation of men. He was begotten by the Father and not by the Holy Ghost. When you go to preach and believe that Jesus Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost, don't lay hands upon the ladies and then give them the Holy Ghost lest it beget them with child. I have told you nothing in this thing but what you have read in the Bible. I do not frame it.---Journal of Wilford Woodruff, April 9, 1852*, quoting BY (Michael Kraut 4-5)

1.153a Friday 9th April 1852: Another meeting this evening, President B. Young taught that Adam was the father of Jesus and the only God to us. That he came to this world in a resurrected body, etc. More hereafter.---Horse Stout Journal, Vol. 2:435 (Michael Kraut 4)

1.153b Friday the 9th of Conference (1852) To an assembly of all men members of the Church---Brigham said that there was a great deal about the Father of Jesus Christ. I will tell you that all Spirits that Ever came or Ever will Come on this Earth are Begotten sons & daughters of God Our heavenly Father who came to this Globe & Brought the Seeds with his wife or one of his wives, & with him & Eat of the fruit of this plant & care from Projected Cain & Abel--having a Celestial Body who also Beget our Lord & Saviour Jesus By his wife, the Virgin Mary, Now Elders according the order to the world the Holy Ghost is the Father of the Virgin Mary, when Elders according the order of the world the Holy Ghost is the Father of the Virgin Mary...---Day Book of William Patterson McIntire, p. 123*, typed copy found in Special Collections, BYU Library p. 146* (discourse quoted in JD 6:275, see 1.54)

1.154 Who did beget him? His Father, and his father is our God, and the Father of our spirits, and he is the framer of the body, the god and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who is he? He is Father Adam; Michael; the Ancient of days. Has he a Father? He has. Has he a mother? He has. Now say that the Son of God was begotten by the Father and not by the Holy Ghost, is to say that the Holy Ghost in God the Father, which is inconsistent, and contrary to all the revelations of God both modern, and ancient. I silenced this erroneous doctrine a year ago last fall conference. It was I think when a dispute arose among some of our best Elders, as to who was the Father of the Son of Man pertaining to the flesh. Some contended it was the Holy Ghost, and some that it was Elohim. When I spoke upon it in this stand before a conference of Elders. I cautioned them when they laid their hands upon the people for the gift of the Holy Ghost, according to the instructions of the Savior, to be very careful how they laid hands upon women for if it beget a child in the days of the virgin Mary it is just as liable to beget children in the last days.---Brigham Young Papers, Feb 19, 1854, call number MS. F 219 #81, CHO

1.154a He (Brigham Young) said that our God was Father Adam He was the Father of the Savior Jesus Christ---Our God was no more or less than ADAM, Michael the Arkangetl.---Wilford Woodruff's Journal, February 19, 1854*

1.157 17th (Sept 1854) President Young present this afternoon & spoke upon the Law of consecration in our prayer circle the subject of Elder Orson Pratt publishing the Seer & the doctrine it contained was brought up in conversation, President Young said he ought not to have published the marriage ceremony, it was sacred & one of the last ceremonies attended to in the Endowments & ought not to have been given to the world. I spoke. Pratt said that he thought it was no harm as the plurality of wives & its doctrines was to be published to the world. He said he
should not have done it if He had thought that he had been the least harm in it—President Young said he was satisfied that he intended no wrong in it. He said that the doctrine taught in the Seer that God had arrived at that state whereby He could not advance any further in knowledge, power & glory was a false doctrine & not true that there never will be a time to all eternity when all the Gods of Eternity will cease advancing in power, knowledge, experience & glory for if this was the case Eternity would cease to be & the glory of God would come to an end but all of Celestial beings would advance in knowledge & power except the one who is to be God & be always ahead of us we should never catch up with him in all Eternity nor be his leaders. Pratt also thought that Adam was made of the dust of the Earth. Could not believe that Adam was our God or the Father of Jesus Christ. President Young said that he was that he came from another world & made this brought Eve with him & partook of the fruits of the Earth the begat children & they were Earthly & had mortal bodies. He told Brother Pratt to lay aside his philosophical reasoning & get revelation from God to govern him & enlighten his mind more & it would be a great blessing to him to lay aside his books & go into the canyons as some of the rest of us. He would be better for him. He had his Philosophy injured him in a measure. Many good things was said by President Young that we should grow up in revelation so that prince would govern every act of our lives. He had never found any difficulties in leading this people since Joseph’s death.----Wilford Woodruff Journal, Sept 17, 1854.

President Young preached to a congregation of several thousand, out of doors & I believe that he preached the greatest sermon that ever was delivered to the Latter-day Saints since they have been a people.----Wilford Woodruff Journal, Oct 6-8, 1854* (Falling 60)

October 6, 1854. Attended conference, a very interesting conference, for at this meeting President Brigham Young said thus, that Adam and Eve were the names of the first man and woman of every earth that was ever organized and that Adam and Eve were the natural father and mother of every spirit that comes to this planet, or that receives tabernacles on this planet, consequently we are brother and sisters, and that Adam was God, our Eternal Father. This as Brother Heber remarked, was letting the cat out of the bag, and it came to pass, and it came to pass, for I remembered saying to the Brethren at a meeting of High Priests in Nauvoo, while I was speaking to them under the influence of the Spirit, I remarked thus, that our Father Adam had many wives, and that Eve was only one of them, and that she was our mother, and that she was the mother of the inhabitants of this earth, and I believe that also, but behold ye there were some that did not believe these sayings of the Prophet Brigham, even our beloved Brother Orson Pratt told me he did not believe it. He said he could prove by the scriptures it was not correct. I felt very sorry to hear Professor Orson Pratt say that. I feared least he should apostatize, but I prayed for him that he might endure to the end, for I believe it was not for a moment that great men might fall.----History of Joseph Lee Robinson, p. 62* (Michael Kranz II, 99; MFG 46; also (l.liii) and (l.liii))

Oct 8, 1854. Now if you believe what you have heard me say you will believe there are Lords many, and Gods many; and you will believe that unto us, the inhabitants of the earth there is but one God with whom we have to do. ... You and I have one God to whom we are accountable, so we will let the rest alone, and search after the one we have to do with; let us seek after him, the very being who commenced this creation. ... But let us turn our attention to the God with which we have to do. I tell you simply, he is our Father; the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the father of our spirits. ... I tell you more, Adam is the father of our spirits. He had lived upon an earth; he did abide his creation, and did honor to his calling and priesthood, and obeyed his master or Lord, and probably many of his wives did the same and they lived, and died upon an earth and then were resurrected again to immortality and eternal

life. ... I reckon that Father Adam was a resurrected being, with his wives and posterity, and in the Celestial kingdom they were crowned with glory, immortality, and eternal lives, with thrones, principalities and powers; and it was said to him it is your right to organize the elements; and to your creations and posterity there shall be no end. ... Our spirits and the spirits of all the human family were begotten by Adam and born of Eve.----Brigham Young Papers, Oct 8, 1854, call number Ms. D 1234, CHO (quoted in Adam is God?? 14)

DN Oct 12, 1854, p. 2—BY “held the vast audience as it were spellbound.” (quoted in Adam is God?? 14)

Sunday, March 25, 1855 (Orson Pratt preached a lengthy discourse reading 2 Nephi relative to opposition in all things, “applying the principle to Adam’s position when placed in the garden, the necessity of his fall that they might have natural or mortal offspring, and that every good might be known by its opposite. explained also the eternity of Gods as written by him in the “Seer”, for the benefit of Elders who are abroad at any (time) preaching to the world.”

In the P.M. Prest. B. Young spoke to the meeting in a very interesting manner referring to several points touched upon in the morning by Bro. Pratt. Did not seem fully to fancy Orson’s idea about the “Great Almighty God” referring so especially to his attributes. Priesthood is the Principle by which all beings have become Gods, or will become Gods, they must follow the principles of government as revealed in the Priesthood. Adam and Eve were made of the dust of the Earth from which they came,—they brought their bodies with them. They had lived die and been resurrected before they came with immortal bodies, and had to partake of the fruit of this Earth in order to bring forth Mortal bodies, or natural bodies, that their seed might be of the dust of this Earth as they were of the dust of the earth from which they came. It was difficult to teach mankind the way of Life. The Lord had to put in a little at a time as much could not be received, and it is our duty to use that little so as to profit by it and be prepared to profit by it when we come to receive more. Use that little so as to profit by it and be prepared to profit by it when we come to receive more.----Journal of Samuel W. Richards, Book II, pp. 63, 64 (typed copy in Special Collections, BYU, Journal volume 2, no. 55, page 214-5; also quoted in Michael Kranz II, 41; MFG 40)

March 11, 1856. Evening with the Regency in the Upper Room of the President’s office. ... A very serious conversation took place between Prest. B. Young and Orson Pratt upon doctrine. O. P. was directly opposed to the Prest. views and very freely expressed his entire disbelief in them after being told by the President that things were so and so in the name of the Lord. He was firm in the Position that the President’s word in the name of the Lord, was not the word of the Lord to him. The Prest. did not believe that Orson would ever be Adam, to learn by experience the facts discussed, but every other person in the room would if they lived faithful.----Diary of Samuel Whitney Richards, March 11, 1856, typed copy at BYU Special Collections

LWW 156—WW felt his journals would contain enlightenment & guidance for those who would faithfully read them

LWW 21—contents of WW’s “supreme historical importance in annals of LDS LWW 347—some day BY would look to WW for his journal where the LWW 477—WW remembered sermon until it was written, then he forgot it

LWW 500—WW warns all future historians to give heed to his history because it is true and will be manifest to the world

A son of Heber C. Kimball (Elder J. Golden Kimball of the First Council of 70) informed the writer (Joseph W. Musser) that he, Elder Kimball, had read the following in his father’s journal: “The Lord told me that Jesus Christ was the Son of Adam.”----MFG 49* (Fallacy 129)
ADAM &

GENERAL REFERENCES—Journals 1.163a

1.163a April 30, 1862, the Lord told me that Adam was my father and that he was the God and father of all the inhabitants of this earth.----HCK, Sacred History, Solomon F. Kimball Papers, CHO, this is a notebook containing several personal revelations to HCK (quoted in Adam Is God??? 21)

1.164 (From the notebook of President B.H. Roberts) Pres. Young on Adam sermon: Elder Young's 1st Discourse on Adam God idea is in J. of Dis. First Vol Sermon Preached Apr 9th 1852

Subsequent viz 1869: "Some may think what I have said concerning Adam stranger, but the period will come when the people will be willing to adopt Joseph Smith as their prophet, Seer and revelator and God (f), but not the Father of their Spirits; for that was our Father Adam."

Above in "School of the Prophets" Dec 11th 1869, see Journal Hist of B. Young (NS) for Dec 11th 1869, p. 1313; also Journal Hist of Wilford Woodruff same date, for which above in MS Hist of BY is evidently taken. BHR

Adam a Resurrected Being

God: B. Young's Idea of

President Young said:

Michael (Adam) was a resurrected being, and he left Elohim and came to the earth an immortal body, and continued so till he partook of earthly food & begot children who were mortal (keep this to yourselves), then he died. (The above is from Wilford Woodruff's Journal entry for Jan 27, 1860. Trial of O. Pratt one of the Twelve on the matter of worshipping Attributes rather than the Person of God (see fuller item in MS notes)

Comment: If Adam was a resurrected being then he could not die. See Alma 11:45 & context

---BHR Notebook (Michael Kraut 18*)

1.164a Man also will have to be sealed to man until the chain is united from Father Adam down to the last Saint. This will be the work of the Millenium and Joseph Smith will be the man to attend to it or to direct it. It will not administer in person. But he will receive the resurrected body and will dictate to those who dwell in the flesh and tell what is to be done for he is the LAST PROPHET who is called to lay the foundation of the great Last Dispensation of the Fullness of Times.----Wilford Woodruff Journal Dec 11, 1869 (Michael Kraut 51-52*)

1.165 President Young said Adam was Michael, the Archangel & he was the Father of Jesus Christ & was our God & that Joseph taught this Principle.----Wilford Woodruff Journal Dec 16, 1876 (Falling 59)

1.166 The Savior comes to the Father, the Ancient of Days, and presents to the Father the kingdoms of this world all in a saved condition--except the sons of perdition. And he says, "Here Father; here they are, and I with them." Then he is prepared to go forth and fill up his kingdom, and so he goes on.----JLN, 1877, quoting Brigham Young in St. George (Michael Kraut 66)

1.166a In January 1877, shortly after the lower portion of the St. George Temple was dedicated, President Brigham Young, in following up in the Endowments, became convinced that it was necessary to have the formula of the Endowments written, and he gave directions to have the same put in writing.

Shortly afterwards he explained what the Lecture at the Veil should portray, and for this purpose appointed a day when he would personally deliver the Lecture at the Veil. Elders J. D. Y. McAllister and L. John Nuttall prepared writing material, and as the President spoke they took down his words. Elder Nuttall put the same into form and the writing was submitted to President Young who approved it and approved his office in residence at St. George. He there made such changes as he deemed proper, and when he finally passed upon it said: This is the Lecture to be observed in the Temple.

A copy of the Lecture is kept at the St. George Temple, in which President Young refers to Adam in his creation and &c.----JLN Papers, Letter Press Book No. 4, p. 290, Special Collections, BYU Library (Falling 105) (The Letter Press Book has either been removed, or they will not allow it to be seen. As of February 1969.)

1.166b February 7, 1877. - In the creation the Gods entered into an agreement about forming this earth &c putting Michael or Adam upon it. These things of which I have been speaking are what are termed the mysteries of godliness but they will enable you to understand that resumption of Jesus must take place. This is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent. We were once acquainted (acquainted) with the Gods & lived with them but we had the privilege of taking upon us flesh that the spirit might have a house to dwell in. We did so and forgot all, and came into the world not recollecting anything of which we had previously learned. We have heard a great deal about Adam and Eve, how they were formed &c some think he was made like an abode and the Lord breathed into him the breath of life. For we read "from dust thou art and unto dust shall thou return." Well he was made of the dust of the earth but not of this earth. he was made just the same way you and I are made but on another earth. Adam was an immortal being when he came. On this earth he had lived on an earth similar to ours he had received the Priesthood and the Keys thereof and had been faithful in all things and gained his resurrection and his exaltation and was crowned with glory immortality and eternal lives and was numbered among the Gods for such he became in that plan of the ages. He had begotten all the spirits that was to come to this earth. And Eve our common Mother who is the mother of all living bore those spirits in the celestial world. And when that earth was organized by Elohim Jehovah and Michael who is Adam our common Father. Adam & Eve had the privilege to continue the work of Progression consequently came to this earth and commenced the great work of forming tabernacles for those spirits to dwell in. and when Adam and those that assisted him had completed this kingdom our earth he came toil and slept and forgot all and became like an infant child. It is said by Moses the historian that the Lord caused a deep sleep to come upon Adam and took from his side a rib and formed the woman that Adam called Eve—this should be interpreted that the Man Adam like all other Men had the seed within him to propagate his species. But not the Woman. She conceives the seed but she does not produce it. Consequently she was taken from the side or bowels of her father. This explains the mystery of Moses's dark sayings in regard to what Adam & Eve when they were placed on this earth were immortal beings with flesh bones and sinews but upon partaking of the fruits of the earth while in the Garden and cultivating the ground their bodies became changed from immortal to mortal beings with the blood coursing through their veins. At the same time they were not under transgression until after he partook of the forbidden fruit this was necessary that they might be together that man might be the woman was found in transgression not the Man—Now in the law of Sacrifice we have the promise of a Savior and man who had the privilege and showed forth his obedience by offering the first fruits of the earth and the firstlings of the flock--this as a showing that Jesus would come and shed his blood. (four lines without any writing on them.) Father Adam's oldest son (Jesus the Saviour) who is the heir of the family is Father Adams first begotten in the spirit World, who according to the flesh is the only begotten as it is written. (In his divinity he has gone back into the spirit World. and come in the spirit to Mary and she conceived for when Adam and Eve got through with their work in this earth. they did not lay their bodies down in the dust, but returned to the spirit World from whence they came.
I felt myself much blessed in being permitted to associate with such meand hear such instructions as they savor of life to me.----JLJN 1:19-21 BYU (p. 21-24 in original) (Michael Kraut 25, 36, 46, 53, 55, 64, 67; PA 32-3; Falling 106-7; Unpublished 117-8)

1.167 ...He (George Q. Cannon, father) asked me what I understood concerning Mary conceiving the Savior; and if I found no answer, he asked what he was to prevent Father Adam from visiting and overshadowing the mother of Jesus. "Then," said I, "He must have been a resurrected being." "Yes," said he, "and though Christ is said to have been the first fruits of them that slept, yet the Savior said he did nothing but He had seen His Father do, for He had power to lay down His life and take it up again. Adam, though made of dust, was made, as Pres. Young said, of the dust of another planet than this." I was very much instructed by the conversation and this day's services.----JAHC, 10:16*: March 1888 (Michael Kraut 70)

1.168 He (G.Q.C.) believes that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, and that Adam is His Father and our God; that under certain unknown conditions the benefits of the Savior's atonement extend to our entire Solar System.----JAHC, June 25, 1888* (Photograph in Mormonism: Shadow or Reality 177)

1.169 Elder Horne and I chatted again tonight about the Gospel and the Adam--God Doctrine, as we have done many times before. Brother Horne, who grew up in Salt Lake City, and was the son of Richard Horne and the grandson of Joseph Horne, said--in reference to the Adam--God Doctrine--that when he first went through the Temple (SL) for his Endowment in 1902 before going on his mission he was surprised to hear the teaching during the Temple ceremony that "Adam was our God" and that "He came here with Eve, one of His wives." Also, it was taught that "Eve bore our spirits" (i.e. the spirits of all men). He asked his father about it but he declined to give his opinion about it. After Brother Horne returned from his mission a few years later, in 1905, he noticed the teachings had been removed from the Temple ceremony. He feels that they were left over from Brigham Young's influence, but that he himself (Brother Horne) couldn't believe such doctrine. He thinks perhaps Brigham just got off in his speculation----C. Jess Groesbeck's Elders Journal, Vol. 1, p. 291 (Michael Kraut 101)

OPPOSITION

NOTE: One would not think that a doctrine taught by the President of the Church, the man holding the keys of the Priesthood, to the Saints in General Conference could be rejected and anathematized, but such was indeed the case. Some Latter-day Saints today, for want of a better reason, say the Adam Doctrine is part of Protestantism that was left in Brigham Young but now has been purged out by 150 years of pure LDS leaders who have not been so tainted in their backgrounds. The Truth, however, is just the opposite! When Brother Brigham first taught the Adam Doctrine and Plural Marriage in 1852, the entire "Christian" world as in one voice (and this is one of the few things they agree on) have said that the Adam Doctrine is blasphemous and Plural Marriage is adultery! Elwood Norris (Dec 38) says that when people apostatize, the first thing they lose is the True concept of God. And LDS are correct at least in their statement that there has been changes in Mormon thought. Today LDS are taught by the General Authorities that the Adam Doctrine is a blasphemous error and that Plural Marriage is Adultery! You should be able to easily determine who has converted whom to what! See DIAGRAM 1: 2.42.18.

First, return and read quotes from Redney Turner's Position of Adam concerning Brigham Young's teachings (1.121, 1.122, 1.123, 1.124, and 1.126). Then compare the following statements made in opposition to the Adam Doctrine. Also included in this section are quotes from Joseph Smith, Brigham Young and others showing the opposition among the Latter-day Saints to the teachings concerning the Godhead.

1.170 DS 1:17 (JFS Jr) -- all revelation since the fall has come through Jesus Christ, who is the Jehovah of the Old Testament, and the Father never dealt di-
1.183 We are accused by the Reorganites, however, of departing from the doctrines of the Prophet Joseph Smith in that we believe in a plurality of Gods. That we believe in a plurality of Gods is true, and if they do not—and they confess almost unanimously that they do not—then they are not following the teachings and revelations of Joseph Smith. If the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are separate and distinct personages, then they are three Gods, then they are plural, this fact Joseph Smith taught to the world. But our Reorganites friends quote from a purported discourse of President Brigham Young to the effect that Adam is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do. But this discourse even if reported correctly—which we have reason to believe is not the case—is not the doctrine of the Church and has not been received by the Church. Joseph Smith the Prophet taught a plurality of Gods, and moreover, that man, by obeying the commandments of God and keeping the whole law will eventually reach the power and exaltation by which he also will become a God.——Origin 98-99

1.184 The Father said unto the Son, Elohim said unto Jehovah, sit thou on my right hand until after your mortal ministry; then will I raise you up to eternal glory and exaltation with me, where you will continue to sit on your right hand forever.——Promised Messiah 102*, Bruce R. McConkie

1.185 YOUNG MISQUOTATIONS

( Note: The following is a summary of statements concerning Brother Brigham’s discourses supposed misquotations.)

1. PA 48-9—Was Brigham’s teachings misquoted? A categorical NO! (1.123)
2. Adam Who? 16-7—JD 1:50 is “wrongfully reported,” “misquotation,” “a mistake,” and “quickly noted” to be wrong
3. Science & Mormonism 101—BY tried to stop JD 3:319 from being reprinted in the MS. (See also Adam Who? 17-8 for other mistakes of BY & the MS)
5. Origin 98-9—JD 1:50 not reported correctly
6. DS 1:96—JD 1:50 erroneously transcribed
7. Deceived 18—BY never taught Adam Doctrine & it is false

VARIOUS STATEMENTS OF OPPOSITION AND UNBELIEF

1.186 1843: There are a great many wise men and women, too, in our midst who are too wise to be taught; therefore they must die in their ignorance, and in the resurrection they will find their mistake.——DHC 5:424 * (TPJS 309*), JS, June 11, 1843

1.187 1844: But there has been a great difficulty in getting anything into the heads of this generation. It has been like splitting hemlock knots with a cornpicker for a wedge, and a pumpkin for a beetie. Even the Saints ar slow to understand. I have tried for a number of years to get the minds of the Saints prepared to receive the things of God; but we frequently see some of them, after suffering all they have for the work of God, will fly to pieces like glass as soon as anything comes that is contrary to their traditions: they cannot stand the fire at all. How many will be able to abide a celestial law and go through and receive their exaltation? I am unable to say, as many are called, but few are chosen.——DHC 6:184-85 (TPJS 331*), JS, Jan 20, 1844

1.188 I suppose I am not allowed to go into an investigation of anything that is not contained in the Bible. If I do, I think there are so many oversights men here, that they would cry “treason” and put me to death. So I will go to the old Bible and turn commentator today.——DHC 6:307* (TPJS 348*), JS, April 6, 1844, (see 1.9)

1.189 Mankind verily say that the Scriptures are with them. Search the Scriptures, for they testify of things that these apostates would gravely pronounce blasphemy. Paul, if Joseph Smith is a blasphemer, you are.——DHC 6:474* (TPJS 379*), JS, June 16, 1844, (see 1.10)

1.190 There is too much covetousness in the Church, and too much disposition amongst the brethren to seek after power and has been from the beginning, but this failing is diminishing and the brethren begin to know better. In consequence of such feelings Joseph left the people in the dark on many subjects of importance and they still remain in the dark. We have got to rid such principles from our hearts.——DHC 7:545*, BY, Dec. 14, 1845 (MK 80-1)

1.191 I could tell you much more about this; but were I to tell you the whole truth, blasphemy would be nothing to it, in the estimation of the superstitious and over-righteous of mankind. However, I have told you the truth as far as I have gone.

I have given you a few leading items upon this subject, but a great deal more remains to be told.....

Treasure up these things in your hearts. In the Bible you have read the things I have told you tonight; but you have not known what you did read. I have told you no more than you are conversant with; but what do the people in Christendom, with the Bible in their hands, know about this subject? Comparatively nothing.....——JD 1:50*, BY, April 9, 1852

1.192 1857: Whether Adam is the personage that we should consider our Heavenly Father, or not, is considerable of a mystery to a good many.——JD 4:217*, BY, Feb 8, 1857

1.193 1857: Some have grumbled because I believe our God to be so near as Father Adam. There are many who know that doctrine to be true.——JD 5:331*, BY, Oct 7, 1857

1.194 1859: Am I hated for the same cause? I am. I am hated for teaching people the way of life and salvation—for teaching them principles that pertain to eternity, by which the Gods were and are, and by which they gain influence and power. Obtain their influence, and you will be hated, despised, and hunted like the roe upon the mountains.——JD 7:**, BY, July 3, 1859

1.195 1864: President Kimball remarked that he had been told that some did not believe all that he said, or all that he said, I care not one great whether they believe all that I say or not, or whether they love me or not; I have no concern about that. If I can see the people serving God with all their hearts, building up His Kingdom on the earth, and bringing forth righteousness, I do not care whether they ever think of brother Brigham or of brother Heber C. Kimball, or whether they believe what we say or not; if they believe what the Almighty says, that will content me; then will they realize what the power of faith will do for a people.——JD 10:302*, BY, June 4, 1864

1.196 1873: How much unbelief exists in the minds of the Latter-day Saints in regard to one particular doctrine which I revealed to the, and which God revealed to me—namely that Adam is our Father and God.——DN June 18, 1873*, BY, (ST 2:174; 3:72; PA 6,28,30,37)

1.197 1895: (WW) How much longer I shall talk to this people I do not know; but I want you to say this to all Israel: Cease troubling yourselves about who God is; who Adam is, who Christ is, who Jehovah is. For heaven’s sake, let these things alone. Why trouble yourselves about these things? I say this because we are troubled every little while with inquiries from Elders anxious to know who God is,
who Christ is, and who Adam is. I say to the Elders of Israel, stop this.----MS 57:355-56*, WW, April 7, 1895 (MK 100; PA 70)

1.198 1898: Concerning the doctrine in regard to Adam and the Savior, the Prophet Brigham Young taught some things concerning that; but the First Presidency and the Twelve do not think it wise to advocate these matters.-----First Sunday School Convention 1898, p. 88* (DEN April 17, 1898; Michael Kraut 100)

1.199 1902: But though we look upon Adam as a God, we worship the same God that Adam worshipped in the Garden of Eden.-----MS 64:742*, AIL (MK 102)

1.200 1903: Some remarks concerning him (Adam) by President Brigham Young, in a discourse delivered in this city many years ago, have been commented upon, added to, and sometimes misinterpreted, in a manner that has led to considerable confusion and misunderstanding.-----IE 5:979*, CWP (MK 102, PA 79)

1.201 1910: Whether the mortal bodies of man evolved in natural processes to present perfection, through the direction and power of God; whether the first parents of our generations, Adam and Eve, were transplanted from another sphere, with immortal tabernacles, which became corrupted through sin and the partaking of natural foods, in the process of time; whether they were born here in mortality, as other mortals have been, are questions not fully answered in the revealed word of God.-----IE 13:576*, JFS* (MK 102-3; PA 76)

1.202 1912: Speculations as to the career of Adam before he came to the earth are of no real value. We learn by revelation that he was Michael, the archangel, and that he stands at the head of his posterity on earth. Dogmatic assertions do not take the place of revelation, and we should be satisfied with that which is accepted as doctrine, and not discuss matters that, after all disputes, are merely matters of theory.-----IE 15:417*, JFS, AIL, CWP, Jan 31, 1912 (MFP 4:264-5*; Michael Kraut 105)

1.203 1912: If you will carefully examine the sermon to which you refer, in the JD Vol. 1, you will discover that, while President Young denied that Jesus was “begotten of the Holy Ghost,” he did not affirm, in so many words, that “Adam is the father of Jesus Christ in the flesh.”-----But President Young went on to show that our father Adam,----that is, our earthly father,-----the progenitor of the race of man, stands at our head, being “Michael the Archangel, the Ancient of Days,” and that he was not fashioned from earth like an abode, but “begotten by his Father in Heaven.”-----our Father in Heaven was the Father of the Son of Mary, to whom the Savior prayed, as did our earthly father Adam.-----

When President Young asked, “‘Who is the Father?’” he was speaking of Adam as the father of our earthly bodies, who are at our head, as revealed in D&C 107:53-6.-----MFP 4:286-7*, JFS, AIL, CWP

1.204 1915: Well, now for the benefit of the older ones, how are children begotten? I answer just as Jesus Christ was begotten of his father.....there never will come a time when God the Father will not have power to extend His dominion and His glory. He is the maker of Heaven and the Earth, on which we dwell, for He made this earth by his word and by his power.... Now, little boys and girls, when you are confronted by infidels who know nothing of how Christ was begotten, you can say he was born just as the infidel was begotten and born, so was Christ begotten by his Father, who is also our Father—the Father of our spirits—and he was born of his mother Mary.-----Some of our grandparents find it difficult to conceive the truth—we want to think of something marvelous.-----Box Elder News Jan 28, 1915, JFS* (MFP 4:329-30*)

1.205 1916: Jesus of Nazareth, born of the virgin Mary, was literally and truly the Son of the Father, the Eternal God, not of Adam.-----CR April 1916, p. 23, CWP* (MFP 7: MK 103)

1.206 1921: As a matter of fact, the “Mormon” Church does not teach that doctrine. A few men in the “Mormon” Church had held such views; and several of them quite prominent in the councils of the Church... Brigham Young and others may have taught that doctrine.-----DN July 23, 1921, BHR, article “Answers Given to ‘10 Reasons Why Christians Can Not Fellowship With Latter-day Saints’” (Michael Kraut 17)

1.207 1931: If what is meant is that Adam had passed on to celestial glory through a resurrection before he came here, and that afterwards he was appointed to this earth to do again, the second time becoming mortal, then it is not scriptural or according to the truth.-----MFP 5:290*, HUG & DOM, Feb 26, 1931 (MK 103; MFG 9-11)

1.208 1939: ...in all probability the sermon was erroneously transcribed.-----DS 1:96*, April 15, 1939 (MK 103)

1.209 1942: I think we ought to get that clearly in our minds because there are those who are trying to stir up trouble among the Latter-day Saints today by teaching doctrines that are not in accordance with the revelations of the Lord, and maintaining that Authorities of the Church who have gone before taught doctrines which they did not teach. So we must have it understood clearly that while Adam will preside over his posterity as Michael, the prince, and as he will hold the keys of salvation, as he does, all of that will be under the direction of Jesus Christ, the Holy One of Israel, for Christ is greater than Adam.-----CR April 1942 p. 56*, JFS Jr (MFG 93-4)

1.210 1943: Those who peddle the well-worn Adam-God myth, usually charge the LDS with believing that: (1) Our Father in Heaven, the Supreme God, to whom we pray, is Adam, the first man; and (2) Adam was the father of Jesus Christ. A long series of absurd and false deductions are made from these propositions.-----E&R 1:287, JAWS* (MK 104)

1.211 1949: Lashing out at persons who expound the belief that Adam is the God of this world, Elder (Milton R.) Hunter stated that such doctrine is false and impossible and must be destroyed. “The idea that Adam is the God of this world or that he was transplanted here from another planet is false and misleading,” he declared.-----Provo Daily Herald, March 22, 1949 (MK 104)

1.212 1953: A careful, detached study of his available statements, as found in the official publications of the Church, will admit to no other conclusion than the identification of Adam with God the Father by President Brigham Young is an irrefutable fact.-----We cannot ignore or subvert those of his ideas which were expressed in undesirably specific terms, in order to justify and sustain uncertain interpretations of his intent in general ones.-----FA 58*

1.213 1958: Cultists and other enemies of the restored truth, for their own nefarious purposes sometimes try to make it appear that LDS worship Adam as their Father in Heaven.-----MD 18* (see 1.121)

1.214 ? 7: This so-called Adam-God theory is false and contrary to all the body of revealed truth.-----Criticism of Factions, BRM, (MK 105-6)
1.215 1972: I maintain that President Young was NOT referring to Adam, but to God the Father, who created Adam, for he was in the Garden of Eden, and according to Mormon doctrine Adam was in his presence constantly. President Brigham Young did not believe and did not teach, that Jesus Christ was Begotten by Adam.


1.216 1976: ADAM-GOD THEORY DENOUNCED The importance of teaching the "orthodox truth" of the gospel throughout the Church was emphasized by President Spencer W. Kimball during the Priesthood session of conference October 2.

We warn you against the dissemination of doctrines which are not according to the scriptures and which are alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities of past generations. Such, for instance, is the Adam-God theory.

We denounce that theory and hope that everyone will be cautioned against this and other kinds of false doctrine. --DN, CN Oct 9, 1976, p II*, SWK

(Note: ORTHODOX: conforming to the usual beliefs or established doctrines, esp. in religion, conventional (Webster Dictionary)

DENOUNCE: to accuse publicly; inform against. To condemn strongly. To give formal notice of the ending of an (treaty, etc.) (Webster Dictionary)

Succession of the Presidency of the Church (B. H. Roberts) 79-- "...so easy is it to say: Orthodoxy, my lord, is my doxey; and heterodoxy is some other man's doxey?" (quoting Bishop Warburton's answer to Lord Sandwich when he said he did not know the difference between heterodoxy and orthodoxy.)

1.217 (April 4, 1860, Brigham Young's statement before the Quorum of Twelve Apostles in response to Orson Pratt's accusation that the Adam Doctrine was not according to Joseph Smith's teachings.)

Your statements to-night you come out tonight and place them charges and have as many against me as I have you. One thing I have thought that I might still have committed. It was Joseph's doctrine that Adam was God. And when in Luke Johnson's at O. the power came upon us or such that alarmed the neighborhood. God comes to earth and eats and partakes of fruit.

Joseph could not make what was revealed to him, and if Joseph had it revealed he was not told to reveal it. ---Brigham Young Papers, Minutes of the meeting taken by Thomas Bullock, CHO (from notes of Fred C. Collier)

1.218 Buckeye's Lament for Want of More Wives

I once thought I had knowledge great,
But now I find 'tis small;
I once thought I'd religion, too
But now I find I have none at all;
For I have but one lone wife,
And can obtain no more;
And the doctrine is, I can't be saved,
Unless I've half a score!

The narrow gate that Peter kept,
In ages long ago,
Is locked and barred since he gave up
The keys to beardless Joe.
And Joe proclaims it is too small,
And causes great delay,
And that he has permission got
To open the broad-way.

The narrow gate did well enough
When Peter, James and John,
Did lead the Saints on Zion-ward,
In Single File along:
When bachelors, like good old Paul,
Could win the glorious prize,
And maids, without a marriage-rite,
Reach "mansions in the skies."

But we have other teaching now,
Of greater glories far;
How a single glory's nothing more
Than some lone twinkling star.
A twofold glory's like the moon,
That shines so bright at night,
Whatever he thinks right.

This is the secret doctrine taught,
By Jo and the Red Rams.*
Although in public they deny,
But then 'tis all a sham.
They fear the indignation just,
Of those who have come here,
With hands that's clean and honest hearts,
To serve the Lord in fear.
Thus, all the Twelve do strily teach,
And strily practice too;
And even the sage Patriarch,
Won't have untied his shoe;
For sure, 'would be quite impolite,
If not a great disgrace,
To have a widow sister face,
Spite in a Prophet's face!

But Jo at snaring beats them all,
And at the rest does laugh;
For widows poor, and orphan girls,
He can ensnare with chaff,
He seizes his snares around for all,
And very seldom fails,
To catch some thoughtless Partridges,
Snow-birds, or Knight-ig글

But there are a hundred other birds,
He never can make sing:
Who won't be dragged to hell.
By Prophet, Priest nor King;
Whose sires have bled in days gone by.
For their dear country's cause;
And who will still maintain its rights,
Its Liberty and Laws!

---Warsaw Message, Feb. 7, 1844 (MHP 5:133-36)*

(Note: Although this poem is not from recognized LDS source, the doctrines it is based upon were later taught in Utah by Joseph Smith. First, the “mighty God” create worlds and “take with you there” one wife per world is absolutely in line with that exalted Doctrine presented to the Church and world by the Prophet and President Brigham Young April 9, 1852 and recorded in JD 1:46-53. See 1:38 and Compendium (1884) p. 193. The comparison of a man’s wives to his talents has also been ascribed to the Prophet Joseph, See 27:125 through 31:32. As important as is the internal consistency of the doctrines, of the date of this article speaks loudly in corroboration of President Young's testimony that the Adam Doctrine was taught him by the Prophet Joseph. See 1:165 and 1:89. Sister Eliza R. Snow testified of the same. See 1:140 and 1:141.)
February, 1877

L. John Futtell P. 20

spirit that was to come to this earth, and give our common mother who is the mother of all living beings, spirits in the celestial world, and when this earth was organized by Elohim Jehovah & Michael who is Adam our common father. Adam & Eve had the privilege to continue the work of Progression, consequently came to this earth and commenced the great work of forming tabernacles for those spirits to dwell in. and when Adam and those that assisted him had completed this kingdom our earth he came to It, and slept and forgot all and became like an infant child. it is said by Moses the historian that the Lord caused a deep sleep to come upon Adam and took from his side a rib and formed the woman that Adam called Eve; this should be interpreted that the man Adam like all other men had the seed within him to propagate his species, but not the woman, she conceived the seed but she does not produce it, consequently she was taken from the side or bosom of her father. This explains the mystery of Jesus' dark sayings in regard to Adam and Eve. Adam & Eve when they were placed on this earth were immortal beings with flesh, bones and sinews, but upon partaking of the fruit of (Gen. 3:22) the earth while in the garden and cultivating the ground their bodies became changed from immortal to mortal beings with the blood coursing through their veins as the action of life. Adam was not under transgression until after he partook of the forbidden fruit this was necessary that they might be together that man might be the woman was found in transgression not the man. Eve in the list of sacrifices we have the promise of a Savior and man had the privilege and showed forth his obedience by offering of the first fruits of the earth and the firstlings of the flock—this is a showing that Jesus would come and shed His blood.

February, 1877

L. John Futtell P. 21

(your lines without any writing on them.) Father Adam's oldest son (Jesus the Saviour) who is the heir of the family is father Adam first forgotten in the spirit world, and came in the spirit to Mary and she conceived for when Adam and Eve got through with their work in this earth, they did not (p. 26) lay their bodies down in the dust, but returned to the spirit world from whence they came.

I felt myself much blessed in being permitted (sic) permitted to associate with such men and hear such instructions as they imparted of life to me.

Thursday, 8th. Attended at the Temple as Recorder also at the sealings. 37 living endowments. 76 dead. 38 sealings S.S. & F Y J. 39 ordination I wrote to my wife Sophia & Geo J. Rider—spent the evening at 4th Ward School House. Frest Snow lectured on the Book of Mormon to the Y. M. I Ama. he gave the name of the Era of Jared as "Exarch" "Keriman-cutter" the Prophet Joseph received it by revelation. had no (fate) good time.

Fri. 9th at the Temple affiliated as Recorder & at the sealing record—also as Michael or Adam and at the well- Frest Young present. 2 living endowments. 75 dead. 10 ordained. 23 sealings H. & M. — a heavy day— but all felt well attended prayer meeting at S. 6th house. spoke, a good feeling prevailed.

starting

& had assisted E. Young. Jr. to fit up his carriage preparatory to
set up talking with Frost Snow until after 11 P.M.

Wed 7 At Temple. I officiated as Recorder at the font - false (sic) in the Sealing room in anointing where Josiah Quins Hardy & his wife Ann Denston Hardy - had their 2 anointing (p. 20) also Mathew Clayton - also Sarah Johnson (as) anointed to F. McDonald. his wife Elizabeth Graham Ld. as proxy - Mrs. (sic) VanCott McDonald was also anointed to A. F. McDonald - W. Woodruff anointing. H. W. Bigler held the horn. 336 Baptisms. J. L. Smith - D. H. Cannon confirmed 185. A. H Raleigh Sl. N. W. Bigler 77. D. D. InArthur 63 - wrote to my wife Elizabeth & son Leonard - after supper want to President Youngs present Frost Young, W. Woodruff. E. Snow, R. Young Jr., I. G. Bleek, L. K Greene & myself. works in the Temple being under consideration Frost Young was filled with the spirit of God & revelation & said when we got our washings and anointings under the hands of the Prophet Joseph at Nauvoo we had only one room to work in with the exception of a little side room or office were we were washed and anointed had our garments placed upon us and received our New Name.

and after he had performed these ceremonies. he gave the Key Words signs, tokens (sic) and penalties. then after we went into the large room over the store in Nauvoo. Joseph divided up the room the best that he could hung up the veil. marked it gave us our instructions as we passed along from one department to another giving us signs, tokens, penalties with the Key words pertaining to those signs and after we had got through. Bro Joseph turned to me (Frost & Young) and said Bro Brigham this is not arranged right but we have done the best we could under the circumstances in which we are placed and I (p.21) there-3-at-the-Temple-officiated-as Recorder (sic) wish you to take this matter in hand and organize and system-
Bruce McConkie's Letter of Rebuke to Professor Eugene England

Introduction:

The following is a letter written by LDS Apostle Bruce R. McConkie and sent to a BYU Professor by the name of Eugene England. The purpose of McConkie's letter was to let Dr. England know that he was very displeased with certain ideas he was espousing publicly. These included teachings taught in the past by leaders such as Brigham Young. McConkie admits in the letter that Brigham Young was guilty of teaching things that were "out of harmony with the gospel" (p. 6). In fact, McConkie makes the amazing confession that "I do not know all of the providences of the Lord, but I do know that he permits false doctrine to be taught in and out of the Church and that such teaching is part of the sifting process of mortality" (p. 7). Such a statement should be disconcerting to the average Mormon who has heard his leaders time and time again insist that, "God will never allow the prophet of the [LDS] church to lead the church astray." Since when has teaching false doctrine not been a method of leading people astray?

McConkie soundly attacks Young's notion that God is ever progressing in knowledge or that Adam is God. The letter is most revealing in that while Mr. McConkie claims that individuals who hold to some of the views of Mormonism's 2nd president will be damned (p. 7), he fails to admit that Young must have been damned for teaching them. We offer this letter for your perusal.

THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS
The Council of Twelve
47 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84150
February 19, 1981

Mr. Eugene England
xxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxx, xx xxxxxxx

Dear Brother England:

This may well be the most important letter you have or will receive. It is written in reply to an undated letter from you which came in an envelope postmarked, September 4, 1980. Your letter enclosed a 19-page document which you had prepared under the title, "The Perfection and Progression of God: Two Spheres of Existence and Two Modes of Discourse."

In your letter and the article enclosed with it, you set forth the thesis that although God knows all things as pertaining to our sphere of existence, there are nonetheless other spheres beyond ours in which Deity continues to advance and progress in knowledge and truth. In espousing and explaining this philosophy you suppose you are harmonizing quotations from various of the early Brethren. Some of these statements emphatically say that God knows all things and has all power and others of them say that he is advancing in knowledge and understanding and is gaining new truths.

When your letter arrived I was aware of the subject material contained in it and in the enclosed article. Because I do not engage in controversy or discussion of divergent views, either orally or in writing, I simply dropped your letter in a drawer and did not bother to read it. Some four and a half months later, in January of this year, I did read your presentation for the first time. I was not at all pleased, but still thought I would have nothing to say to you on the subject.

Over the months various hearsay reports have come to me indicating that you are presenting and championing the views you sent to me. I have now reached the conclusion that it would be wise for me to depart from my usual custom and send you an answer to your letter. I do so out of respect for your parents, G. Eugene and Dora, and for your own personal well-being and for your guidance where your teachings and discussions with others are concerned.

Mr. Eugene England
February 19, 1981
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I shall write in kindness and in plainness and perhaps with sharpness. I want you to know that I am extending to you the hand of fellowship though I hold over you at the same time, the scepter of judgment. My office door is open to you and if you feel the need for discussion with me, my secretary will be pleased to set up a mutually convenient time or times for such.

On Sunday, June 1, 1980, I spoke at one of the multi-stake firesides in the Marriott Center on the subject, "The Seven Deadly Heresies." In that talk I said:

"There are those who say that God is progressing in knowledge and is learning new truths.

"This is false -- utterly, totally, and completely. There is not one sliver of truth in it. It grows out of a wholly twisted and incorrect view of the King Follet Sermon and of what is meant by eternal progression.

"God progresses in the sense that his kingdoms increase and his dominions multiply -- not in the sense that he learns new truths and discovers new laws. God is not a student. He is not a laboratory technician. He is not postulating new theories on the basis of past experiences. He has indeed graduated to that state of exaltation that consists of knowing all things and having all power."
"The life that God lives is named eternal life. His name, one of them, is 'Eternal,' using that word as a noun and not as an adjective, and he uses that name to identify the type of life that he lives. God's life is eternal life, and eternal life is God's life. They are one and the same. Eternal life is the goal we shall obtain if we believe and obey and walk uprightly before him. And eternal life consists of two things. It consists of life in the family unit, and, also, of inheriting, receiving, and possessing the fulness of the glory of the Father. Anyone who has each of these things is an inheritor and possessor of the greatest of all gifts of God, which is eternal life.

"Eternal progression consists of living the kind of life God lives and of increasing in kingdoms and dominions everlastingl. Why anyone should suppose that an infinite and eternal being, who has presided in our universe for almost 2,555,000,000 years, who made the sidereal heavens, whose creations are more numerous than the particles of the earth, and who is aware of the fall of every sparrow -- why anyone would suppose that such a being has more to learn and new truths to discover in the laboratories of eternity is totally beyond my comprehension.

"Will he one day learn something that will destroy the plan of salvation and turn man and the universe into an uncreated nothingness? Will he discover a better plan of salvation than the
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one he has already given to men in worlds without number?

"The saving truth, as revealed to and taught, formally and officially, by the prophet Joseph Smith in the Lectures on Faith is that God is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. He knows all things, he has all power, and he is everywhere present by the power of his Spirit. And unless we know and believe this doctrine we cannot gain faith unto life and salvation.

"Joseph Smith also taught in the Lectures on Faith 'that three things are necessary in order that any rational and intelligent being may exercise faith in God unto life and salvation. These he named as:

1. "The idea that he actually exists';
2. "A correct idea of his character, perfections, and attributes; and
3. "An actual knowledge that the course of life which he is pursuing is according to the divine will.'

"The attributes of God are given as knowledge, faith or power, justice, judgment, mercy, and truth. The perfections of God are named as 'the perfections which belong to all of the attributes of his nature,' which is to say that God possesses and has all knowledge, all faith or power, all justice, all judgment, all mercy, and all truth. He is indeed the very embodiment, personification, and source of all these attributes. Does anyone suppose that God can be 'more honest than he already is'? Neither need any suppose there are truths he does not know or knowledge he does not possess.

"Thus Joseph Smith taught, and these are his words:

'Without the knowledge of all things, God would not be able to save any portion of his creatures, for it is by reason of the knowledge which he has of all things, from the beginning to the end, that enables him to give that understanding to his creatures by which they are made partakers of eternal life; and if it were not for the idea existing in the minds of men that God had all knowledge it would be impossible for them to exercise faith in him.' (Cited, Mormon Doctrine, p. 264.)

"If God is just dabling with a few truths he has already discovered, we have no idea as to the real end and purpose of creation."

The foregoing quotation is from the published version of the talk. As it was actually given it included the following
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paragraph: "Will he one day learn something that will destroy the plan of salvation and turn man and the universe into an uncreated nothingness? Will he discover a better plan of salvation than the one he has already given to men in worlds without number? I have been sorely tempted to say at this point that any who so suppose have the intellect of an ant and the understanding of a clod of miry clay in a primordial swamp -- but of course I would never say a thing like that." I deliberatly deleted the last quoted sentence because it does not come out in print the way it was expressed by voice. It was said in such a tone as to draw laughter from the congregation and is of course, a normal use of hyperbole.

In that same devotional speech I said; "There are those who believe or say they believe that Adam is our father and our God, that he is the father of our spirits and our bodies, and that he is the one we worship." I, of course, indicated the utter absurdity of this doctrine and said it was totally false.

Since then I have received violent reactions from Ogden Draut and other cultists in which they have expounded upon the views of Brigham Young and others of the early Brethren relative to Adam. They
have plain and clear quotations saying all of the things about Adam which I say are false. The quotations are in our literature and form the basis of a worship system followed by many of the cultists who have been excommunicated from the Church. I also received, of course, your material in which you quote from Brigham Young and others of the early Brethren saying that God is progressing in knowledge.

I assume that you were aware of the foregoing quotations when you wrote me in September of 1980. In the October 1980 General Conference, without as yet having read your material, I said the following:

"True religion is found only where men worship the true and living God. False religion always results from the worship of false gods. Eternal life itself, which is the greatest of all the gifts of God, is available to those and those only who know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.

"It is all the rage in this modern world to worship false gods of every sort and kind. There are those who bow before idols of wood and stone, and others who insist their petitions to icons and images. There are those who worship cows and crocodiles, and others who acclam Adam or Allah or Buddha as their Supreme Being.

"There are those who apply the names of Deity to some spirit essence that is immaterial, uncreated and unknowable and
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that fills the immensity of space and is everywhere and nowhere in particular present.

"And there are even those who champion the almost unbelievable theory that God is an Eternal Student enrolled in the University of the Universe where he is busily engaged in learning new truths and amassing new and strange knowledge that he never knew before.

"How belittling it is -- it borders on blasphemy -- to demean the Lord God Omnipotent by saying he is an idol, or an image, or an animal, or a spirit essence, or that he is ever learning but never able to come to a knowledge of all truth.

"It is the first principle of revealed religion to know the nature and kind of being that God is. As for us: 'We know [and testify] that there is a God in heaven, who is infinite and eternal, from everlasting to everlasting the same unchangeable God, the framer of heaven and earth, and all things which are in them.' (D&C 20:17.)

"This great God, the Lord Almighty, is a personage of tabernacle. He 'has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's.' (D&C 130:22.) He is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. He has all power, knows all things, and, by the power of his Spirit, is in and through all things."

On Tuesday, February 17, 1981, I was the speaker at the BYU Devotional. My subject was "The Three Pillars of Eternity," under which heading I spoke of the creation, the fall and the atonement. With reference to the omnipotence and omniscience of God I said in that talk:

"Who is Elohim? He is God the Eternal Father. He is a glorified and exalted personage. He has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's. In the language of Adam, Man of Holiness is his name. He is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. He knows all things and has all power -- not simply as pertaining to us or in some prescribed sphere or realm -- but in the absolute, eternal, and unlimited sense. In the ultimate sense, he is the Creator. And anything you may have heard to the contrary, whether in the creeds of Christendom or the mouthings of intellectuals who, in their own eyes, know more than the Lord, is false."

Now may I say something for your guidance and enlightenment. If what I am about to say should be taken out of context and published in Dialogue or elsewhere, it would give an entirely erroneous impression and would not properly present the facts. As it happens, I am a great admirer of Brigham Young and a great believer in his doctrinal presentations. He was called of God.
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He was guided by the Holy Spirit in his teachings in general. He was a mighty prophet. He led Israel the way the Lord wanted his people led. He built on the foundation laid by the Prophet Joseph. He completed his work and has come on to eternal exaltation.

Nonetheless, as Joseph Smith so pointedly taught, a prophet is not always a prophet, only when he is acting as such. Prophets are men and they make mistakes. Sometimes they err in doctrine. This is one of the reasons the Lord has given us the Standard Works. They become the standards and rules that govern where doctrine and philosophy are concerned. If this were not so, we would believe one thing when one man was president of the Church and another thing in the days of his successors. Truth is eternal and does not vary. Sometimes even wise and good men fall short in the accurate presentation of what is truth. Sometimes a prophet gives personal views which are not endorsed and approved by the Lord.
Yes, President Young did teach that Adam was the father of our spirits, and all the related things that the cultists ascribe to him. This, however, is not true. He expressed views that are out of harmony with the gospel. But, be it known, Brigham Young also taught accurately and correctly, the status and position of Adam in the eternal scheme of things. What I am saying is that Brigham Young, contradicted Brigham Young, and the issue becomes one of which Brigham Young we will believe. The answer is we will believe the expressions that accord with the teachings in the Standard Works.

Yes, Brigham Young did say some things about God progressing in knowledge and understanding, but again, be it known, that Brigham Young taught, emphatically and plainly, that God knows all things and has all power meaning in the infinite, eternal and ultimate and absolute sense of the word. Again, the issue is, which Brigham Young shall we believe and the answer is: We will take the one whose statements accord with what God has revealed in the Standard Works.

I think you can give me credit for having a knowledge of the quotations from Brigham Young relative to Adam, and of knowing what he taught under the subject that has become known as the Adam God Theory. President Joseph Fielding Smith said that Brigham Young will have to make his own explanations on the points there involved. I think you can also give me credit for knowing what Brigham Young said about God progressing. And again, that is something he will have to account for. As for me and my house, we will have the good sense to choose between the divergent teachings of the same man and come up with those that accord with
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what God has set forth in his eternal plan of salvation.

This puts me in mind of Paul’s statement: "There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." (1 Cor. 11:19.) I do not know all of the providences of the Lord, but I do know that he permits false doctrine to be taught in and out of the Church and that such teaching is part of the sifting process of mortality. We will be judged by what we believe among other things. If we believe false doctrine, we will be condemned. If that belief is on basic and fundamental things, it will lead us astray and we will lose our souls. This is why Nephi said: "And all those who preach false doctrines, . . wo, wo, wo be unto them, saith the Lord God Almighty, for they shall be thrust down to hell!: (2 Ne. 28:15.) This clearly means that people who teach false doctrine in the fundamental and basic things will lose their souls. The nature and kind of being that God is, is one of these fundamentals. I repeat: Brigham Young erred in some of his statements on the nature and kind of being that God is and as to the position of Adam in the plan of salvation, but Brigham Young also taught the truth in these fields on other occasions. And I repeat, that in his instance, he was a great prophet and has gone on to eternal reward. What he did is not a pattern for any of us. If we choose to believe and teach the false portions of his doctrines, we are making an election that will damn us.

It should be perfectly evident that under our system of church discipline, it would be anticipated that some others besides Brigham Young would pick up some of his statements and echo them. Those who did this, also on other occasions, taught accurately and properly what the true doctrines of the gospel are. I do not get concerned when a good and sound person who, on the over-all, is teaching the truth happens to err on a particular point and say something in conflict with what he has said himself on a previous occasion. We are all mortal. We are all fallible. We all make mistakes. No single individual all the time is in tune with the Holy Spirit, but I do get concerned when some person or group picks out false statements and makes them the basis of their presentation and theology and thus ends up having a false concept of the doctrine, which in reality, was not in the mind of the person whose quotations they are using.

Wise gospel students do not build their philosophies of life on quotations of individuals, even though those quotations come from presidents of the Church. Wise people anchor their doctrine on the Standard Works. When Section 20 says that God is infinite and eternal, it means just that and so on through all
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of the revelations. There is no need to attempt to harmonize conflicting views when some of the views are out of harmony with the Standard Works. This is what life is all about. The Lord is finding out what we will believe in spite of the allurements of the world or the philosophies of men or the seemingly rational and logical explanations that astute people make.

We do not solve our problems by getting a statement from the president of the Church or from someone else on a subject. We have been introduced to the gospel; we have the gift of the Holy Ghost; we have the Standards Works and it is our responsibility to get in tune and understand properly what the Lord has revealed and has had us canonize. The end result of this course of personally and individually pursuing light and truth is to reach that millennial state of which the scriptures say it will no longer be necessary for every man to say to his neighbor "know the Lord," for all
shall know him from the greatest to the least. Joseph Smith says this will be by the spirit of revelation.

If it is true, as I am advised, that you speak on this subject of the progression of God at firesides and elsewhere, you should cease to do so. If you give other people copies of the material you sent me, with the quotations it contains, you should cease to do so. It is not in your province to set in order the Church or to determine what is doctrines shall be. It is axiomatic among us to know that God has given apostles and prophets "for the edifying of the body of Christ," and that their ministry is to see that "we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. 4:11-16.) This means, among other things, that it is my province to teach the Church what the doctrine is. It is your province to echo what I say or to remain silent. You do not have a divine commission to correct me or any of the Brethren. The Lord does not operate that way. If I lead the Church astray, that is my responsibility, but the fact still remains that I am the one appointed with all the rest involved so to do. The appointment is not given to the faculty at Brigham Young University or to any of the members of the Church. The Lord's house is a house of order and those who hold the keys are appointed to proclaim the doctrines.

Now you know that this does not mean that individuals should not do research and make discoveries and write articles. What it does mean is that what they write should be faith promoting and where doctrines are concerned, should be in harmony with that which comes from the head of the Church. And those at
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the head of the Church have the obligation to teach that which is in harmony with the Standard Works. If they err then be silent on the point and leave the event in the hands of the Lord. Some day all of us will stand before the judgment bar and be accountable for our teachings. And where there have been disagreements the Lord will judge between us. In the meantime if we want to save our own souls we need to strive with all the power we have to be in harmony with the revelations and not to be teaching or promulgating doctrines that suit our fancy.

I advise you to take my counsel on the matters here involved. If I err, that is my problem; but in your case if you single out some of these things and make them the center of your philosophy, and end up being wrong, you will lose your should. One of the side effects of preaching contrary to what the Brethren preach is to get a spirit of rebellion growing up in your heart. This sort of thing cansers the soul spiritually. It drives people out of the Church. It weakens their faith. All of us need all of the faith and strength and spiritual stability we can get to maintain our positions in the Church and to work out our salvation.

Now, I think I have said enough in this letter so that if you are receptive and pliable, you will get the message. If you are not, rebellion will well up in your heart. I pray for your well-being. I repeat: the door to my office is open. Perhaps I should tell you what one of the very astute and alert General Authorities said to me when I chanced to mention to him the subject of your letter to me. He said: "Oh dear, haven't we rescued him enough times already."

Now I hope you will ponder and pray and come to a basic understanding of fundamental things and that unless and until you can on all points, you will remain silent on those where differences exist between you and the Brethren. This is the course of safety. I advise you to pursue it. If you do not, perils lie ahead. It is not too often in this day that any of us are told plainly and bluntly what ought to be. I am taking the liberty of so speaking to you at this time, and become thus a witness against you if you do not take the counsel.

I repeat: I have every good wish for you, pray that the Lord will bless you and hope that things will work out properly and well in your life.

Sincerely,

Bruce R. McConkie

BRM: vh
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P.S. I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this response to those to whom you sent your communication.
There has been an official statement made on this subject by President Spencer W. Kimball, made in the Priesthood session of October conference 1976.

We hope that you who teach in the various organizations, whether on the campuses or in our Chapels, will always teach the orthodox truth. We warn you against the dissemination of doctrines which are not according to the Scriptures and which are alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities of past generations. Such, for instance, is the Adam-God theory. We denounce that theory and hope that everyone will be cautioned against this and other kinds of false doctrine. (See Ensign, November 1976 p. 77)

Several important things can be gleaned from this brief statement by President Kimball:

- The Adam-God theory is not orthodox truth.
- The Adam-God theory is a doctrine which is not in accordance with scripture.
- The Adam-God theory is alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities of past generations.
- The Adam-God theory is false doctrine.

At the time this statement was made in the 1976 Priesthood conference, I was serving on a priesthood committee under the direction of Elder Mark E. Petersen. We were at that time working with a number of people who believed the Adam-God theory, and our committee wanted to know more precisely what President Kimball meant by his statement, so through Elder Petersen we made an appointment with him and asked him. In a private interview President Kimball made the following clarifications: He said that he did not say that President Brigham Young did not make the statements which are attributed to him, nor did he claim that they were falsely reported. Neither did he say that Brigham Young taught false doctrine. What he did say and what he meant is that the Adam-God theory is false, and the Adam-God theory is that interpretation which is placed on Brigham Young's words by present day apostates and fundamentalists - their understanding of what Brigham Young meant is false.

Considering both President Kimball's original statement and his subsequent clarification, we need an understanding of what Brigham Young meant by his statements which is in accordance with scripture. This is reasonable even without President Kimball's statements, because any of President Young's teachings which are not in harmony with scripture would simply be wrong anyway.

**Interpretation as a Guide to Understanding**

It has been alleged by some that we are not allowed to interpret Brigham Young's statements at all, but we must take them in the most direct and straightforward understanding of his words as they appear, and allow them to thus interpret themselves. To this, I answer "Why?" This is not the way we approach any other doctrine or teaching of the Church. Why must we make a special exception for Brigham Young's statements about Adam-God?

In Isaiah when we read "Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly." [Isaiah 6:2], we do not let this stand free of interpretation, but we interpret it in view of Joseph Smith's declaration that "An angel of God never has wings." [TPJS p
Adam was not a resurrected being

One of the worst misconceptions which has been caused by incorrectly interpreting some of Brigham Young's statements is that Adam and Eve were resurrected beings when they entered the garden of Eden. Correct doctrine respecting this topic is most easily demonstrated by reviewing some of Amulek's teachings in the 11th chapter of the Book of Alma in the Book of Mormon. In verse 45, Amulek states:

Alma 11:45

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.

From this verse it is evident that once an individual is resurrected, he can never die again, because the spirit and body are inseparably connected through the resurrection. Not only can resurrected beings never die, they can never even become mortal again, because mortality is corruption, and after the resurrection they can no more experience corruption. That Adam did die is universally acknowledged throughout the four standard works:

Adam died

Book of Mormon: In Alma, chapter 12 verse 23, Alma states

And now behold, I say unto you that if it had been possible for Adam to have partaken of the fruit of the tree of life at that time, there would have been no death, and the word would have been void, making God a liar, for he said: If thou eat thou shalt surely die.

Now, we know God told Adam that if he were to partake of the forbidden fruit, he would surely die. We also know that Adam did partake of the forbidden fruit, therefore either Adam died, or God is a liar.

Bible: In Genesis, chapter 5, verse 5 we read:

5 And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died.

Three verses later, Moses uses nearly identical wording to indicate that Seth died.

8 And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years: and he died.

It is clear that the intent of the author was to inform the reader that Adam died in the same sense in which Seth died, and not in some figurative or representative manner.

Pearl of Great Price: Moses 6:12 and Moses 6:16 are virtually identical to the verses quoted above in Genesis 5:

Interpreting Brigham Young's Discourses

It is my belief that in order to understand Adam God correctly, we must take Brigham Young's statements and interpret and understand them in such a manner that they harmonize with other known statements of Brigham Young as well as with what is known to be true from other reliable sources such as the four Standard Works, teachings of Joseph Smith, the temple ceremony etc. If we do not do this, then we are alternatively assuming by default that Brigham Young was incapable of logical thought, that he was inconsistent, and that he did not understand the four Standard Works, the temple endowment or the teachings of Joseph Smith etc., none of which is acceptable to me.

It is important to note that of the more than 1500 recorded discourses of Brigham Young, only 20 of those discourses can be associated with the topic of Adam-God, and even most of those 20 are orthodox when not improperly inserted into an Adam-God context in which they do not belong. We are considering a teaching of Brigham Young which was brought up in less than 1% of his recorded discourses.

In order to correctly understand Brigham Young's views on the topic of Adam, it is most practical to first review certain scriptural accounts pertaining to Adam, Eve and the creation. Once the scriptural accounts are correctly understood, the views presented by President Brigham Young become much easier to interpret. If we make the assumption that Brigham Young would not intentionally contradict consistent scriptural teachings, then correctly interpreting many of his controversial and even apparently contradictory statements becomes much easier.

162], thus requiring a figurative rather than a literal interpretation of the passage in Isaiah.

Similarly, we do not require the most straightforward interpretation of John 4:24 "God [is] a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship [him] in spirit and in truth." but we interpret it in light of D&C 130:22 "The Father has a body of flesh and bones as tangible as man's; the Son also; but the Holy Ghost has not a body of flesh and bones, but is a personage of Spirit. Were it not so, the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us."

The Book of Mormon says that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are one God. Are we required to accept that in its most direct and straightforward interpretation? Not at all. We know from the Pearl of Great Price that two separate personages appeared to Joseph Smith in the First Vision, so we go through some theological gyrations in order to make it possible for the two seemingly dissonant passages to agree. In order to do that, we interpret and explain the "oneness" of God, and to some that appears to be an invalid interpretation.

God says that sinners will suffer eternal damnation, but from D&C 19:10-12 we know that we must interpret eternal damnation as God's damnation, not a never ending torment of fire and brimstone. My point is that we interpret scripture and statements of the prophets in a manner in which they will harmonize with other scripture and other statements of the prophets all the time with almost every doctrine and concept we believe. Why then must we accept only the most direct understanding of Brigham Young's statements and not interpret them to fit with truth that is known from other sources? Are we to make Brigham Young's teachings on this one subject a rare exception to the general way we come to a correct understanding of all other doctrines?
12 And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died.

16 All the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years, and he died.

Doctrine and Covenants: In D&C 107, verses 42 and 53 both speak of the death of Adam:

42 From Adam to Seth, who was ordained by Adam at the age of sixty-nine years, and was blessed by him three years previous to his (Adam's) death, and received the promise of God by his father, that his posterity should be the chosen of the Lord, and that they should be preserved unto the end of the earth;

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

D&C 138 gives additional information about the fact that Adam died: In this Vision of the Redemption of the Dead, President Joseph F. Smith states:

11 As I pondered over these things which are written, the eyes of my understanding were opened, and the Spirit of the Lord rested upon me, and I saw the hosts of the dead, both small and great.

12 And there were gathered together in one place an innumerable company of the spirits of the just, who had been faithful in the testimony of Jesus while they lived in mortality;

13 And who had offered sacrifice in the similitude of the great sacrifice of the Son of God, and had suffered tribulation in their Redeemer's name.

14 All these had departed the mortal life, firm in the hope of a glorious resurrection, through the grace of God the Father and his Only Begotten Son, Jesus Christ.

15 I beheld that they were filled with joy and gladness, and were rejoicing together because the day of their deliverance was at hand.

16 They were assembled awaiting the advent of the Son of God into the spirit world, to declare their redemption from the bands of death.

17 Their sleeping dust was to be restored unto its perfect frame, bone to his bone, and the sinews and the flesh upon them, the spirit and the body to be united never again to be divided, that they might receive a fullness of joy.

Note that in verse 17 the assurance is reiterated that once resurrected, the spirit and the body will never again be separated. Then, in verse 38, begins a description of those who were in this vast congregation of the righteous dead who were eagerly awaiting their resurrection as Christ entered the spirit world to break the bands of death:

38 Among the great and mighty ones who were assembled in this vast congregation of the righteous were Father Adam, the Ancient of Days and father of all,

39 And our glorious Mother Eve, with many of her faithful daughters who had lived through the ages and worshiped the true and living God.

There is no question that Adam and Eve died in the normal sense of the word, and that they remained in the spirit world awaiting their resurrection until the meridian of time. It is therefore beyond any question that Adam and Eve were not resurrected beings in the garden of Eden.

Adam is not God

Some of Brigham Young's discourses have been interpreted to mean that Brigham Young believed that Adam is God, the Eternal Father. These interpretations all directly contradict scripture, and are therefore false and must be discarded by every rational believer of scripture. President Spencer W. Kimball in his closing address at the October 1976 General Priesthood Session stated:

We hope that you who teach in the various organizations, whether on the campuses or in our Chapels will always teach the orthodox truth. We warn you against the dissemination of doctrines which are not according to the Scriptures and which are alleged to have been taught by some of the General Authorities of past generations. Such, for instance, is the Adam-God theory. We denounce that theory and hope that everyone will be cautioned against this and other kinds of false doctrine. [Ensign, November 1976, p 77]

The first and most obvious reason that Adam is not God is that given above. In the Garden of Eden, God was a resurrected being, but Adam was not. It is therefore impossible that they could be the same being. In fact, the scriptures inform us quite explicitly that while Adam was in mortality, God the Father called upon him with his own voice.

50 But God hath made known unto our fathers that all men must repent.

51 And he [i.e. God] called upon Adam by his own voice, saying: I am God; I made the world, and men before they were in the flesh. [Moses 6:51-52]

The reference here to "God" cannot refer to Jesus Christ because it was not Christ who made the spirits of men.

Adam is subordinate to Jesus Christ

Another reason that Adam cannot be God, the Father, is because Adam is subordinate to Jesus Christ. This is affirmed in Jude, verse 9 in which Michael (who is Adam) dared not bring a railing accusation against the devil, but said, "The Lord rebuke thee Satan."

9 Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee.

It has been claimed that the word "durst" is not properly translated, or at least does not carry the meaning "dared not," but the Prophet Joseph Smith certainly interpreted it that way:

Be honest; be men of truth and integrity; let your word be your bond; be diligent, be prayerful; pray for and with your families; train up
your children in the fear of the Lord; cultivate a meek, a quiet spirit; clothe the naked, feed the hungry, help the destitute, be merciful to the widow and orphan, be merciful to your brethren, and to all men; bear with one another's infirmities, considering your own weakness; bring no railing accusations against your brethren, especially take care that you do not against the authorities or Elders of the Church, for that principle is of the devil, he is called the accuser of the brethren; and Michael, the archangel, dared not bring a railing accusation against the devil, but said, "The Lord rebuke thee, Satan," and any man who pursues this course of accusation and murmuring, will fall into the snare of the devil, and apostatize, except he repent. [History of the Church, Vol.3, Ch.27, p.394]

The subordination of Adam to Christ is further evidenced by section 78 of the Doctrine and Covenants, in which the individual speaking:

- Appointed Michael to be our prince.
- Established Michael's feet.
- Set Michael upon high.
- Gave unto Michael the keys of salvation under the counsel and direction of the Holy One.

13 Behold, this is the preparation wherewith I prepare you, and the foundation, and the ensample which I give unto you, whereby you may accomplish the commandments which are given you; ...

15 That you may come unto the crown prepared for you, and be made rulers over many kingdoms, saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Zion, who hath established the foundation of Adam-onodi-Ahman;

16 Who hath appointed Michael your prince, and established his feet, and set him upon high, and given unto him the keys of salvation under the counsel and direction of the Holy One, who is without beginning of days or end of life. [D&C 78:13, 15-16]

The individual speaking identifies himself in verse 20 as our "Redeemer, even the Son Ahman."

20 Wherefore, do the things which I have commanded you, saith your Redeemer, even the Son Ahman, who prepareth all things before he taketh you; [D&C 78:20]

In an article on Priesthood, prepared in July of 1839, the Prophet Joseph Smith rigidly bracketed the position of Adam in the priesthood hierarchy. On page 158 of Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith, Joseph is cited as stating:

How have we come at the Priesthood in the last days? It came down, down, in regular succession. Peter, James, and John had it given to them and they gave it to others. Christ is the Great High Priest; Adam next. [TPJS 158]

Some have pointed out that this statement is ambiguous, and could either mean that Christ is superior to Adam, or that Christ is subordinate to Adam, depending upon whether "next" is interpreted as "next higher" or "next lower." This statement therefore only requires that the hierarchy of priesthood authority be represented in one of the following two ways,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesus Christ</th>
<th>Adam (Michael)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in the same article, just 5 paragraphs earlier, Joseph Smith made the following statement:

The Priesthood 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, before the world was formed, as in Genesis 1:26,27,28. He had dominion given him over every living creature. He is Michael the Archangel, spoken of in the Scriptures. Then to Noah, who is Gabriel; he stands next in authority to Adam in the Priesthood; he was called of God to this office, and was the father of all living in his day, and to him was given the dominion. These men held keys first on earth, and then in heaven. [TPJS 157]

Therefore, Noah also stands next to Adam in priesthood authority. With Jesus Christ and Noah, each standing next to Adam in priesthood authority (one higher, and one lower), Adam is bracketed with Christ on one side, and Noah on the other, which means that our representation of the hierarchy of priesthood authority must extend to one of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesus Christ</th>
<th>Noah (Gabriel)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam (Michael)</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah (Gabriel)</td>
<td>Jesus Christ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since no one will contend that Noah is superior to Jesus Christ, the second column is demonstrated invalid and the subordination of Adam to Jesus Christ as shown in the first column is established. This is a simple demonstration that the Prophet Joseph Smith understood these scriptures in the same way we understand them.

**Adam and Eve were Unmarried when they came into the Garden of Eden**

In Kirtland, on November 24, 1835, while performing the marriage for Newel Knight and Lydia Goldthwaite, the Prophet Joseph Smith stated that marriage is an institution of heaven, which was instituted in the garden of Eden:

I had an invitation to attend a wedding at Brother Hyrum Smith's in the evening; also to solemnize the matrimonial ceremony between Newel Knight and Lydia Goldthwaite. My wife accompanied me. On our arrival a considerable company had collected. The bridegroom and bride came in, and took their seats, which gave me to understand that they were ready. After prayers, I requested them to rise, and join hands. I then remarked that marriage was an institution of heaven, instituted in the garden of Eden; that it was necessary it should be solemnized by the authority of the everlasting Priesthood. The ceremony was original with me, and in substance as follows—You covenant to be each other's companions through life, and discharge the duties of husband and wife in every respect; to which they assented. I then pronounced them husband and wife in the name of God, and also pronounced upon them the blessings that the Lord conferred upon Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden, that is, to multiply and replenish the earth, with the addition of long life and prosperity. Dismissed them and returned home. Freezing cold, some snow on the ground. [History of the Church, 2.320]

That marriage was instituted in the garden of Eden means that the first marriage was performed in the garden of Eden. The only people
who could have been married in the garden were Adam and Eve. The fact that their marriage was performed in the garden means that they were not married when they first entered the garden. Being unmarried prior to living in the garden of Eden, Adam and Eve could not possibly be our Heavenly Parents.

Adam is a son of God

Another, and even more positive reason that Adam is not God, The Eternal Father, is because Adam, physically, is a son of God, The Eternal Father. This profound doctrine is scriptural and has been taught by many general authorities of the Church from Joseph Smith, down to the present day. It has never been emphasized as a doctrine of the Church because knowledge of this principle is generally not essential to our salvation. To an individual, however, who has been mislead by false interpretations of some of Brigham Young's discourses to the point where they have fallen away or are ready to fall away from the Church, a proper understanding of this principle becomes singularly important.

In understanding this principle, it is appropriate to first turn to Moses, chapter 6, where Moses gives a genealogy of the sons of Adam. Note that this is called a genealogy of "the children of God," and that they were created "in the image of his own body."

8 Now this prophecy Adam spake, as he was moved upon by the Holy Ghost, and a genealogy was kept of the children of God. And this was the book of the generations of Adam, saying: In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him;

9 In the image of his own body, male and female, created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created and became living souls in the land upon the footstool of God.

Moses then recites a genealogy of the sons of Adam, from which the following excerpts are significant:

10 And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his own image, and called his name Seth. ...

13 Seth lived one hundred and five years, and begat Enos, ...

17 And Enos lived ninety years, and begat Cainan. ...

19 And Cainan lived seventy years and begat Mahalaleel; ...

20 And Mahalaleel lived sixty-five years and begat Jared; ...

21 And Jared lived one hundred and sixty-two years, and begat Enoch; and Jared lived, after he begat Enoch, eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters. And Jared taught Enoch in all the ways of God.

22 And this is the genealogy of the sons of Adam, who was the son of God, with whom God, himself, conversed. [Moses 6:10,13,17,19,20,21-22]

This statement that Adam was the son of God, refers to a real, literal, physical relationship. Adam was physically born on this earth, to our Heavenly Father and his spouse, our Heavenly Mother. Adam's parents were both resurrected beings, hence there were no seeds of death in Adam's physical body, and he would have lived forever had it not been for the fall. A good understanding of Adam's relationship to our Heavenly Father is essential to a proper understanding of many of Brigham Young's controversial discourses, so it becomes imperative to establish a good foundation by providing a number of solid quotations, both from scripture and from a variety of authorities throughout the history of the Church. Both the citations and their sequence have been carefully selected from a larger assortment in order to preempt a number of questions which typically arise during explanations of how Adam and Eve were physically born to our heavenly parents.

The foundational account of the Creation of Adam and Eve is found in Genesis 1:26-27:

26 ¶ And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

27 So God created man in his [own] image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

Verse 27 would be more properly translated from the Hebrew as:

27 So God begat man in his own image, in the image of God begat he him, male and female begat he them.

[footnote: 1. In the original Hebrew, the word translated "man" is {adam} (there is no upper case/lower case distinction in Hebrew). The word translated "made" is {bara} and the word translated "God" is {elohim}. In Genesis the word {adam} may be translated as "Adam" when context implies the specific individual or "man," "mankind" or even "husband" as the context requires. {bara} is a technological term which means to create from pre-existing material, but its root meaning is to cut or hew. If a statue or figurine were being created it could be translated "carve," but when children are being created the proper translation is "beget." We are more familiar with it in the New Testament Aramaic form "bar" as in Simon bar Jonah (Simon begotten of Jonah). {elohim} is a plural word, but is normally used as if it were singular. It should perhaps be translated "Gods" in this context as indicated by the "us," and "our" of verse 26.]

In commenting on Genesis 1:26-27 Brigham Young left us no doubts as to his understanding that it was the normal birth process which was being described

"And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

I believe that the declaration made in these two scriptures is literally true. God has made His children like Himself to stand erect, and has endowed them with intelligence and power and dominion over all His works, and given them the same attributes which He himself possesses. He created man, as we create our children; for there is no other process of creation in heaven, on the earth, in the earth, or
under the earth, or in all the eternities, that is, that were, or that ever
will be. [JD 11:122-123, June 18, 1865]

It is true that in Genesis, chapter 3 Adam is spoken of as having been
formed of the dust of the ground:

7 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. [Ge 3:7]

But in Moses, chapter 6, the Lord specifically defines what it means
to be formed from the dust of the ground to become a living soul:

59 ... 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 ... [Moses 6:59]

In Luke, chapter 3, a genealogy of Jesus Christ is given, beginning in
verse 23:

23 And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being as
was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli,

24 Which was the son of Mattha, which was the son of Levi, which
was the so of Melchi which was the son of Janna, which was the son
of Joseph, ...

Luke continues through a total of 70 generations of literal father/son
relationships, ending in verses 37 and 38 with:

37 Which was the son of Mathusala, which was the son of Enoch,
which was the son of Jared, which was the son of Maleleel, which
was the son of Cainan.

38 Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was
the son of Adam, which was the son of God.

In his inspired revision of the Bible, Joseph Smith modified verse 38
to read "... Adam, who was formed of God, and the first man on the
earth," but this does not detract from the argument of Adam having
been physically begotten by God. Joseph Smith did not believe that
any man ever came into existence without a father. In Teachings he is
recorded as saying:

If Abraham reasoned thus—If Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and
John discovered that God the Father of Jesus Christ had a Father, you
may suppose that he had a Father also. Where was there ever a son
without a father? And where was there ever a father without first
being a son? Whenever did a tree or anything spring into existence
without a progenitor? And everything comes in this way. [TPJS 373]

And Brigham Young was just as clear in specifying that the father of
Adam and Eve was none other than our Heavenly Father.

The world may in vain ask the question, "Who are we?" But the
Gospel tells us that we are the sons and daughters of that God whom
we serve. Some say, "we are the children of Adam and Eve." So we
are, and they are the children of our Heavenly Father. We are all the
children of Adam and Eve, and they and we are the offspring of Him
who dwells in the heavens, the highest Intelligence that dwells

anywhere that we have any knowledge of. [JD 13:311-312, April 17,
1870]

President John Taylor also clearly understood and taught these
principles:

In regard to the earth, is it the Lord's? Yes. We are told that he made
it, that he created all things, visible and invisible, whether pertaining
to the earth or the heavens. And where did man originate? As we read
it, he originated also from God. Who formed man according to the
Bible record? The Lord. Whence came our spirits? We are told that
God is the God and Father of the spirits of all flesh. Then He of
course is interested in the welfare of all flesh and all people of all
languages, of tongues, of every color, and of every clime. That is the
way that I understand these things. Our spirits are eternal and
emanate from God. So we, as a people, have always understood and
do understand to-day. We possess our bodies also, and they also
emanated from God. The Bible tells us something in relation to these
matters in tracing out genealogies. Who was Seth? He was the son of
Adam. Who was Adam? The son of God. In another place we are told
that "all we are His offspring"—that is, according to that, we are all
the offspring of God. [JD 26:34, Dec 14, 1884]

Message of the First Presidency

In 1909, the First Presidency of the Church (Joseph F. Smith, John R.
Winder and Anton H. Lund) issued an official declaration on the
"Origin of Man" in the pages of the Improvement Era. It will be
noticed by reading the introductory paragraph of this declaration, that
it was written in response to an inquiry, and although the First
Presidency did not consider the topic to be doctrinally "vital," it was
nevertheless considered to be an important subject closely related to
the fundamental principles of the gospel.

THE ORIGIN OF MAN

By The First Presidency of the Church

"God created man in his own image."

Inquiries arise from time to time respecting the attitude of the Church
of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints upon questions which, though not
vital from a doctrinal standpoint, are closely connected with the
fundamental principles of salvation. The latest inquiry of this kind
that has reached us is in relation to the origin of man. It is believed
that a statement of the position held by the Church upon this
important subject will be timely and productive of good.

The major emphasis of the declaration seems to be the truthfulness
and reliability of the scriptural accounts of the creation. Of particular
interest to us, on the topic of Adam being born, are the following
paragraphs.

Adam, our progenitor, "the first man," was, like Christ, a pre-existent
spirit, and like Christ he took upon him an appropriate body, the body
of a man, and so became a "living soul.‖ The doctrine of the pre-
existence, revealed so plainly, particularly in latter days, pours a
wonderful flood of light upon the otherwise mysterious problem of
man's origin. It shows that man, as a spirit, was begotten and born of
heavenly parents, and reared to maturity in the eternal mansions of
the Father, prior to coming upon the earth in a temporal body to
undergo an experience in mortality. It teaches that all men existed in
the spirit before any man existed in the flesh, and that all who have
inhabited the earth since Adam have taken bodies and become souls in like manner.

It is held by some that Adam was not the first man upon this earth, and that the original human being was a development from lower orders of the animal creation. These, however, are the theories of men. The word of the Lord declares that Adam was "the first man of all men" (Moses 1:34), and we are therefore in duty bound to regard him as the primal parent of our race. It was shown to the brother of Jared that all men were created in the beginning after the Image of God; and whether we take this to mean the spirit or the body, or both, it commits us to the same conclusion: Man began life as a human being, in the likeness of our heavenly Father.

True it is that the body of man enters upon its career as a tiny germ embryo, which becomes an infant, quickened at a certain stage by the spirit whose tabernacle it is, and the child, after being born, develops into a man. There is nothing in this, however, to indicate that the original man, the first of our race, began life as anything less than a man, or less than the human germ or embryo that becomes a man. [James R. Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, 4:200-201, 206, November 1909]

Some have felt that this declaration was left intentionally ambiguous, and is therefore not sufficiently clear, but one need only read the following comments by President Joseph F. Smith to know how he believed the statement should be understood.

Man A Child Of God

-----------

That man as a descendent of Adam, is, in a most literal sense, a child of God is emphatically explained in the following group of brief excerpts from Church records:

THE CREATION OF ADAM

BY

PRES. JOSEPH F. SMITH,

<7>.

At Stake Conference of Maricopa Stake

President Smith closed the conference with his usual brilliant, thoughtful remarks. He bore a strong testimony of the truthfulness of the gospel and said in part: "I know that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God; I know that God is a being with body, parts and passions and that His Son is in His own likeness, and that man is created in the image of God. The Son, Jesus Christ, grew and developed into manhood the same as you or I, as likewise did God, His Father, grow and develop to the Supreme Being that He now is. Man was born of woman; Christ, the Savior, was born of woman; and God, the Father, was born of woman. Adam, our earthly parent was also born of woman into this world, the same as Jesus and you and I."

JOSEPH E. NOBLE,
Stake Clerk.

(Deseret News, Dec. 27, 1913, Sec. III, p. 7)

[Deseret News Church Section, Sept 19, 1936 pp 2-3]

Possibly the most clear and definitive statement available on the subject is one which was written by Reed C. Durham after a telephone conversation with Bruce R. McConkie in 1966. I personally presented a copy of this statement to Brother McConkie in Dec of 1982 and asked if he would verify it. After reviewing it, Br. McConkie said that it accurately expressed his understanding.

Adam - God Statement


He answered that he had purposely left the door opened on that Point. He said it was a true doctrine that God the Father, Eloheim, a divine resurrected being came down to this earth after its creation, with a wife and produced in the natural way of sexual intercourse, a child who grew up and became known as ADAM. They did the same and brought forth a girl who grew up and became EVE. They had bodies of flesh and bone etc., but were not mortal (not till they fell). They (Adam and Eve) were not resurrected and not translated beings. God really did create their bodies on this earth. They were not transported here (only their spirits).

He then said that his father-in-law told him that was a true doctrine; that it had been taught a great deal by President J. F. Smith (6th president). He also added that President Joseph Fielding Smith said it was too deep now for most saints--that's the reason for saying about the creation of Adam and Eve in the temple, "It's only figurative ..."

Reed C. Durham, Jr.

According to this account, President Joseph F. Smith, President Joseph Fielding Smith and Bruce R. McConkie all understood that Adam and Eve were born on this earth, to our Heavenly Father, and our Heavenly Mother, and then placed in the garden of Eden. This is one of the reasons that these three brethren were always opposed to the theory of the organic evolution of man. They, and many others who believe as they did, believe that man did not evolve from any lower order of creation, but that man devolved from the highest order of creation--from God himself.

Many were so open about teaching this principle that the doctrine cannot be considered secret, or even hidden. It was merely not emphasized. The following example is from a response by John A. Widtsoe to a question about Brigham Young's Adam-God sermon. The article is one of a series which was entitled "Evidences and Reconciliations." The series was published monthly in the Improvement Era. This article was first published in the December 1943 issue of the Era, and was later republished in volume 1 of a three volume set which was a collection of the "Evidences and Reconciliations" articles. It appeared again in a one volume reprint of the three volume set published in 1960.

Brigham Young's much-discussed sermon says that "Jesus was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the Garden of Eden, and who is our Father in heaven. Enemies of the Church, or stupid people, reading also that Adam is "our father and our God."

have heralded far and wide that the Mormons believe that Jesus
Christ was begotten of Adam. Yet, the rational reading of the whole sermon reveals the falsity of such a doctrine. It is explained that God the Father was in the Garden of Eden, before Adam, that he was the Father of Adam, and that this same personage, God the Father, who was in the Garden of Eden before Adam, was the Father of Jesus Christ, when the Son took upon himself a mortal body. That is, the same personage was the Father of Adam and of Jesus Christ. In the numerous published sermons of Brigham Young, this is the doctrine that appears, none other. The assertion is repeatedly made that Jesus Christ was begotten by God, the Father, distinct by any stretch of imagination from Adam. This is a well established Latter-day Saint doctrine. [John A. Widtsoe, Evidences and Reconciliations pp 56-57; also Improvement Era 46:769]

One question which frequently arises is how Adam can be a son of God, when Jesus Christ is described in scripture as the Only Begotten Son. This question is answered in another widely referenced and readily available book, Mormon Doctrine, by Bruce R. McConkie under "Son Of God."

2. Father Adam, the first man, is also a son of God (Luke 3:38; Moses 6:22, 59), a fact that does not change the great truth that Christ is the Only Begotten in the flesh, for Adam's entrance into this world was in immortality. He came here before death had its beginning, with its consequent mortal or flesh-status of existence. Mormon Doctrine, p 742]

Another question frequently asked is, if resurrected beings have spirit children, then how can resurrected beings produce physical children? Apparently the type of body produced by an exalted being depends upon what type of materials are available to the body of the mother as she forms the child within her. If only spirit matter is available, then a spirit body will be produced, but if they plant a garden on an earth, and live in and partake of the physical fruits of that garden until their bodies are charged with the physical particles of that earth, then the body formed will be a physical body, and the particles constituting the body thus formed will belong to that earth.

Adam Created From Dust of This Earth.

The Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price all declare that Adam's body was created from the dust of the ground, that is, from the dust of this ground, this earth. Moreover, the Lord said to Adam, that if he partook of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, he should surely die. "By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou shalt return unto the ground--for thou shalt surely die--for out of it [i.e., the ground] wast thou taken: for dust wast thou, and unto dust shalt thou return." Now how could he return to the dust of the earth, if his body was not taken from it? [Joseph Fielding Smith Jr., Doctrines of Salvation 1:90-91]

We organize according to men in the flesh. By combining the elements and planting the seed, we cause vegetables, trees, grains, &c., to come forth. We are organizing a kingdom here according to the pattern that the Lord has given for people in the flesh, but not for those who have received the resurrection, although it is a similitude. Another item: We have not the power in the flesh to create and bring forth or produce a spirit; but we have the power to produce a temporal body. The germ of this, God has placed within us. And when our spirits receive our bodies, and through our faithfulness we are worthy to be crowned, we will then receive authority to produce both spirit and body. But these keys we cannot receive in the flesh. [JD 15:137, Brigham Young, August 24, 1872]

Eve was not created from a rib

It will be appropriate to answer one more question before proceeding. The question is sometimes asked, if Eve was born, then why do the scriptures say that she was created from Adam's rib? First, President Spencer W. Kimball assured the sisters at Relief Society general conference in October 1975 that the creation of Eve from the rib of Adam was figurative.

The role of woman was fixed even before she was created, and God is the same yesterday, today, and forever. It is written:

"And I, God, created man in mine own image, in the image of mine Only Begotten created I them. [the story of the rib, of course, is figurative."

"And I, God, blessed them [Man here is always in the plural. It was plural from the beginning.] and said unto them: Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over it." (Moses 2:27-28) [Ensign, vol. 6, March 1976, p 71]

Brigham Young, however, went further and explained the basic meaning behind the figure.

It is said by Moses the historian that the Lord caused a deep sleep to come upon Adam and took from his side a rib and formed the woman that Adam called Eve--this should be interpreted that the Man Adam like all other men had the seed within him to propagate his species. But not the woman; she conceives the seed but she does not produce it, consequently she was taken from the side or bowels of her father. This explains the mystery of Moses' dark sayings in regard to Adam and Eve. [Brigham Young, "Lecture at the Veil," St. George Temple, Feb 1, 1877]

Meaning of the word Adam

Another concept which is important to the correct understanding of Brigham Young's dark sayings in regard to Adam and Eve is a particular meaning of the word "Adam." Adam in the Hebrew can have several meanings. As was mentioned above, in Genesis Adam has been translated as "man" (or mankind) and also "husband." It can also have the meaning of "ruddy" (a reddish hue), and "one blood." In the Book of Moses there is another meaning which is alluded to.

34 And the first man of all men have I called Adam, which is many. [Moses 1:34]

Now, the word Adam does not mean "many," so the intent of this verse is that there are many men who have been named Adam. In context, the implication is that the first man of each earth is always called Adam. Brigham Young verifies this in one of his discourses.

Every world has had an Adam and an Eve, named so simply because the first man is always called Adam and the first woman Eve. [Brigham Young "For this is Life Eternal," Oct 8, 1854 p 7]"
before the foundation of the earth, down to the present time, even the right of the firstborn, or the first man, who is Adam, or first father, through the fathers unto me. [Abraham 1:3]

In a church wide satellite fireside, "Using the Scriptures," telecast on 10 May, 1985, Elder Bruce R. McConkie commented on some changes which had been made in the new edition of the Book of Abraham, emphasizing a significant change made in verse 3.

One minor textual change in Abraham is significant. A single letter is changed and a whole new doctrinal meaning is revealed. Heretofore the text read, "the first man, who is Adam, our first father," which is a simple recitation of the fact, also set forth in other scriptures, that Adam, the first man, is also our first father. If he is the first man he is obviously the first father of other men. The new rendition, according with the ancient manuscript, reads, "Adam, or first father," making the word Adam, a synonym for "first Father." That is, the name Adam means first father. (See Abr. 1:3.) [Ensign, Vol 15, December 1985, p 59]

Now, if the name Adam means "first father," then that name is certainly applicable to God, our Heavenly Father, because he was the father of the physical bodies of Adam and Eve, and the one who placed them in the garden of Eden. He was in that sense, the first father of everyone who has ever received a physical body on this earth. Brigham Young believed that one of the names of our Heavenly Father is "Adam." Recognition of this simple fact will resolve the large majority of the difficulties people encounter in some of Brigham Young's discourses on the subject.

Joseph Smith's birth date: An example

Joseph Smith was born July 12, 1771. Although simple, straightforward and unobtrusive, this statement is almost universally met with an attitude of resistance and disbelief. When followed by an assurance that the statement is correct, there is often a brief feeling of confusion and even slight disorientation. Those who are students of Church history will assure you that you are wrong, and will generally even supply the correct birth date. The 1771 birth date is correct as it stands. The difficulty is that Joseph Smith is such a well known name that when the words "Joseph Smith" are heard, the mind clicks into autopilot and designates the Prophet Joseph Smith. It was his father.

In a similar manner, the name Adam immediately and automatically designates to most people, that individual who partook of the forbidden fruit in the garden of Eden and became the father of the race of mortals who inhabit this earth. This is especially true of those who are unaware that there is another Adam. Members of the Church should not have difficulty in recognizing both a father and his son as having the same name. We have Joseph Smith and Joseph Smith Sr., and even Joseph Smith III. We have Brigham Young and Brigham Young Jr., John Taylor and John Taylor Jr., and Wilford Woodruff and Wilford Woodruff Jr, to mention just a few of those who are more prominent.

Two Adams

Byram Young believed that one of the names of God, our Heavenly Father is Adam, and in many of President Young's discourses he referred to God the Father using that name. There are therefore two Adams, and although President Young did not use the designation, it will be simpler for us in the following discussion to distinguish between the two individuals by referring to them as Adam Sr. (When referring to God, our Heavenly Father) and Adam Jr. (When referring to the embodied archangel, Michael, who partook of the forbidden fruit, fell, and became the father of Cain, Able and Seth etc.). It follows that there are also two Eves, and although in English the designation is never used with women, we shall distinguish between them as Eve Sr. and Eve Jr. This understanding allows us for the first time to correctly interpret a well known biblical passage.

20 And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living. [Genesis 3:20, (see also Moses 4:26)]

To whom does the pronoun "she", who was the mother of all living, refer? It cannot refer to Eve Jr., because although she was Adam's wife, she was not the mother of anyone at the time. She had never had a child, nor would she be able to have one until after the fall.

22 And now, behold, if Adam had not transgressed he would not have fallen, but 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.

23 And they would have had no children, 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. [2Ne 2:22-23]

It was Eve Sr. to whom Adam was referring who was the mother of all living. Adam was saying: I will name her after my mother, just as I was named after my father. This explanation allows a simple understanding of one of Brigham Young's most difficult statements, found in the Wilford Woodruff Journals. Wilford Woodruff recorded Brigham Young as saying:

"Mother Eve was the daughter of Adam." [WWJ 7:152, Aug 31, 1873]

Note how easily this correlates with the statement quoted above by Brigham Young that Eve was taken from the side or bowels of her father.

Similarly, one would expect the mother of all living to be the spouse of the father of all living. And who is the father of all living? The following is from the Lectures on Faith.

2. Let us here observe, that three things are necessary in order that any rational and intelligent being may exercise faith in God unto life and salvation.

3. First, the idea that he actually exists.

4. Secondly, a correct idea of his character, perfections, and attributes.

5. Thirdly, an actual knowledge that the course of life which he is pursuing is according to his will. For without an acquaintance with these three important facts, the faith of every rational being must be imperfect and unproductive; but with this understanding it can become perfect and fruitful, abounding in righteousness, unto the praise and glory of God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

6. Having previously been made acquainted with the way the idea of his existence came into the world, as well as the fact of his existence,
we shall proceed to examine his character, perfections, and attributes, in order that this class may see, not only the just grounds which they have for the exercise of faith in him for life and salvation, but the reasons that all the world, also, as far as the idea of his existence extends, may have to exercise faith in him, the Father of all living. [Lectures on Faith, Lecture 3, p.33, emphasis added]

The almost universal question asked by those hearing of two Adams for the first time is: "If there are two Adams, why didn't Brigham Young just say so instead of leaving his talks so confusing?" There are two distinct answers to this question, and we will present one of them now, and save the other to a more appropriate place which will be treated later.

Actually Brigham Young and others did on many occasions distinguish, or at least try to distinguish, between Adam Sr. and Adam Jr. He did not use those particular designations, but that is because it was not the vernacular of the time. The terms Jr. and Sr. were legal terms, and were frequently used in writing, but they were not common terms employed while speaking. Brigham Young did on occasion refer to the Prophet as Joseph Smith Jun., but he never did refer to the father of the Prophet as Joseph Smith Sen. In every instance in speaking of the father of the Prophet, he used the more common term, "Father Smith." The following paragraph is a good example of the way in which such designations were used at that time.

I have reflected much concerning the family of the grandfather and father of Joseph the Prophet. Their family connections were very extensive; and it has been a subject of deep regret to me that there were so few in that large circle who have been valiant for the truth since the death of the Prophet. Still I do not know but that Joseph had quite as many of his connections valiant for the truth, in proportion to their number, as Jesus had, for Jesus had many brothers and sisters, and the most of them were opposed to him, and continued so during the greater part of their lives. I used to think, while Joseph was living, that his life compared well with the history of the Saviour; though the most of father Joseph Smith’s family have believed and obeyed the Gospel, and have lived their religion in a good degree. Many of them are not here. Some of them I have known in the Eastern States that never have gathered with us. But the old stock are pretty much dead, and I do not know but what all of them are. Father John Smith was the last one, in this Church, of the brothers of father Joseph Smith; and he died, and is buried here. Grandmother Smith lived in Kirtland a short time after she gathered. [Journal of Discourses, Vol.5, p.97, Brigham Young, August 2, 1857, emphasis added]

Brigham Young was not consistent in using the words "Father Adam" to refer to Adam Sr. and "Adam" or "our father Adam" to refer to Adam Jr., but in most instances in which he refers to both Adams in the same discourse, he does attempt to make that distinction. It is inconsistent to complain that Brigham Young did not specify that there were two Adams, and at the same time refuse to understand the words which Brigham Young chose to tell us just that. Others of the general authorities also used the term Father Adam to refer to Adam Sr. Note in the following that Orson Hyde is discussing the instruction given "of Father Adam, not "to" Father Adam.

There is hardly ever a commandment given to any person or persons before whom a temptation is not placed to decay them, if possible, from an obedience to that commandment. Our parents in the garden of Eden had had but little experience in this world; and it seemed that they must have a trial corresponding with the experience and knowledge they had of things as they were. The instruction of Father Adam was, "of all the trees in the garden thou mayest eat, excepting onc; and in the day thou eatest of that, thou shalt surely die." The Lord said, Adam and Eve, you may enjoy yourselves; but there is one tree I command you that ye shall not eat of; for in the day that ye do, ye shall surely die." [JD 5:16, Orson Hyde, June 14, 1857]

There is another scripture in the Doctrine and Covenants which in its original form distinguishes between the two Adams. When this account of Joseph Smith's vision was first published in the Deseret News on September 4, 1852, someone, knowing that Michael was Adam, felt that the sentence did not make sense and modified it. Subsequent publications in Millennial Star and History of the Church have retained the modification. The account has since been incorporated into Section 137 of the Doctrine and Covenants in its modified form. In the current edition of the Doctrine and Covenants it reads

5 I saw Father Adam and Abraham; and my father and my mother, my brother Alvin, that has long since slept; [D&C 137:5]

In its original form, however, it read

I saw Father Adam, and Abraham and Michael and my father and mother, my brother Alvin that has long since slept, [Dean Jessee, The Papers of Joseph Smith, vol 2, p 157.]

In 1861 in speaking of this same vision of Joseph Smith's, Heber C. Kimball maintained the distinction between Adam and Father Adam as he related what Joseph Smith saw. He said that it was Adam who opened the gate of the Celestial City, but it was Father Adam who led them to the throne to be crowned

This brings to my mind the vision that Joseph Smith had, when he saw Adam open the gate of the Celestial City and admit the people one by one. He then saw Father Adam conduct them to the throne one by one, when they were crowned Kings and Priests of God. I merely bring this up to impress upon your mind the principles of order, but it will nevertheless apply to every member of the Church. [JD 9:41, Heber C. Kimball, March 17, 1861]

Interpretation of Brigham Young

In interpreting Brigham Young's comments, one must therefore determine by the context of the discourse whether he was speaking of Adam Sr. or Adam Jr. This simple process will relieve 98% of the difficulties encountered in understanding Brigham Young's discourses on the topic of Adam. The same process applies to an interpretation of the statements of many of his close contemporaries such as Heber C. Kimball and Orson Hyde.

When someone cites Brigham Young's notorious statement: "He [Adam] is our father and our God and the only God with whom we have to do," there is no real problem. Brigham Young is not saying that Adam Jr. is God, instead he is saying that the name of God is Adam Sr.

When Heber C. Kimball's Journal is referenced as saying: "The Lord told me that Jesus Christ was the son of Adam," we must understand that President Kimball was speaking of Adam Sr.

Ninety-eight percent of all of Brigham Young's problematic discourses on Adam-God can be correctly understood by ascertaining from the context whether he is speaking of Adam Sr. or of Adam Jr.
The Remaining Two Percent

Those problematic discourses of Brigham Young which are not so simply resolved are all caused by either incomplete or inaccurate reporting, but may be easily discussed by giving examples illustrative of four broad categories:

1. Interpreting, rather than quoting, Brigham Young.
2. Grammatical difficulties.
3. Brigham Young's choice of words.
4. Incorrect Reporting.

Interpreting, Rather than Quoting, Brigham Young

In many instances people have reported Brigham Young's views on Adam-God, but rather than report what Brigham Young actually said, they report what they thought they heard, or what they understood Brigham Young to have said, and they are frequently very wrong. A good example of this type of problem is Edward Tullidge in chapter 18 of his 1877 book, Women of Mormondon, published after Brigham Young's death, with just a few subtle changes, makes some very erroneous statements:

"Adam is our Father and God. He is the God of the earth."

So says Brigham Young.

Adam is the great archangel of this creation. He is Michael. He is the Ancient of days. He is the father of our elder brother, Jesus Christ—the father of him who shall also come as messiah to reign. He is the father of the spirits as well as the tabernacles of the sons and daughters of Adam!

Michael is one of the grand mystical names in the works of creations, redemptions, and resurrections. Jehovah is the second and the higher name. Elohein-signifying the Gods-is the first name of the celestial trinity.

Michael was a celestial, resurrected being, of another world.

"In the beginning" the Gods created the heavens and the earths.

In their councils they said, let us make man in our own image. So, in the likeness of the Fathers, and the Mothers—the Gods-created they man-male and female.

When this earth was prepared for mankind, Michael, as Adam, came down. He brought with him one of his wives, and he called her name Eve.

Adam and Eve are the names of the fathers and mothers of worlds.

Adam was not made out of a lump of clay, as we make a brick, nor was Eve taken as a rib—a bone—from his side. They came by generation. But woman, as the wife or mate of man, was a rib of man. She was taken from his side in their glorified world, and brought by him to earth to be the mother of a race.

These were father and mother of a world of spirits who had been born to them in heaven. These spirits had been waiting for the grand period of their probation, when they should have bodies or tabernacles, so that they might become, in the resurrection, like Gods.

When this earth had become an abode for mankind, with its Garden of Eden, then it was that the morning stars sang together, and the sons and daughters of God shouted for joy. They were coming down to earth.

The children of the sun, at least, knew what the grand scheme of the everlasting Fathers and the everlasting Mothers meant, and they, both sons and daughters, shouted for joy. The temple of the eternities shook with their hosannas, and trembled with divine emotions.

The father and mother were at length in their Garden of Eden. They came on purpose to fall. They fell "that man might be; and man is, that he "might have joy." They ate of the tree of mortal life, partook of the elements of this earth that they might again become mortal for their children's sake. They fell that another world might have a probation, redemption and resurrection.

The grand patriarchal economy, with Adam, as a resurrected being, who brought his wife Eve from another world, has been very finely elaborated, by Brigham, from the patriarchal genesis which Joseph conceived. [Tullidge, Women of Mormondon, 179-181]

There are no references cited. Tullidge is not quoting from any documented source, he is explaining what he heard, or rather, what he thought he heard, and he is simply wrong. Not understanding the principles himself, he has misunderstood, and put back into Brigham Young's mouth things which Brigham Young never actually said. Errors of this kind are frequent in diaries and journals as people record (sometimes a day or two after the event) their impressions of what they saw or heard.

Another example of an abusive interpretation of one of Brigham Young's statements comes from his discourse of January 12, 1862. Brigham Young's comments on this occasion were as follows:

How has it transpired that theological truth is thus so widely disseminated? It is because God was once known on the earth among his children of mankind, as we know one another. Adam was as conversant with his Father who placed him upon this earth as we are conversant with our earthly parents. The Father frequently came to visit his son Adam, and talked and walked with him; and the children of Adam were more or less acquainted with their Grandfather, and their children were more or less acquainted with their Great-Grandfather, and the things that pertain to God and to heaven were as familiar among mankind, in the first ages of their existence on the earth, as these mountains are to our mountain boys, as our gardens are to our wives and children, or as the road to the Western Ocean is to the experienced traveller. [JD 9:149]

This statement has been cited to demonstrate the supposed existence of father Gods, grandfather Gods, and great-grandfather Gods, but it neither says nor implies anything of the sort. Brigham Young's statement says that Adam [Jr.] was acquainted with his father [Adam Sr.] and that his [Adam Jr.'s] children [Cain, Abel, Seth etc.] were more or less acquainted with their grandfather [Adam Sr.]. and that their children [i.e. the children of Cain and Seth] were more or less acquainted with their great-grandfather [Adam Sr.].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God [Adam Sr.] is</th>
<th>Father to</th>
<th>grandfather to</th>
<th>great-grandfather to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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In attempting to understand Brigham Young it is important to distinguish between what he actually said, and people's impressions, understandings or insinuations of what they thought he meant.

### Punctuation Difficulties.

In Pitman shorthand of the 1850's, there was no means provided for punctuation; there were paragraph markers at best. Although this is not usually a problem, there are instances where incorrect punctuation during the transcription of the shorthand report has led to major differences in intended meaning. A classic example of this occurs in a manuscript discourse of Brigham Young which was recorded on February 19, 1854. As transcribed by the reporter, Brigham Young said:

Who was it that spoke from the heaven and said "this is my beloved son, hear him,"? Was it God the Father? It was. The Apostles bear testimony that such a voice was actually heard. This is my beloved son, and if it is true the Holy Ghost begat him I would add, which was begotten by one of my neighbors, hear ye him. Who was the Savior begotten by? O, by his father or his brother, or some other person. So the Holy Ghost begetting the Savior looks to me. It makes me think of a story I heard in a dramatical performance once, that a certain individual was born of one of his Aunts, but he had no mother. It appears as reasonable to me to say a cousin or a fellow laborer of the Savior's begat him, as to say the Holy Ghost begat him. Who did beget him? His Father, and his Father is our God, and the Father of our spirits, and he is the framer of the body, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who is he? He is Father Adam; Michael; the Ancient of Days. Has he a father? He has. Has he a mother? He has. Now to say that the Son of God was begotten by the Holy Ghost, is to say the Holy Ghost is God the Father, which is inconsistent, and contrary to all the revelations of God both modern and ancient. [Watson, Brigham Young Addresses, 19 Feb. 1854.]

But with only slight modification in punctuation, a more conventional understanding in complete harmony with Brigham Young's recorded views on the subject appears.

Who was it that spoke from the heaven and said "this is my beloved son, hear him,"? Was it God the Father? It was. The Apostles bear testimony that such a voice was actually heard. This is my beloved son, and if it is true the Holy Ghost begat him I would add, which was begotten by one of my neighbors, hear ye him. Who was the Savior begotten by? O, by his father or his brother, or some other person. So the Holy Ghost begetting the Savior looks to me. It makes me think of a story I heard in a dramatical performance once, that a certain individual was born of one of his Aunts, but he had no mother. It appears as reasonable to me to say a cousin or a fellow laborer of the Savior's begat him, as to say the Holy Ghost begat him. Who did beget him? His Father, and his Father is our God, and the Father of our spirits, and he is the framer of the body, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who is he? He is Father Adam; Michael; the Ancient of Days. Has he a father? He has. Has he a mother? He has. Now to say that the Son of God was begotten by the Holy Ghost, is to say the Holy Ghost is God the Father, which is inconsistent, and contrary to all the revelations of God both modern and ancient. [Watson, Brigham Young Addresses, 19 Feb. 1854.]

---

**Brigham Young's choice of words.**

There were times when Brigham Young’s words, although properly recorded, were not technically accurate when scrutinized by critics. There were instances when he could have made a better choice of his words. Take the following paragraph as an example:

After men have got their exaltations and their crowns—have become Gods, even the sons of God—are made Kings of kings and Lords of lords, they have the power then of propagating their species in spirit; and that is the first of their operations with regard to organizing a world. Power is then given to them to organize the elements, and then commence the organization of tabernacles. How can they do it? Have they to go to that earth? Yes, an Adam will have to go there, and he cannot do without Eve; he must have Eve to commence the work of generation, and they will go into the garden, and continue to eat and drink of the fruits of the corporeal world, until this grosser matter is diffused sufficiently through their celestial bodies to enable them, according to the established laws, to produce mortal tabernacles for their spiritual children. [JD 6:275, Brigham Young, August 28, 1852.]

As published, Brigham Young stated that God [Adam Sr.] created "mortal" tabernacles for his spiritual children, but the term "mortal" is not completely correct for describing that state in which Adam Jr. and Eve Jr. (i.e. the spiritual children) found themselves before their fall. Hindsight would allow us to use "physical tabernacles" as more appropriate wording than "mortal tabernacles." It is also possible that Brigham Young was describing the entire process of their birth followed in course of time by their fall as comprising the "established laws" by which their tabernacles were made. In either event, Brigham Young is speaking of Adam Sr. and Eve Sr. as resurrected beings creating physical bodies for Adam Jr. and Eve Jr., and not Adam and Eve as fallen resurrected beings (fallen Gods having returned to a state of mortality) creating the mortal tabernacles for Cain, Abel, Seth etc., as has been claimed by some who advocate apostate interpretations of the Adam-God theory. In understanding Brigham Young, it is important that we not accept unreasonable interpretations which have him contradicting scripture as well as other statements made by himself.

### The April 9, 1852 Discourse

Probably more than any other, the discourse which has given rise to the most wide spread and incorrect interpretations of Brigham Young’s views on Adam-God is his April 9, 1852 discourse. It has since been called Brigham Young's Adam-God sermon.

Over the years this particular discourse received sufficient attention that it warranted a response by the First Presidency of the Church which was published by James R. Clark in Messages of the First Presidency. This response, which may be considered an official interpretation, will be presented first, in order to facilitate a proper understanding of the report of the discourse, which will then be presented. Written in 1912 to Samuel O. Bennion, then president of the Independence Missouri Mission, this message states:

Salt Lake City, Utah

February 20, 1912

Prest. Samuel O. Bennion
Independence,

Dear Brother:

Your question concerning Adam has not been answered before because of pressure of important business. We now respond briefly, but, we hope, plainly. You speak of "the assertion made by Brigham Young that Jesus was begotten of the Father in the flesh by our father Adam, and that Adam is the father of Jesus Christ and not the Holy Ghost," and you say that Elders are challenged by certain critics to prove this.

If you will carefully examine the sermon to which you refer, in the Journal of Discourses, Vol. 1, you will discover that, while President Young denied that Jesus was "begotten of the Holy Ghost," he did not affirm, in as many words, that "Adam is the father of Jesus Christ in the flesh." He said, "Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the garden of Eden and who is our Father in Heaven. Who is our Father in Heaven?" Here is what President Young said about him; "Our Father in heaven begat all the spirits that ever were or ever will be upon this earth and they were born spirits in the eternal world. Then the Lord by his power and wisdom organized the mortal tabernacle of man." Was He in the Garden of Eden? Surely He gave commandments to Adam and Eve; He was their Father in Heaven; they worshiped Him and taught their children the fall to worship and obey Him in the name of the Son who was to come.

But President Young went on to show that our father Adam,—that is, our earthly father,—the progenitor of the race of man, stands at our head, being "Michael the Archangel, the Ancient of Days," and that he was not fashioned from earth like an adobe, but "begotten by his Father in Heaven." Adam is called in the Bible "the son of God" (Luke 3:38). It was our Father in Heaven who begat the spirit of him who was "the firstborn" of all the spirits that come to this earth, and who was, also his Father by the Virgin Mary, making him "the only begotten in the flesh." Read Luke 1:26-35. Where is Jesus called "the only begotten of the Holy Ghost?" He is always singled out as "the only begotten of the Father." (John 1:14; 3:16, 18, &c) The Holy Ghost came upon Mary, and her conception was under that influence, even of the spirit of life; our Father in Heaven was the Father of the Son of Mary, to whom the Savior prayed, as did our earthly father Adam.

When President Young asked, "who is the Father?" he was speaking of Adam as the father of our earthly bodies, who is at our head, as revealed in Doctrine and Covenants, Section 107, verses 53-56. In that sense he is one of the gods referred to in numerous scriptures, and particularly by Christ (John 10:34-36). He is the great Patriarch, the Ancient of Days, who will stand in his place as "a prince over us forever," and with whom we shall "have to do," as each family will have to do with his head, according to the holy patriarchal order. Our father, Adam, perfected and glorified as a God, will be the being who will carry out the behests of the great Elohim in relation to his posterity. (See Daniel 7:9-14.)

While, as Paul puts it, "there be gods many and Lords many (whether in heaven or in earth), unto us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things." The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints worships Him, and Him alone, who is the Father of Jesus Christ, whom He worshiped, whom Adam worshiped, and who is God the Eternal Father of us all.

Your brethren,

(signed)

JOSEPH F. SMITH,

ANTHON H. LUND,

CHARLES W. PENROSE,

First Presidency.

[James R. Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, 4:266-267]

In a fundamentalist publication Michael, Our Father and Our God, Joseph W. Musser documented a letter written by Joseph Fielding Smith on April 9, 1935. Eighty-three years after the original discourse, and as president of the Quorum of the Twelve, President Smith said:

"Dear Brother:

I have before me your letter of yesterday in which you say that the question of the Godhead has caused considerable discussion among some of the Elders because of certain things published in early days purporting to come from President Brigham Young and others.

First let me say, the discourse from which you quote purporting to have been delivered by President Brigham Young, is one which, for some reason is widely circulated and everybody seems to know about it and have placed upon in their interpretation to the effect that Adam is our god, the only God with which we have to do, and that he is the Father of Jesus Christ; but they do not seem to know that President Brigham Young spoke perhaps a thousand times in which he declared that Jesus Christ is the Son of God the Father who created Adam, and that Adam is the Son of God. The remarkable thing is that this one thing, which perhaps ought to be forgotten, is remembered, and all else, which should be remembered, is forgotten or never considered. I will say frankly that I believe President Brigham Young was not properly quoted in this discourse. He did not see it before it was published in England. I firmly believe this for the implication in the discourse is foreign to all that President Brigham Young taught. For proof of this see Brigham Young's discourses.

Now, it is a fact that Adam is our god; we are and will be subject to him; he will preside over all of his posterity and will be the immediate personage unto whom they will look for counsel and direction. Adam holds the keys of salvation for this earth, under the Holy One of Israel. The Holy One is, of course, Jesus Christ. See D. & C. 78:16. Adam, as Michael, will stand at the head of his posterity, just as each father will over his immediate family, but all under the direction of Jesus Christ. What Presidents Young and Kimball had in mind was this very thing.

I am enclosing an article - OFFICIAL - which will, I believe, explain all of this apparent mystery to you.

Sincerely your Brother,

(Sig.) Joseph Fielding Smith."
In the Musser book, President Joseph Fielding Smith was ridiculed for expressing his belief that the discourse was not properly recorded. As will be shown below, it can now be demonstrated that not only was the talk not properly recorded, but the major discrepancy in the talk occurs just at the most critical juncture for causing the popular misunderstanding.

Brigham Young's discourse was delivered before approximately 2500 Elders and brethren assembled in the new adobe tabernacle which was located at the site of the present Assembly Hall. It was in an evening priesthood session, which began at 6:00 p.m., Friday, April 9, 1852, on the fourth day of general conference. Bishop Edward Hunter was the first speaker in that session, and he spoke about his conversion to the Church. He was followed by President Young, who spoke briefly on the value of preaching good doctrine and practices followed by a short sermon on tithing. It would have been about 7:30 or 8:00 p.m. when he began his sermon on Adam-God. The sermon is reproduced here in double columns. The left column is from the Wilford Woodruff Journal, as he recorded it longhand, and the right column is from the Journal of Discourses.

### Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilford Woodruff Journal 6:xxx</th>
<th>Journal of Discourses 1:50-51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I will now preach to you another sermon</strong></td>
<td>My next sermon will be to both Saint and Sinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is one great master and head in all kingdoms and governments, So with us.</strong></td>
<td>One thing has remained a mystery in this kingdom up to this day. It is in regard to the character of the well beloved Son of God, upon which subject the Elders of Israel have conflicting views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our Father in Heaven is a tabernacle. He created us in the likeness of his own image.</strong></td>
<td>Our God and Father in Heaven is a being of Tabernacle, or, in other words, he has a body, with parts the same as you and I have; and is capable of showing forth His works to organized beings, as, for instance, in the world in which we live, it is the result of the knowledge and infinite wisdom that dwell in His organized body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Son has also a tabernacle like the Father &amp; the Holy Ghost</strong></td>
<td>His son Jesus Christ has become a personage of tabernacle, and has a body like his father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is a minister to the people</strong></td>
<td>The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Lord, and issues forth from Himself, and may properly be called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>but not a tabernacle.</strong></td>
<td>God's minister to execute His will in immensity; being called to govern by His influence and power;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who begat the Son of God?</strong></td>
<td>who it was that begat the Son of the Virgin Mary. The infidel world have concluded that if what the Apostles wrote about his father and mother be true, and the present marriage discipline acknowledged by Christendom be true, then Christians must believe that God is the father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infidels say that Jesus was a bastard</strong></td>
<td>of an illegitimate son, in the person of Jesus Christ! The infidel fraternity teach that to their disciples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>but let me tell you the truth concerning the matter. Our Father begat all the spirits that were before any tabernacles were made.</strong></td>
<td>I will tell you how it is. Our Father in Heaven begat all the spirits that ever were, or ever will be, upon this earth; and they were born spirits in the eternal world. Then the Lord by His power and wisdom organized the mortal tabernacles of man. We were made first spiritual, and afterward temporal. Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and Sinner!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When our Father came into the garden he came with his celestial body &amp;brought one of his wives with him and eat of the fruit of the garden until he could beget a tabernacle,</strong></td>
<td>When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and Adam is Michael</strong></td>
<td>is MICHAEL, the Archangel, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! About whom holy men have written and spoken - He is our FATHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>our God and all the god that we have anything to do with</strong></td>
<td>and our GOD, and the only God with whom we have to do. Every man upon the earth, professing Christians or non-professing, must hear it, and will know it sooner or later. They came here, organized the raw material, and arranged in their order the herbs of the field, the trees, the apple, the peach, the plum, the pear, and every other fruit that is desirable and good for man; the seed was brought from another sphere, and planted in this earth. The thistle, the thorn, the brier and the obnoxious weed did not appear until after the earth was cursed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>They eat of this fruit &amp; formed the first tabernacle that was formed</strong></td>
<td>When Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden fruit, their bodies became mortal from its effects, and therefore their offspring were mortal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and when the Virgin Mary was begotten with child it was by the Father and in no other way</strong></td>
<td>When the Virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the Father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the Father? He is the first of the human family; and when he took a tabernacle, it was begotten by his Father in heaven,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>only as we were begotten</strong></td>
<td>after the same manner as the tabernacles of Cain, Abel, and the rest of the sons and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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daughters of Adam and Eve; from the fruits of the earth, the first earthly tabernacles were originated by the Father, and so on in succession. I could tell you much more about this; but were I to tell you the whole truth, blasphemy would be nothing to it, in the estimation of the superstitious and overtighteous of mankind. However, I have told you the truth as far as I have gone. I have heard men preach upon the divinity of Christ, and exhaust all the wisdom they possessed. All Scripturists, and approved theologians who were considered exemplary for piety and education, have undertaken to expound on this subject, in every age of the Christian Era; and after they have done all, they are obliged to conclude by exclaiming "great is the mystery of godliness," and tell nothing.

It is true that the earth was organized by three distinct characters, namely, Eloheim, Yahovah, and Michael, these three forming a quorum, as in all heavenly bodies, and in organizing element, perfectly represented in the Deity, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Again, they will try to tell how the divinity of Jesus is joined to his humanity, and exhaust all their mental faculties, and wind up with this profound language, as describing the soul of man, "it is an immaterial substance!" What a learned idea! Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the garden of Eden, and who is our Father in Heaven.

Handle it as you please, it will either seal the salvation or damnation of man.

Now, let all who may hear these doctrines, pause before they make light of them, or treat them with indifference, for they will prove their salvation or damnation.

I have given you a few leading items upon this subject, but a great deal more remains to be told. Now remember from this time forth, and forever, that Jesus Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. I will repeat a little anecdote. I was in conversation with a certain learned professor upon this subject, when I replied, to this idea--"if the Son was begotten by the Holy Ghost, it would be very dangerous to baptize and confirm females, and give the Holy Ghost to them, lest he should beget children, to be palmed upon the Elders by the people, bringing the

---

I have told you nothing in this thing but what you have read in the Bible, I do not frame it. In the Bible, you have read the things I have told you to-night; but you have not known what you did read. I have told you no more than you are conversant with; but what do the people in Christendom, with the Bible in their hands, know about this subject? Comparatively nothing.

Brigham Young then concluded his comments with a few more remarks on the topic of tithing.

As can be seen by comparing the two accounts, Wilford Woodruff was a good reporter. He captured in brief nearly every major concept which Brigham Young presented throughout the discourse. His comments are short and succinct. Brigham Young's drawn out statement "The infidel world have concluded that if what the Apostles wrote about his father and mother be true, and the present marriage discipline acknowledged by Christendom be correct, then Christians must believe that God is the father of an illegitimate son in the person of Jesus Christ!" becomes simply: "infidels say that Jesus was a bastard." What is most interesting, however, about Wilford Woodruff's synopsis account is that in two places the synopsis contains more information than exists in the shorthand "verbatim" account. These have been represented above by leaving a gap in the published report across from the additional information provided by Wilford Woodruff. Since it is impossible for a synopsis to contain more information than a full stenographic report, this means that the stenographic report is incomplete.

The first omission occurs right at the beginning of Brigham Young's sermon:

"There is one great master and head in all kingdoms and governments. So with us."

This appears to be an introductory statement to explain that he is preparing to tell us something about God, who is our great master and head. It is not uncommon for impromptu speakers to thrash around a little at the beginning of a new topic before they settle into their train of thought, nor is it uncommon for reporters to omit in the transcription of their report some introductory thoughts which do not blend readily with the discourse they are reporting. This may well have been the case here.

The second omission is of a more critical nature. Brigham Young was making an important declation to all inhabitants of the earth:

Now hear it, O inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saint and Sinner! When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives with him.

A very unconventional statement by itself, and anything but a yawner. With our present understanding, we must presume that he is speaking of God the Father (Adam Sr.) and our Heavenly Mother (Eve Sr.), but in the published report the next sentences disallow this interpretation:
He helped to make and organize this world. He is MICHAEL, the Archangel, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! About whom holy men have written and spoken -

But between these two statements, the Wilford Woodruff journal documents a significant bridge. After stating that our Father (i.e. Adam Sr.) came into the garden with a celestial body and brought Eve (i.e. Eve Sr.), with him, Brigham Young made a statement to the effect that they then partook of the fruit of the garden until they could beget a tabernacle. If the subsequent two sentences refer to the "tabernacle" (i.e. Adam Jr.) who was begotten, then certainly

He helped to make and organize this world. He is MICHAEL, the Archangel, the ANCIENT OF DAYS! About whom holy men have written and spoken - He is our FATHER and our GOD, and the only God with whom we have to do.

It is apparent that the report of the discourse has been corrupted right at this critical juncture, and we have neither an accurate nor a complete account of what was said. It is important to note that the Wilford Woodruff account successfully bridges the gap between talking about Adam Sr. and talking about Adam Jr., which the published account does not. There is additional support for this bridge in the journal account of Samuel Hollister Rogers, who was also present at this meeting. Samuel Rogers records the following:

April 16, 1852. Conference commenced on the 6 and continued until the 11, it was held in the new tabernacle, adjourned until the 7 of next October. We had the best conference that I ever attended during the time of the Conference President Brigham Young said that our spirits were begotten before that Adam came to the Earth, and that Adam helped to make the earth, that he had a Celestial body when he came to the earth, and that he brought his wife or one of his wives with him, and that Eve was also a Celestial being, that they eat of the fruit of the ground until they beget children from the Earth, he said that Adam was the only God that we would have, and that Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost, but of the Father Adam, that Christ was our Elder brother. The argument that he used to show that Christ was not begotten by the holy ghost was a caution to the Elders that when they should go to preach the Gospel, to be careful how they laid their hands on the sisters, for the reception of the holy ghost, lest the Holy Ghost should get them with child and that it would be laid to them.

[Samuel Hollister Rogers Journal (typescript), MS d 1910 CHD; page 145]

Note that Elder Rogers also includes the same transition as does Wilford Woodruff, at the same point in the discourse. After Adam and Eve came to the earth with celestial bodies.

"that they eat of the fruit of the ground until they beget children from the Earth,"

This is immediately followed by the information that Adam was the only God with whom we have to do. We therefore have a second witness that the discourse as originally published is corrupted and cannot be relied upon to determine what Brigham Young was attempting to express.

Word counts of the two reports can give us an approximation of how much material was omitted. The following table compares the relative sizes of the Journal of Discourses account and the Wilford Woodruff account:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Journal of Discourses</th>
<th>Wilford Woodruff Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JD par 1</td>
<td>008 words</td>
<td>015 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD par 3</td>
<td>077 words</td>
<td>015 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD par 4</td>
<td>021 words</td>
<td>014 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD par 5</td>
<td>014 words</td>
<td>072 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD par 6</td>
<td>000 words</td>
<td>000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD par 7</td>
<td>068 words</td>
<td>021 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD par 8</td>
<td>021 words</td>
<td>021 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>293 words</td>
<td>1061 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtracting 015 (the number of paragraph 2 words) and 014 (the number of paragraph 5 words) of the Wilford Woodruff account which are not included in the Journal of Discourses, we have 1061 words in JD reported in 264 words by Woodruff. This represents approximately 3.6 times as many words in JD as are in WW. Multiplying paragraphs 2 and 5 of the Wilford Woodruff account back into the equation, we see that each paragraph could represent an omission of approximately 50 words.

Other difficulties

There are a few other problems among the Brigham Young materials, but they all relate to an inaccurate reporting or transmission of the text. As another example, among the manuscript papers of Brigham Young is the report of a sermon delivered before the Deseret Theological Institute on April 25, 1855 relative to Adam-God. An initial reading of this report would lead one to conclude that Brigham Young's sentiments on this occasion were not completely consistent with the interpretations given in this paper. A closer reading, however, reveals some interesting aspects of this report. First, the report is unsigned, giving us no indication of who it was who reported the discourse. Second, the discourse does not flow coherently. There are points in the discourse where the thought shifts abruptly, without a meaningful transition, which is atypical of Brigham Young's discourses. After careful consideration, I believe the report to have been made by someone inexperienced in reporting discourses of this nature, who was not able to keep up with the speaker. There are recurrences of paragraphs which appear to trail off into a quick summary rather than a quotation, followed by a jump in thought. It appears as though someone hurriedly reported as much as they were able, but often fell behind the speaker, and then occasionally omitted a portion of the talk in order to catch up. What remains does not represent an accurate portrayal of Brigham Young's feelings on the subject of Adam-God.

The Eugene England Letter

In October of 1982 a letter was made public which had been written on February 19, 1981 by Bruce R. McConkie in response to some questions which had been asked him by Eugene England. In this response Br. McConkie told Brother England that Brigham Young had apparently taught that Adam [Jr.] was God, but that he was simply wrong. When this letter was printed and distributed by an anti-Mormon group, we went to Br. McConkie and told him that we had been teaching differently than him, and we did not want to be teaching anything that was incorrect. We told Br. McConkie that if we were wrong, we wanted to know, and we would quit teaching it. After considerable discussion Br. McConkie told us to keep teaching what we had been teaching, because it was he that was wrong. He
said if he had known of our views, he never would have said what he did in his letter to Eugene England, and we had his permission to tell anyone we wanted that Br. McConkie had said he was wrong in saying that Brigham Young had taught that Adam was God.

Why didn't Brigham Young just say so?

We return now to the question raised earlier. If it is this simple, why didn't Brigham Young just say so? As was pointed out previously, there is some indication that he did try to make the distinction between Adam Sr. and Adam Jr., but that doesn't sufficiently answer the question. After years of working with Brigham Young's discourses, it has become apparent that Brigham Young avoided the topic of Adam God unless he was prodded in that direction. There were brethren among the General Authorities of the church who occasionally taught wrong doctrine on the subject, and Brigham Young seldom broached the topic except in those instances when there had been some incorrect information taught, either in discourses or in writings by the Church leaders. On those occasions, Brigham Young generally got up, said what he had to say in order to correct the false information, and then either quit speaking or switched to another topic. He did not try to make the concept crystal clear, nor did he ever attempt to establish it as a Church doctrine.

Brigham Young's concepts of Adam and God do not appear to have gone through a growth, or learning process. Instead they emerge full blown, early in the 1850's, which would indicate that he did not develop the knowledge by himself, but was taught it by someone else, either directly or through revelation. He credits much of his understanding about God and Michael etc. to the Prophet Joseph Smith.

Did I ever see a man who could instruct me in these matters, until I saw Joseph Smith? I never did. And after I had made a profession of religion, I would ask the most powerful preachers whether they knew anything about God - where He is located, where Heaven is, and where Hell is, who is the Father, who is the Son, and what the distinction is between them, who is Michael the archangel, who is Gabriel, and so on. Could they tell a thing about it? No: and I am a witness that no man in Christendom knew anything about it, unless it was revealed by the Spirit to him. [JD 5:124]

Although I cannot cite anything to support the idea, I can think of no reason which better explains the existing historical data than to suggest that the Prophet Joseph Smith told Brigham Young not to teach the concept to the people until they were ready to understand it. It would appear that out of respect to Joseph Smith, Brigham Young never taught the sacred principles behind Adam God in their simplicity, but only taught what he felt he must to insure that the Saints were not mislead by false doctrine taught by a few of their priesthood leaders.
Another Look at Adam-God

David Buerger's article, "The Adam-God Doctrine" (Spring 1982) demonstrates a great degree of skill and scholarly research. Nevertheless, he too lightly passes over times Brigham Young taught against the Adam-God theory and the considerable evidence that Young did not believe Adam to be our God in the normal sense of the word. This information really warrants an article of its own; but here I will try to give some idea of the type of evidence that exists, and put in perspective some of the quotes in Buerger's essay.

Before beginning, I need to reemphasize a point Buerger made well, namely that President Young never equated Elohim and Adam. For example, Young asserts, "Adam... is Michael. The earth was organized by three distinct characters, namely, Elohim, Jehovah, and Michael..."

We have seven examples where Young refers to Adam as the "father" of Jesus Christ. But two may not refer to Adam at all (AG 14, 15). One or two are of questionable accuracy (AG 33, 18), and the rest merely state without elaboration that Adam is the "father of Jesus Christ." Thus it is possible they were intended metaphorically. It is also possible that he was merely citing Joseph Smith and was personally unsure how they should be interpreted. Apparently

1. Doctrines of Salvation, 3 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1977), 1:96-97; hereafter cited parenthetically in the text as DS.


Young did not believe Jesus was the Only Begotten Son of Adam, for he explained: it is the Lord who "created Adam and Eve" that sent his Only Begotten Son (AG 59) and that the Father demanded "recompense" for Adam and Eve's transgression and sent his "Only Begotten Son" to die for us. He often preached that Adam and Eve sinned the original sin, that Jesus atoned for it, and that no man could be saved without this atonement (BY 21, 26, 27, 30, 60, etc.). He seems to have believed that Adam was dependent upon Jesus for his salvation. All this and more strongly suggests Young did not think of Adam as the literal father of Jesus.

The book of Moses explicitly denotes Jesus as the Only Begotten Son of Adam's God (1:33, 34; 3:18; 20; 4:28; 6:52) and conclusively demonstrates Adam's dependence on Christ for his salvation (5:7-11; 6:59). An exhaustive search through the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants yields only scriptures agreeing with the book of Moses, for example, Alma 12:26; 42:5, 7; D&C 29:1-26.

Buerger presents convincing evidence that Young did indeed believe Adam to be the literal father of our spirits. One would think such evidence would end all thoughts that Young believed Elohim to be the father of our spirits. Strangely enough, this is not the case. It turns out Young also taught clearly that Elohim is the father of our spirits. For instance, he explains that the father of our spirits sent his Only Begotten Son to atone for Adam's sin (BY 59). He also proclaimed, "You are well acquainted with God our Heavenly Father, or the great Elohim... There is not a person here to-day but what is a son or daughter of that Being... If you do not believe it, cease to call him Father; and when you pray, pray to some other character" (BY 50). Another time he said, "We are the children of Adam and Eve. So we are, and they are the children of our Heavenly Father" (BY 222).

Admittedly it is unerving to have Young teaching so clearly such contradictory doctrines. One possibility is that he was genuinely confused. Or he may have held that Adam, though already resurrected and a god, sent his spirit children to this earth upon which it is Elohim and not Adam whom we consider to be our God, to whom we pray, and whom we call our Heavenly Father. He may have held it proper to speak of Elohim as the father of our spirits because he saw Elohim as our spiritual grandfather, making us his literal spiritual descendants.

We can find some insight into what Young meant when he called Adam our God in the following quote: "Joseph [Smith] said to us 'I am a God to this people & so is any man who is appointed to lead Israel or the Kingdom of God.' Then Young elaborated, 'God did not say worship Moses because he [Moses] was a God to the people. You may say to your wife or son... I am your councillor, Dictator, or your[er] God. Either would be correct... yet they should not worship you, for this would be sin.'"

Here Young demonstrates that in calling Adam our God he need only have meant that Adam presided over us or that we are his descendents. When he referred to Adam as the God of Jesus he may have meant only that Jesus is a descendant of Adam or that Adam presided over some element of Jesus' earthly life — such as perhaps the sending of angels to instruct him.

Do we have any evidence that Adam presides over us or presided over some element of Jesus' life? Joseph Smith preached that whenever keys of the priesthood are revealed from heaven, it is by Adam's authority (DS 1:59). Young may have taken this to imply that Adam presided over sending Moses and Elias to Jesus on the mount of transfiguration. Joseph also taught "Christ is the Great High Priest, Adam next" (ibid.) and that Adam "presides over the Spirits of all men" (AG 25). We know the twelve apostles will judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28).

Young may have reasoned that Adam will also be one of the great judges of mankind — even greater than the apostles. At Adam-Ohio-Alma, every man will return the keys of the priesthood he held to Adam. In the Old Testament, Daniel graphically describes Adam sitting on his throne in glory (7:9, 21, 22). It was Adam who led the war in heaven against Satan (Rev. 12:7), who will lead the last great battle against Satan (D&C 88:112-115), who is called "the father of all, the prince of all" (D&C 27:11), who is "in a high and exalted... key of salvation under the... Holy One" (D&C 78:16), and who is a "prince over us forever" (D&C 107:55).

Certainly most members of the church are not aware of just how exalted a character Adam is. We seldom think of Adam as presiding over our spirits, as being a judge over us, as being a prince over us forever, or of our being accountable to Adam in any sense. Yet Young seems to have believed Adam was only slightly less exalted than Jesus Christ. He was aware that his views on Adam were unusual and difficult for many to accept.

On the other hand, there are significant areas in which Young did not seem to exalt Adam. Though the relevant resources at my disposal are limited to Discourses of Brigham Young, Doctrine of Salvation, and two recent articles in Dialogue (Summer 1980).
which deemphasized his stand on the issue: "Tell me this as my belief about that person - who is called the ancient of days, the prince, and so on. But I do not tell it because I wish to be established in the minds of others" (AG 23). In January of 1860 he advised the apostles to avoid discussing the issue publicly (AG 24).

Strangely enough, it was the time when Brigham Young was trying to deemphasize Adam-God that he (possibly to justify his past remarks) made three of his four statements that he was confident on his stand that Adam is our Father and our God (AG 23, 29, 31). His strongest statement called such a belief a doctrine "which God revealed to me" in the midst of explaining that "how much unbeknown exists in the minds of Latter-day Saints... that Adam is our Father and God - I do not know, I dare not inquire, I care nothing about it" (AG 31). The obvious intent of what he was saying was to explain that he did not care what people thought about his ideas, not to declare once and for all that the Lord had revealed it to him. Thus he clearly communicated that his belief need not be accepted by others and was not to be considered church doctrine. This is very different from teaching his ideas as church doctrine in the name of the Lord. Moreover, after Young's manner of speaking, what he said was revealed to him was technically correct. Adam is our father in the same sense that Abraham is our father. He is our God in the same sense that Young called Joseph Smith and Moses gods to their people. Apparently Young did not view himself as using the word God loosely or metaphorically, but believed any enlightened person would use the term God in this manner. We should note that every recorded instance where he expressed confidence in a specific point of his beliefs, he used the same words - he was confident that Adam was "our Father and God" (AG 29, 31). It is possible he was merely voicing his confidence in the words themselves which the Lord had "revealed" to him through Joseph Smith.

In conclusion, it seems Young did not consider Adam to be literally the father of Jesus. Since any father may correctly say to his son, "I am your God," Young need not have meant much by calling Adam our God. He was correct in his belief that Adam presides over us. His questionable belief seems to have been seeing Adam literally as the father of our spirits. But he did not believe Adam is the God to whom we pray, in whom we believe, whom we serve, from whom we receive revelations, whose gospel we teach, or even whom we call our Heavenly Father. If President Young was wrong about Adam being the father of our spirits, at least he did not teach his idea as church doctrine, believed he heard it from Joseph Smith, and also referred to Elohim as the father of our spirits. These points need further elaboration as many other relevant statements exist on both sides of the argument. This letter abridges a much longer paper which comes to the same conclusion. Though not every one will agree with my view in all its particularities, the evidence that Young did not view Adam as our God in the usual sense of the term cannot afford to be overlooked.

Carl Broderick, Jr.
Cerritos, California

A Synthesis Desirable?
Re: Lester Bush's valedictory (Summer 1982).
Isn't it likely that the synthesis he desires of Mormon theology cannot exist except in a personal framework? Once a person has complied with the few requirements, such as baptism, priesthood (for the males), temple marriage, sacrament, tithing, etc., he/she can - in fact, must - develop his/her own Mormonism, as long as he/she stays within the fairly loose boundaries of the knowledge and suggested/implied doctrines now available. The true substance of Mormon doctrine is, except for relatively few "doctrines" and corollary actions, the kind of understanding each person works with. This understanding changes constantly and is evaluated by increasingly absolute standards as one's spirituality, discipline, and sense of knowledge change (grow). That is, each individual starts with what he/she understands and can do. As he/she "grows" in the gospel, so do the standards by which God ultimately will judge him/her.

The equation involved is an individual one and requires the knowledge, love, and justice we expect God possesses for its solution. Each equation is made up of elements including such things as each day's expenditure of energy, on what the energy is spent, of the attitude motivating the expenditure, the circumstances of learning and growth each person happens upon, and the degree of control he/she can exercise over life's happenstances, etc. Not the least of the elements is what each person makes of the less-than-skeletal body of doctrine available and the sometimes free-for-all interpretations given him/her or more importantly, determined by him/her.

Threaded through Mormon belief are two doctrines that can only mean a highly personal interpretation and judgment: free agency and personal revelation.

I think this personalness baffles the hierarchy. Free agency means that persons of quite widely differing interpretations can achieve the celestial kingdom. Application of free agency threatens the values of the hierarchy. They are trying to persuade us that prophets do not disagree. They are trying to give us what God has not: absolute patterns of morality, belief, and happiness. And temporal standards of measurement.

Charles Larsen
Pasadena, California

Read It Again, Sam
During the past five years Sam Taylor may have been reading Dialogue or he may have been reading BYU Studies, but when he says, "The baptized Dialogue [i.e., under Mary Bradford's editorship] is identical with BYU Studies," I know he hasn't
Genesis 1:26
26 ¶ And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that creepeth upon the earth.
27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.
28 And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.
29 ¶ And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which [is] upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which [is] the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.
30 And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein [there is] life, I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so.
31 ¶ And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, [it was] very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

Moses 2:26
26 And I, God, said unto mine Only Begotten, which was with me from the beginning: Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and it was so. And I, God, said: Let them have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.
27 And I, God, created man in mine own image, in the image of mine Only Begotten created I him; male and female created I them.
28 And I, God, blessed them, and said unto them: Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.
29 And I, God, said unto man: Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which shall be the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.
30 And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein I grant life, there shall be given every clean herb for meat; and it was so, even as I spake.
31 And I, God, saw everything that I had made, and, behold, all things which I had made were very good; and the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

Genesis 2:7
7 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.
8 ¶ And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.
9 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.

Moses 3:7
7 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.
8 And I, the Lord God, planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there I put the man whom I had formed.
9 And out of the ground made I, the Lord God, to grow every tree, naturally, that is pleasant to the sight of man; and man could behold it. And it became also a living soul. For it was spiritual in the day that I created it; for it remaineth in the sphere in which I, God, created it, yea, even all things which I prepared for the use of man; and man saw that it was good for food. And I, the Lord God, planted the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and also the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

JST Genesis 2:8
8 And I, 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; 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.
9 And I, the Lord God, planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there I put the man whom I had formed.
10 And out of the ground made I, the Lord God, to grow every tree naturally, that is pleasant to the sight of man; and man could behold it, and it was spiritual in the day that I created it; for it remaineth in the sphere in which I, God, created it; yea, even all things which I prepared for the use of man; and man saw that it was good for food.
12 And I, the Lord God, planted the tree of life also, in the midst of the garden; and also the tree of knowledge of good and evil.
Genesis 2:15
15 And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.
16 ¶ And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:
17 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.
18 ¶ And the LORD God said, [It is] not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.
19 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 to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that [was] the name thereof.
20 And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.
21 ¶ And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof;
22 And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.
23 And Adam said, This [is] now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.
24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.
25 And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

Moses 3:15
15 And I, the Lord God, took the man, and put him into the Garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it.
16 And I, the Lord God, commanded the man, saying: Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat,
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.
18 And I, the Lord God, said unto mine Only Begotten, that it was not good that the man should be alone; wherefore, I will make an help meet for him.
19 And out of the ground I, the Lord God, formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and commanded that they should come unto Adam, to see what he would call them;
20 And I, the Lord God, caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam; and he slept, and I took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in the stead thereof;
21 And the rib which I, the Lord God, had taken from man, made I a woman, and brought her unto the man.
22 And Adam said: This I know now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man.
24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.
25 And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

JST Genesis 2:18
18 And I, the Lord God, took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it.
19 And I, the Lord God, commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat;
21 Nevertheless, thou mayest choose for thyself, for it is given unto thee; but remember that I forbid it;
22 For in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.
23 And I, the Lord God, said unto mine Only Begotten, that it was not good that the man should be alone;
24 Wherefore, I will make an help meet for him.
25 And out of the ground I, the Lord God, formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and commanded that they should come unto Adam, to see what he would call them.
26 And they were also living souls; for I, God, breathed into them the breath of life, and commanded that whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that should be the name thereof.
27 And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but as for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.
28 And I, the Lord God, caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam; and he slept, and I took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in the stead thereof; and the rib, which I, the Lord God had taken from man, made I a woman, and brought her unto the man.
29 And Adam said, This I know now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man. [End]
Genesis 3:1
1 ¶ NOW the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?
2 And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:
3 But of the fruit of the tree which [is] in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.
4 And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die:
5 For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.
6 ¶ 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, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.
7 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they [were] naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.

Moses 4:1
1 AND I, the Lord God, spake unto Moses, saying: That Satan, whom thou hast commanded in the name of mine Only Begotten, is the same which was 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.
2 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.
3 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 down;
4 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.
5 And now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which I, the Lord God, had made.
6 And Satan put it into the heart of the serpent, (for he had drawn away many after him,) and he sought also to beguile Eve, for he knew not the mind of God, wherefore he sought to destroy the world.
7 And he said unto the woman: Yea, hath God said—Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? (And he spake by the mouth of the serpent.)
8 And the woman said unto the serpent: We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden;
9 But of the fruit of the tree which thou beholdest in the midst of the garden, God hath said—Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.
10 And the serpent said unto the woman: Ye shall not surely die;
11 For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.
12 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it became pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make her wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and also gave unto her husband with her, and he did eat.
13 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they had been naked. And they sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons.

JST Genesis 3:1
1 AND I, the Lord God, spake unto Moses, saying, That Satan whom thou hast commanded in the name of mine Only Begotten, is the same which was from the beginning;
2 And he came before me, saying, Behold, 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.
3 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.
4 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 down; and be became Satan.
5 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.
6 And now, the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which I, the Lord God, had made.
7 And Satan put it into the heart of the serpent, for he had drawn away many after him; and he sought also to beguile Eve, for he knew not the mind of God; wherefore, he sought to destroy the world.
8 And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden. And he spake by the mouth of the serpent.
9 And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which thou beholdest in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.
10 And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.
11 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it became pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make her wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.
12 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they had been naked; and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons.
Genesis 3:8
8 And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden.
9 ¶ And the LORD God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where [art] thou?
10 And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I [was] naked; and I hid myself.
11 ¶ And he said, Who told thee that thou [wast] naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?
12 And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest [to be] with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.
13 And the LORD God said unto the woman, What [is] this [that] thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat
14 ¶ And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, 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:
15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.
16 ¶ Unto the woman he said, 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.

Moses 4:14
14 And they heard the voice of the Lord God, as they were walking in the garden, in the cool of the day; and Adam and his wife went to hide themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden.
15 And I, the Lord God, called unto Adam, and said unto him: Where goest thou?
16 And he said: I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I beheld that I was naked, and I hid myself.
17 And I, the Lord God, said unto Adam: Who told thee thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat, if so thou shouldst surely die?
18 And the man said: The woman thou gavest me, and commandest that she should remain with me, she gave me of the fruit of the tree and I did eat.
19 And I, the Lord God, said unto the woman: What is this thing which thou hast done? And the woman said: The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.
20 And I, the Lord God, said unto the serpent: Because thou hast done this thou shalt be 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;
21 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed; and he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.
22 Unto the woman, I, the Lord God, said: 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.

JST Genesis 3:13
13 And they heard the voice of the Lord God, as they were walking in the garden, in the cool of the day.
14 And Adam and his wife went to hide themselves from the presence of the Lord God, amongst the trees of the garden.
15 And I, the Lord God, called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where goest thou? And he said, I heard thy voice, in the garden, and I was afraid, because I beheld that I was naked; and I hid myself.
16 And I, the Lord God, said unto Adam, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat, if so thou shouldst surely die?
17 And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest me, and commanded that she should remain with me, she gave me of the fruit of the tree, and I did eat.
18 And I, the Lord God, said unto the woman, What is this thing which thou hast done?
19 And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.
Moses 4:23
23 And unto Adam, I, the Lord God, said: Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the fruit of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying—Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed shall be the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.
24 Thorns also, and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field.
25 By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.
26 And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.
27 Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them.
28 And the Lord God said, 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 forever.
29 Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.
30 So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

JST Genesis 3:23
23 And unto Adam, I, the Lord God, said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the fruit of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed shall be the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.
25 By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou return unto the ground; for thou shalt surely die; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou wast, and unto dust shalt thou return.
26 And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living: for thus have I, the Lord God, called the first of all women, which are many.
27 Unto Adam, and also unto his wife, did I, the Lord God, make coats of skins, and clothed them.
28 And I, the Lord God, said unto mine Only Begotten: Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and partake also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever.
29 Therefore, I, the Lord God, will send him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.
30 For as I, the Lord God, liveth, even so my words cannot return void, for as they go forth out of my mouth, they must be fulfilled.
31 So I drove out the man, and I placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubim and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.
Genesis 4:1
1 ¶ AND Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD.

Moses 5:1
1 AND it came to pass that after I, the Lord God, had driven them out, that Adam began to till the earth, and to have dominion over all the beasts of the field, and to eat his bread by the sweat of his brow, as I the Lord had commanded him. And Eve, also, his wife, did labour with him.
2 And Adam knew his wife, and she bare unto him sons and daughters, and they began to multiply and to replenish the earth.
3 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.
4 And Adam and Eve, his wife, called upon the name of the Lord, and 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.
5 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.
6 And 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.
7 And then the angel spake, saying: This thing is a similitude of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father, which is full of grace and truth.
8 Wherefore, thou shalt do all that thou doest in the name of the Son, and thou shalt repent and call upon God in the name of the Son for evermore.
9 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.
10 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.
11 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.

JST Genesis 4:1
1 AND it came to pass, that after I, the Lord God, had driven them out, that Adam began to till the earth, and to have dominion over all the beasts of the field, and to eat his bread by the sweat of his brow, as I, the Lord had commanded him, and Eve also, his wife, did labor with him.
2 And Adam knew his wife, and she bare unto him sons and daughters, and they began to multiply, and to replenish the earth.
3 And from that time forth, the sons and daughters of Adam began to divide, two and two, in the land, and to tend the land, and to tend flocks; and they also begat sons and daughters.
4 And Adam called upon the name of the Lord, and Eve also, his wife; and they heard the voice of the Lord, from the way towards the garden of Eden, speaking unto them, and they saw him not; for they were shut out of his presence.
5 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.
6 And Adam was obedient unto the commandments of the Lord. And 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.
7 And then the angel spake, saying, This thing is a similitude of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father, which is full of grace and truth;
8 Wherefore, thou shalt do all that thou doest, in the name of the Son. And thou shalt repent, and call upon God, in the name of the Son for evermore.
9 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.
10 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.
11 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.
12 And Adam and Eve blessed the name of God, and they made all things known unto their sons and their daughters.
13 And Satan came among them, saying: I am also a son of God; and he commanded them, saying: BeliEVE it not; and they believed it not, and they loved Satan more than God. And men began from that time forth to be carnal, sensual, and devilish.
14 And the Lord God called upon men by the Holy Ghost everywhere and commanded them that they should repent;
15 And as many as believed in the Son, and repented of their sins, should be saved; and as many as believed not and repented not, should be damned; and the words went forth out of the mouth of God in a firm decree; wherefore they must be fulfilled.
16 And Adam and Eve, his wife, ceased not to call upon God. And Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain, and said: I have gotten a man from the Lord; wherefore he may not reject his words. But behold, Cain hearkened not, saying: Who is the Lord that I should know him?

Moses 5:27
27 And Adam and his wife mourned before the Lord, because of Cain and his brethren.

JST Genesis 4:12
12 And Adam and Eve blessed the name of God; and they made all things known unto their sons and their daughters.
13 And Satan came among them, saying, I am also a son of God, and he commanded them, saying, BeliEVE it not. And they believed it not; and they loved Satan more than God. And men began from that time forth to be carnal, sensual and devilish.
1 AND the Lord God called upon men, by the Holy Ghost, everywhere, and commanded them that they should repent;
2 And as many as believed in the Son, and repented of their sins, should be saved. And as many as believed not, and repented not, should be damned. And the words went forth out of the mouth of God, in a firm decree, wherefore they must be fulfilled.
And Adam ceased not to call upon God; and Eve also his wife.
And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord; wherefore he may not reject his words. But, behold, also Cain hearkened not, saying, Who is the Lord, that I should know him.

JST Genesis 5:12
12 And Adam also, and his wife, mourned before the Lord, because of Cain and his brethren.
Eve in the Garden

2 Corinthians 11:3
3 But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.

1 Timothy 2:13
13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.
14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.
15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

2 Nephi 2:15
15 And to bring about his eternal purposes in the end of man, after he had created our first parents, and the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, and in fine, all things which are created, it must needs be that there was an opposition; even the forbidden fruit in opposition to the tree of life; the one being sweet and the other bitter.
16 Wherefore, the Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself. Wherefore, man could not act for himself save it should be that he was enticed by the one or the other.
17 And I, Lehi, according to the things which I have read, must needs suppose that an angel of God, according to that which is written, had fallen from heaven; wherefore, he became a devil, having sought that which was evil before God.
18 And because he had fallen from heaven, and had become miserable forever, he sought also the misery of all mankind. Wherefore, he said unto Eve, yea, even that old serpent, who is the devil, who is the father of all lies, wherefore he said: Partake of the forbidden fruit, and ye shall not die, but ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil.
19 And after Adam and Eve had partaken of the forbidden fruit they were driven out of the garden of Eden, to till the earth.
20 And they have brought forth children; yea, even the family of all the earth.
21 And the days of the children of men were prolonged, according to the will of God, that they might repent while in the flesh; wherefore, their state became a state of probation, and their time was lengthened, according to the commandments which the Lord God gave unto the children of men. For he gave commandment that all men must repent; for he showed unto all men that they were lost, because of the transgression of their parents.
22 And now, behold, if Adam had not transgressed he would not have fallen, but 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.
23 And they would have had no children; 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.
24 But behold, all things have been done in the wisdom of him who knoweth all things.
25 Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy.
26 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.
27 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.

D&C 138:39
39 And our glorious Mother Eve, with many of her faithful daughters who had lived through the ages and worshiped the true and living God.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.102
These spirits I shall leave for the present, and refer to our first parents, Adam and Eve, who were found in the Garden of Eden, tempted and overcome by the power of evil, and consequently subject to evil and sin, which was the penalty of their transgression. They were now prepared, as we are, to form bodies or tabernacles for the reception of pure and holy spirits. 18:257.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.102
When Father Adam came to assist in organizing the earth out of the crude material that was found, an earth was made upon which the children of men could live. After the earth was prepared Father Adam came and stayed here, and there was a woman brought to him. There was a certain woman brought to Father Adam whose name was Eve, because she was the first woman, and she was given to him to be his wife. 16:167.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.103
Some may regret that our first parents sinned. This is nonsense. If we had been there, and they had not sinned, we should have sinned. I will not blame Adam or Eve. Why? Because it was necessary that sin should enter into the world; no man could ever understand the principle of exaltation without its opposite; no one could ever receive an exaltation without being acquainted with its opposite. How did Adam and Eve sin? Did they come out in direct opposition to God and to his government? No. But they transgressed a command of the Lord, and through that transgression sin came into the world. The Lord knew they would do this, and he had designed that they should. Then came the curse upon the fruit, upon the vegetables, and upon our mother earth; and it came upon the creeping things, upon the grain in the field, the fish in the sea, and upon all things pertaining to this earth, through man's transgression. 10:312.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.103
Mother Eve partook of the forbidden fruit. We should not have been here today if she had not; we could never have possessed wisdom and intelligence if she had not done it. It was all in the economy of heaven, and we need not talk about it; it is all right. We should never blame Mother Eve, not the least. I am thankful to God that I know good from evil, the bitter from the sweet, the things of God from the things not of God. When I look at the economy of heaven my heart leaps for joy, and if I had the tongue of an angel, or the tongues of the whole human family combined, I would praise God in the highest for his great wisdom and condescension in suffering the children of men to fall into the very sin into which they had fallen, for he did it that they, like Jesus, might descend below all things and then press forward and rise above all. 13:145.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.103
The Devil had truth in his mouth as well as lies when he came to Mother Eve. Said he, "If you will eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, you will see as the Gods see." That was just as true as anything that ever was spoken on the face of the earth.
She did eat, her eyes were opened, and she saw good and evil. She gave of the fruit to her husband and he ate, too. What would have been the consequence if he had not done so? They would have been separated, and where would we have been? I am glad he did eat. 12:70.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.105
We all belong to the races which have sprung from Father Adam and Mother Eve; and every son and daughter of Adam and Eve is a son and daughter of that God we serve, who organized this earth and millions of others, and who holds them in existence by law. 14:111.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.107
You can read the account given of our first parents. Along came a certain character and said to Eve, you know women are of tender heart, and he could operate on this tender heart, "The Lord knows that in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt not surely die, but if thou wilt take of this fruit and eat thereof thine eyes will be opened and thou wilt see as the Gods see"; and he worked upon the tender heart of Mother Eve until she partook of the fruit, and her eyes were opened. He told the truth. And they say now, "Do this that your eyes may be opened, that you may see: do this that you may know thus and so." In the days of Jesus and his Apostles the same power was operating, and, actuated by that men hunted them until the last one was banished from human society, and until the Christian religion was so perverted that the people received it with open hands, arms, mouth and heart. It was adulterated until it was congenial to the wicked heart, and they received the Gospel as they supposed. But that was the time they commenced little by little to transgress the laws, change the ordinances, and break the everlasting covenant, and the Gospel of the kingdom that Jesus undertook to establish in his day and the Priesthood were taken from the earth. 15:126.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.116
In the Millennium, when the Kingdom of God is established on the earth in power, glory and perfection, and the reign of wickedness that has so long prevailed is subdued, the Saints of God will have the privilege of building their temples, and of entering into them, becoming, as it were, pillars in the temples of God, and they will officiate for their dead. Then we will see our friends come up, and perhaps some that we have been acquainted with here. If we ask who will stand at the head of the resurrection in this last dispensation, the answer is—Joseph Smith, Junior, the Prophet of God. He is the man who will be resurrect and receive the keys of the resurrection, and he will seal this authority upon others, and they will hunt up their friends and resurrect them when they shall have been officiated for, and bring them up. And we will have revelations to know our forefathers clear back to Father Adam and Mother Eve, and we will enter into the temples of God and officiate for them. Then man will be sealed to man until the chain is made perfect back to Adam, so that there will be a perfect chain of Priesthood from Adam to the winding-up scene.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.198
It is for the husband to learn how to gather around his family the comforts of life, how to control his passions and temper, and how to command the respect, not only of his family but of all his brethren, sisters, and friends. It is the calling of the wife and mother to know what to do with everything that is brought into the house, laboring to make her home desirable to her husband and children, making herself an Eve in the midst of a little paradise of her own creating, securing her husband's love and confidence, and tying her offspring to herself, with a love that is stronger than death, for an everlasting inheritance. 10:28.

Discourses of Brigham Young, p.199
I have a word to say to my sisters. When I reflect upon the duties and responsibilities devolving upon our mothers and sisters, and the influence they wield, I look upon them as the mainspring and soul of our being here. It is true that man is first. Father Adam was placed here as king of the earth, to bring it into subjection. But when Mother Eve came she had a splendid influence over him. A great many have thought it was not very good; I think it was excellent.

John Taylor, The Gospel Kingdom, p.96
ADAM AND EVE AND THE LAW.—Adam and Eve both considered that they had gained, instead of suffered loss, through their disobedience to that law: for they made the statement, that if it had not been for their transgression they never would have "known good and evil." And again, they would have been incapable of increase; and without that increase the designs of God in relation to the formation of the earth and man could not have been accomplished; for one great object of the creation of the world was the propagation of the human species, that bodies might be prepared for those spirits who already existed, and who, when they saw the earth formed, shouted for joy.

John Taylor, The Gospel Kingdom, p.97-98
THE PRINCIPLE OF SACRIFICE.—Now, to carry out this view of indebtedness a little further. We will suppose that a man has given his note to pay a certain amount in a certain given time, and in order to keep that note good, he agrees to pay interest on it. Now, when Jesus gave himself up as security for the sins of mankind, and God accepted of his security, what was done then? Why, sacrifices were introduced as types of the sacrifice of the Son of God, to show that the ancient servants of God recognized this principle which had existed in the heavens, and many of them understood the principle with great clearness. We find that Adam offered sacrifices, and when he did this, he said in answer to a question put to him by an holy angel, I do not know why I do it, only the Father has commanded it. And then the angel commenced to explain to him that this rite was a type of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father who should come in the meridian of time to offer himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world; and said he, "Wherefore, thou shalt do all that thou dost in the name of the Son, and thou shalt repent and call upon God in the name of the Son for evermore." (Pearl of Great Price, Moses 5:8.) When Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden fruit, the mercy of God was extended to them, and they perceived as Eve expressed it, that if there had been no fall, they would have had no posterity, and that they would have been deprived of many joys and blessings relating both to this life and the life to come. And so Adam and Eve rejoiced in their hearts that God had provided the plan, and although they were fallen, yet in this life, through the atonement, they would have joy, and by and by they would return to their Father, and there rejoice exceedingly in the abundant mercy of God, and in the redemption wrought out for them by the Son of God.

Discourses of Wilford Woodruff, p.233
ADAM AND EVE. The world, more or less, has found a great deal of fault with Mother Eve and with Father Adam, because of the fall of man; what I have to say with regard to it, I express as my own opinion. Adam and Eve came to this world to perform exactly the part that they acted in the Garden of Eden; and I will say, they were ordained of God to do what they did, and it was therefore expected that they would eat of the forbidden fruit in order that man might know both good and evil by passing through this school of experience which this life affords us. That is all I want to say about Father Adam and Mother Eve. Adam fell that man might be, and men are that they might have joy; and some have found fault with that.—JD 23:125, May 14, 1882.
For the young man, his education is important, his mission vital; but his proper marriage and his proper life to be a righteous father and to properly provide for and give leadership to a family—that is wonderful, a wonderful role in life to play. (74-27)

Motherhood is a noble work. Motherhood is a holy calling, a sacred dedication for carrying out the Lord's work, a consecration and devotion to the rearing and fostering, the nurturing of body, mind, and spirit of those who kept their first estate and who came to this earth for their second estate to learn and be tested and to work toward godhood.

Mothers have a sacred role. They are partners with God, as well as with their own husbands, first in giving birth to the Lord's spirit children, and then in rearing those children so they will serve the Lord and keep his commandments. Could there be a more sacred trust than to be a trustee for honorable, well-born, well-developed children?

So our beloved mother Eve began the human race with gladness, wanting children, glad for the joy that they would bring to her, willing to assume the problems connected with a family, but also the joys. (75-46)

To be a righteous woman during the winding-up scenes on this earth, before the Second Coming of our Savior, is an especially noble calling. The righteous woman's strength and influence today can be ten fold what it might be in more tranquil times. She has been placed here to help to enrich, to protect, and to guard the home—which is society's basic and most noble institution. Other institutions in society may falter and even fail, but the righteous woman can help to save the home, which may be the last and only sanctuary some mortals know in the midst of storm and strife. (78-06)

Teachings of Ezra Taft Benson, p.547
It is not good for man to be alone because a righteous woman complements what may be lacking in man's natural personality and disposition. Paul said: "Neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord" (1 Corinthians 11:11). Nowhere is this complementary association more ideally portrayed than in the eternal marriage of our first parents—Adam and Eve. ("To the Elect Women of the Kingdom of God," Beneficial Life Convention, Oahu, Hawaii, 12 May 1986.)

Teachings of Ezra Taft Benson, p.547
In the beginning, Adam—not Eve—was instructed to earn the bread by the sweat of his brow. Contrary to conventional wisdom, a mother's calling is in the home, not in the marketplace.

James E. Talmage
Burton, ed., We Believe, Fall of Adam
Satan presented himself before Eve in the garden, and, speaking by the mouth of the serpent, questioned her about the commandments that God had given respecting the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Eve answered that they were forbidden even to touch the fruit of that tree, under penalty of death. Satan then sought to beguile the woman, contradicting the Lord's statement and declaring that death would not follow a violation of the divine injunction; but that, on the other hand, by doing that which the Lord had forbidden she and her husband would become like unto the gods, knowing good and evil for themselves. The woman was captivated by these representations; and, being eager to possess the advantages pictured by Satan, she disobeyed the command of the Lord, and partook of the fruit forbidden. She feared no evil, for she knew it not. Then, telling Adam
what she had done, she urged him to eat of the fruit also. AF:58-59

Orson F. Whitney
In order that God's spirit children might have the opportunity to take bodies and undergo experiences on this earth, two heavenly beings came down in advance and became mortal for our sake. This is the true significance of the fall of Adam and Eve. It was not a mere yielding to temptation—they came on a mission, to pioneer this earthly wilderness, and open the way so that a world of waiting spirits might become souls, and make a stride forward in the great march of eternal progression. By the experience we gain here—the best of which comes from sorrow and tribulation—and by obedience to divine requirements, we accomplish successfully our earthly pilgrimage. We knew this in the life before, and rejoiced over it: "The morning stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy" at the prospect—not of pain and death, but of eternal life and endless glory beyond ("Significance of the Fall," IE1916Mar:402-03) TLDP:183

George Q. Cannon, Gospel Truth, Vol. 1, p.16
The devil in tempting Eve told a truth when he said unto her that when she should eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil they should become as Gods. He told the truth in telling that, but he accompanied it with a lie as he always does. He never tells the complete truth. He said that they should not die. The Father had said that they should die. The devil had to tell a lie in order to accomplish his purposes; but there was some truth in his statement. Their eyes were opened. They had a knowledge of good and evil just as the Gods have. They became as Gods; for that is one of the features, one of the peculiar attributes of those who attain unto that glory—they understand the difference between good and evil.

I rejoice myself in the fall of man. I rejoice that Adam partook of the forbidden fruit, for he did so knowingly and understandingly, comprehending fully the results that would attend his partaking of that fruit. It was not so with Eve. Eve was deceived; Eve was beguiled. The adversary, Lucifer, through the serpent, beguiled Eve and deceived her and induced her to eat of the forbidden fruit.

George Q. Cannon, Gospel Truth, Vol. 1, p.25
One of the consequences of the fall was that in the day that man ate of that fruit he should surely die—die so far as the temporal body was concerned; that body should be consigned to the tomb, from which it could not be resurrected until the redemption was effected. To effect this resurrection, before man was placed upon this earth, before Eve was exposed to the temptation of the adversary, God prepared a Redeemer in the person of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ... Thus has a means been prepared by which the spirits—our spirits and the spirits of all men—should come forth and receive tabernacles, and a work of probation commence here upon the earth. (Jan. 18, 1885, DW 34:50)

How will it come about? It will come to every soul by wrongdoing on the part of that soul. He or she alone can bring condemnation on himself or herself. There is no other power can do it. Hence, if we are damned we shall have no one to blame but ourselves; we shall have no one to condemn but ourselves; it will be the result of our own agency, the exercise of that power which God gave to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden.... Every one of us will bring upon ourselves either salvation or condemnation as the case may be, according to the manner in which we exercise our agency before God. It is by this Priesthood and the exercise of it that the blessings of God will flow up to us....

Adam and Eve Exercised Agency
George Q. Cannon, Gospel Truth, Vol. 1, p.137
It was so in the beginning—in the very commencement of the work of our God upon the earth when He placed Adam in the garden and gave Eve unto him for a wife. He set before them the principle of knowledge—that is, He told them what they should do; He told them what they should refrain from doing. He told them that if they did certain things, certain penalties should follow....

George Q. Cannon, Gospel Truth, Vol. 1, p.137
There was no attempt on the part of our Father to interfere with the agency of Adam in this respect. He left him perfectly free, and in the exercise of that freedom Adam did partake of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. His wife, Eve, was deceived in eating of the fruit; she partook of it, being beguiled, yet in the perfect exercise of her agency, and after she had partaken of it and become subject to the penalty that God had pronounced—the penalty of death and expulsion from the garden—then she came and told Adam what she had done. (Sept. 28, 1884, JD 26:188)

Bruce R. McConkie, Mormon Doctrine, p.16
ADAM
Our knowledge about Adam, and the exalted station held by him in the eternal provisions of the Almighty, begins with an understanding of his pre-existent work and mission. By his diligence and obedience there, as one of the spirit sons of God, he attained a stature and power second only to that of Christ, the Firstborn. None of all the billions of our Father's children equalled him in intelligence and might, save Jesus only. He sat in the council of the gods in the planning of the creation of this earth, and then, under Christ, participated in the creative enterprise. (Abra. 3:22-26.) He was foreordained to come to earth as the father of the human race, and when Lucifer and one-third of the hosts of heaven rebelled, Adam (with the exalted title of Michael the Archangel) led the hosts of the righteous in the war in heaven. (Rev. 12:7-9.)

"And the first man of all men have I called Adam," the Lord says, "which is many." (Moses 1:34; 3:7; 6:45; Abra. 1:3; 1 Ne. 5:11; D. & C. 84:16.) That is, Adam was placed on earth as the first of the human family and given a name which signifies many as pertaining to the greatness of the posterity which should flow from him.

As to the manner in which Adam was placed on earth, the First Presidency of the Church (Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder, and Anthon H. Lund) has given us this plain statement: "He took upon him an appropriate body, the body of a man, and so became a 'living soul.' ... All who have inhabited the earth since Adam have taken bodies and become souls in like manner. ... Man began life as a human being, in the likeness of our Heavenly Father. True it is that the body of man enters upon its career as a tiny germ or embryo, which becomes an infant, quickened at a certain stage by the spirit whose tabernacle it is, and, after being born, develops into a man. There is nothing in this, however, to indicate that the original man, the first of our race, began life as anything less than a man, or less than the human germ or embryo that becomes a man." (Man: His Origin and Destiny, p. 354.)

Adam's great part in the plan of redemption was to fall from the immortal state in which he first existed on earth and thus bring mortality and death into the world. This he did, bringing temporal and spiritual death into the world, from the effects of which deaths the atonement of Christ was foreordained as a ransom. After the fall, Adam and Eve became the parents of all living. (Moses 5:11; D. & C. 27:11; 1 Ne. 5:11; 2:23-25.) We are his descendants and there are no persons who have ever lived on earth who have not had this same ancestry. "He is the father of the human family; ... [the] head of the
human family." (Teachings, p. 157.)

Father Adam was one of the most noble and intelligent characters who ever lived. He began his earth life as a son of God, endowed with the talents and abilities gained through diligence and obedience in pre-existence. He is the head of all gospel dispensations (Teachings, pp. 167-169), the presiding high priest (under Christ) over all the earth; presides over all the spirits destined to inhabit this earth (Teachings, pp. 157-159); holds the keys of salvation over all the earth; and will reign as Michael, our prince, to all eternity. (D. & C. 78:16.) He was baptized (Moses 6:64-66), married for eternity, for death had not yet entered the world (Moses 3:21-25), had the fulness of the gospel (Moses 5:57-59), and following 930 years of existence after the fall went on to the paradise of God to await a glorious resurrection with Christ and the righteous saints. He has returned to Earth in our day, bringing keys and authorities to the Prophet Joseph Smith (D. & C. 128:21); will soon preside at the great Adam-oni-Adahman council (D. & C. 116); and finally will reign over his righteous posterity in the Patriarchal Order to all eternity. (Doctrines of Salvation, vol. 1, pp. 90-106.)

Bruce R. McConkie, Mormon Doctrine, p.242 EVE

Savant knowledge is available to us of Eve (the wife of Adam) and her achievements in pre-existence and in mortality. Without question she was like unto her mighty husband Adam in intelligence and in devotion to righteousness during both her first and second estates of existence. She was placed on Earth in the same manner as was Adam, the Mosaic account of the Lord creating her from Adam's rib being merely figurative. (Moses 3:20-25.)

Eve was the first woman; she became the mother of the whole human race, her very name signifying "mother of all living." (Moses 4:26; 1 Ne. 5:11.) Strictly speaking it was she who first partook of the forbidden fruit, with the resultant change in the physical body from a state of immortality to mortality. Adam thereafter partook in order to comply with the command to multiply and fill the earth with posterity. "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Tim. 2:14.)

Before the fall Eve was seated to Adam in the new and everlasting covenant of marriage, a ceremony performed by the Lord before death entered the world and therefore one destined to last forever. (Moses 3:20-25.) After the fall the Lord said to her: "I will greatly multiply thine sorrow and thine conception. In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children, and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." (Moses 4:22.)

One of the most perfect summaries of the plan of salvation ever given fell from the lips of Eve: "Were it not for our transgression," she said, "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." (Moses 5:11.) Indeed, Eve is a joint-participant with Adam in all his ministry, and will inherit jointly with him all the blessings appertaining to his high state of exaltation.

Bruce R. McConkie, Mormon Doctrine, p.843 WOMAN

As Adam was the first man of all men, the primal parent of the human race (Moses 1:34), so Eve his wife, was "the mother of all living," and "the first of all women." (Moses 4:26.) The figurative account of her creation says, "She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man." (Moses 3:23.)

Setting the pattern for all her daughters for all ages, Eve's mortal mission included two special assignments: 1. She was to be an help meet for her husband (Moses 3:20); and 2. She was to bring forth children. "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception," the Lord said. "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children, and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." (Moses 4:22.) Thus woman's primary place is in the home, where she is to rear children and abide by the righteous counsel of her husband.

Peter counseled: "Ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands," wearing simple, unadorned apparel, "For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well." (1 Pet. 3:1-6.)

Paul taught: Man "is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man ... Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God." (1 Cor. 11:7-12.)

In the true Patriarchal Order man holds the priesthood and is the head of the household of faith, but he cannot attain a fulness of joy here of or of eternal reward hereafter alone. Woman stands at his side a joint-inheritor with him in the fulness of all things. Exaltation and eternal increase is her lot as well as his. (D. & C. 131:4.) Godhood is not for men only; it is for men and women together. (D. & C. 132:19-20.)

Bruce R. McConkie, The Promised Messiah, p.327 - p.328

Accordingly, he placed the spirit Michael and his chosen consort in the Garden of Eden and gave them immortal bodies made from the dust of the earth. Known then as Adam and Eve, our first parents then dwelt in a state of innocence, "having no joy, for they knew no misery; doing no good, for they knew no sin." (2 Ne. 2:23.) Agreeable to the divine will, these first members of the human family chose to fall from their paradisiacal state and to bring mortality, disease, death, sin, and sorrow into the world. They chose to estrange themselves from God; they elected to depart from the divine presence; they sought the toils and trials and tests of mortality—all with a purpose all to see if they could overcome the world and prove worthy of eternal blessings. They were cast out of the presence of God; they died spiritually; they lost the light which had guided them in Eden—all to enable them to be tried and tested to the full. Such was the divine plan.

Bruce R. McConkie, The Promised Messiah, p.597

Adam, our father, the first man, was the first of earth's inhabitants to see the Lord. He and his wife, Eve, had intimate and extended association with both the Father and the Son before the fall and while they dwelt in Eden's hallowed vales. (Moses 3 and 4.) They then knew, before mortality entered the world, that they were the offspring of Exalted Parents in whose image they were made. It was as automatic and instinctive for them to know their ancestry, their family relationship, and the exalted destiny they might obtain, as it is for mortal children to grow and assume they will be like their parents.

Parley P. Pratt, A Voice of Warning, p.114

First, man fell from his standing before God, by giving heed to temptation; and this fall affected the whole creation, as well as man, and caused various changes to take place; he was banished from the presence of his Creator and a veil was drawn between them, and man was driven from the Garden of Eden to till the earth, which was then cursed for his sake and should begin to bring forth thorns and
thistles; and with the sweat of his face he should earn his bread, and in sorrow eat of it all the days of his life, and finally return to dust. But as to Eve, her curse was a great multiplicity of sorrow and conception; and between her seed and the seed of the serpent there was to be a constant enmity: he should bruise the serpent’s head, and the serpent should bruise his heel.

Parley P. Pratt, A Voice of Warning, p.114
Now, reader, contemplate the change. This scene, which was so beautiful a little before, had now become the abode of sorrow and toil, of death and mourning: the earth groaned with its production of accursed thorns and thistles; man and beast at enmity; the serpent styly creeping away, fearing lest his head should get the deadly bruise; and man startling amid the thorny path, in fear lest the serpent’s fangs should pierce his heel while the lamb yields his blood upon the smoking altar. Soon man begins to persecute, hate and murder his fellow, until at length the earth is filled with violence, all flesh becomes corrupt, the powers of darkness prevailed, and it repented Noah that God had made man, and it grieved him at his heart, because the Lord should come out in vengeance, and cleanse the earth by water.

James E. Talmage, Articles of Faith, Ch.3, p.64 - p.65
The Temptation to disobey this injunction soon came. Satan presented himself before Eve in the garden, and, speaking by the mouth of the serpent, questioned her about the commandments that God had given respecting the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Eve answered that they were forbidden even to touch the fruit of that tree, under penalty of death. Satan then sought to beguile the woman, contradicting the Lord’s statement and declaring that death would not follow a violation of the divine injunction; but that, on the other hand, by doing that which the Lord had forbidden she and her husband would become like unto the gods, knowing good and evil for themselves. The woman was captivated by these representations; and, being eager to possess the advantages pictured by Satan, she disobeyed the command of the Lord, and partook of the fruit forbidden. She feared no evil, for she knew it not. Then, telling Adam what she had done, she urged him to eat of the fruit also.

James E. Talmage, Articles of Faith, Ch.3, p.65
Adam found himself in a position that made it impossible for him to obey both of the specific commandments given by the Lord. He and his wife had been commanded to multiply and replenish the earth. Adam had not yet fallen to the state of mortality, but Eve already had; and in such dissimilar conditions the two could not remain together, and therefore could not fulfill the divine requirement as to procreation. On the other hand, Adam would be disobeying another commandment by yielding to Eve’s request. He deliberately and wisely decided to stand by the first and greater commandment; and, therefore, with understanding of the nature of his act, he also partook of the fruit that grew on the tree of knowledge. The fact that Adam acted understandingly in this matter is affirmed by scripture. Paul, in writing to Timothy, explained that “Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.” The prophet Lehi, in expounding the scriptures to his sons, declared: ”Adam fell that men might be; and men are that they might have joy.”

James E. Talmage, Articles of Faith, Ch.3, p.66
The Tree of Life — There was another tree of special virtues in Eden; its fruit assured life to those who ate of it. While Adam and Eve lived in innocence, immune to death, this tree had not been forbidden them. Now that they had transgressed, however, now that the divine decree had issued fixing death as their lot, it was necessary that the fruit of the tree of life be no longer within their reach. They were, therefore, expelled from the garden, and cherubim with a flaming sword guarded the way, that man might not return in an unregenerate state. By transgression our first parents acquired a knowledge, which in their condition of pristine innocence they had not possessed — the experimental knowledge of good and evil. The result of their fall could have been of none but ill effect had they been immediately brought to a condition of immortality, without repentance, without atonement. In the despair following their realization of the great change that had come upon them, and in the light of the knowledge they had gained at such cost as to the virtues of the tree of life, it would have been natural for them to seek the seeming advantage of an immediate escape by partaking of the immortalizing food. In mercy they were prevented from so doing.

Orson F. Whitney, Saturday Night Thoughts, p.80
Placed in Eden.—Earth having been prepared for man, Adam and Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden—placed there to become mortal, that the Lord’s purpose might be accomplished. The fall, though planned, was not compelled. Man still had his agency, the right and power of choice.

Innocent in the Beginning.—The Great Creator, on the morning of creation, pronounced “good” all that he had made. In perfect keeping with this, modern revelation declares that “every spirit of man was innocent in the beginning.” Consequently, had the spirits of men remained where they were before Adam fell, they would have had no need to exercise a saving faith, no need to repent or to be baptized, having no evil practices to turn from and no uncleanliness to be washed away. But they would have remained ignorant as well as innocent—ignorant of things necessary to their continued progress. Without the fall, they could have advanced no further, but would have remained as they were, “having no joy, for they knew no misery; doing no good, for they knew no sin.” Adam fell that men might be; and men are that they might have joy.

The Woman Beguiled.—When our First Parents partook of the forbidden fruit, it was the woman who was [p.81] beguiled by the Serpent (Satan) and induced to go contrary to the divine command. The man was not deceived. What Adam did was done knowingly and after full deliberation. When Eve had tasted of the fruit, Adam did likewise in order to carry out another command, the first that God had given to this pair—the command to “multiply and replenish the earth.” Eve, by her act, had separated herself from her husband, and was mortal, while he remained in an immortal state. It was impossible, therefore, unless he also became mortal, for them to obey the original behest. This was Adam’s motive. This was his predicament. He was facing a dilemma, and must make choice between two divine commandments. He disobeyed in order to obey, retrieving, so far as he could, the situation resulting from his wife’s disobedience. Fully aware of what would follow, he partook of the fruit of the inhibited tree, realizing that in no other way could he become the progenitor of the human race.

John A. Widtsoe, Evidences and Reconciliations, p.192
According to the plan of salvation, accepted by the hosts of heaven in the great pre-existent council, Adam and Eve were placed on earth to become the parents of the human race. They could not, however, perform this mission, unless they themselves became subject to mortality. Why, then, did the Lord command them not to partake of the tree of good and evil, the gateway of mortal life? There has seemed to be a contradiction between God’s purpose as embodied in the plan of salvation, and this command to Adam and Eve. Perhaps a full explanation is not possible with our present knowledge, yet modern revelation has shed light upon the subject.
First, there is the certain knowledge that without the "Fall," Adam and Eve would have remained in a condition in which children with earthly bodies, for whom the earth was made, could not have been begotten by them. The plan of salvation would have been defeated.

This is the emphatic view of the prophet Lehi. His terse statement leaves no other meaning. "Adam fell that men might be." (2 Nephi 2:25)

Equally direct are the words of Alma: ". . . if it had been possible for Adam to have partaken of the fruit of the tree of life at that time, there would have been no death . . . they would have been forever miserable, having no preparatory state; and thus the plan of redemption would have been frustrated" (Alma 12:23, 26).

Further evidence is supplied by Adam and Eve themselves. After their expulsion from Eden into the earth as it is, Adam exults: ". . . 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." And Eve seemed almost jubilant: ". . . Were it not for our transgression we never should have had seed, and never should have known good and evil, and joy of our redemption, and the eternal life which God giveth unto all the obedient." (Moses 5:10-11)

These were not the words of sinners or of repentant sinners. This was spoken by people who had met and accepted a great challenge, with which, as they imply, God was pleased.

President John Taylor recognized that the "Fall" resulted in good for Adam and Eve, and the whole human family: "They would have been incapable of increase; and without that increase the designs of God in relation to the formation of the earth and man could not have been accomplished; for one great object of the creation of the world was the propagation of the human species, that bodies might be prepared for those spirits who already existed, and who, when they saw the earth formed, shouted for joy." (The Gospel Kingdom, p. 96)

In the joy of Adam and Eve after the "Fall" lies hidden, perhaps, a principle which disputants about this subject have not understood and which may not as yet be full comprehended. However, in modern revelation, a clue to understanding of the "Fall" is given, which may be the key to the apparent contradiction.

After Adam had been supplied with a body made "from the dust of the ground," and placed in the garden of Eden, instructions were given him:

"And I, the Lord God, commanded the man, saying: 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, 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." (Moses 3:16-17)

Though a command had been given, Adam was permitted to exercise his free agency. "Thou mayest choose for thyself." The eternal power of choice was respected by the Lord himself. That throws a flood of light on the "Fall." It really converts the command into a warning, as much as if to say, if you do this thing, you will bring upon yourself a certain punishment; but do it if you choose.

Such was the problem before our first parents: to remain forever at selfish ease in the Garden of Eden, or to face unselfishly tribulation and death, in bringing to pass the purposes of the Lord for a host of waiting spirit children. They chose the latter.

This they did with open eyes and minds as to consequences. The memory of their former estates may have been dimmed, but the gospel had been taught them during their sojourn in the Garden of Eden. They could not have been left in complete ignorance of the purpose of their creation. Brigham Young frankly said: "Adam was as conversant with his Father who placed him upon this earth as we are conversant with our earthly parents." (Discourses, p. 104) The Prophet Joseph taught that "Adam received commandments and instructions from God; this was the order from the beginning." (Teachings, p. 168)

The choice that they made raises Adam and Eve to pre-eminence among all who have come on earth. The Lord's plan was given life by them. They are indeed, as far as this earth is concerned, our loving father and mother. The "Fall" and the consequent redeeming act of Jesus became the most glorious events in the history of mankind.

In the heavens above, as in the earth below, law prevails. No one can escape the consequences of the acceptance or rejection of law. Cause and effect are eternally related. The Lord had warned Adam and Eve of the hard battle with earthly conditions if they chose to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. He would not subject his son and daughter to hardship and the death of their bodies unless it be of their own choice. They must choose for themselves. They chose wisely, in accord with the heavenly law of love for others.

In life all must choose at times. Sometimes, two possibilities are good; neither is evil. Usually, however, one is of greater import than the other. When in doubt, each must choose that which concerns the good of others -- the greater law -- rather than that which chiefly benefits ourselves -- the lesser law. The greater must be balanced against the lesser. The greater must be chosen whether it be law or thing. That was the choice made in Eden.

This view of the "Fall" is confirmed by the scriptures. For example, ". . . if Adam had not transgressed he would not have fallen, but he would have remained in the garden of Eden. . . . forever. . . . And they would have had no children; 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." (2 Nephi 2:22-23)

The role of Satan in this drama is not difficult to understand. He seeks to overthrow the work of God. By inducing Adam and Eve to disobey the Lord, he thought to have them in his power. He forgot, or did not know, that by their very "disobedience" the purposes of the Lord with respect to his spirit children would be accomplished. The temptation of Eve turned upon him to the defeat of his evil designs. This often is the fate of evil.

The Lord himself in these latter days has spoken of the place and mission of Adam: " . . . Michael, or Adam, the father of all, the prince of all, the ancient of days." (D. & C. 27:11; 88:112; 116:1) "The Lord God . . . hath appointed Michael your prince, and established his feet, and set him upon high, and given unto him the keys of salvation under the counsel and direction of the Holy One." (D. & C. 78:15-16) These are eloquent words, which could not well have been spoken of a sinner, only of one who has filled his mission well. Indeed, in the true gospel of Jesus Christ there is no original sin.

It is a thrilling thought that Adam and Eve were not coerced to begin God's work on earth. They chose to do so, by the exercise of their free agency. It is the lesson for all their children: Seek the truth, choose wisely, and carry the responsibility for our acts.

Considering our full knowledge of the purpose of the plan of
salvation, and the reason for placing Adam and Eve on earth, the apparent contradiction in the story of the "Fall" vanishes. Instead the law of free agency, or individual choice, appears in distinct view. God's command is qualified by his great purpose to bless his children. Adam and Eve rise to the position of helpers in initiating the divine purpose on earth. They become partners with the Lord in making eternal joy possible for the hosts of heaven.

We, the children of Adam and Eve, may well be proud of our parentage.

John A. Widtsoe, A Rational Theology, p. 52
The Garden of Eden. The first days on earth of the first man and the first woman are of intense [p. 53] interest to every student of the subject, and it is to be regretted that so little knowledge of those early times has survived the vicissitudes of time. Adam and Eve were placed in a place of limited extent, known to us as the Garden of Eden. Within its precincts conditions existed, not known by the outside world, into which the first parents were driven after the Fall. In the Garden, God walked with man and taught him the living truth.

John A. Widtsoe, A Rational Theology, p. 54
The Great Plan provided that man should come upon earth with the memory of his past taken from him, so that, beginning his earth-life as a child, he might repeat on earth the efforts that earned for him progress in the pre-existent life. Even Adam and Eve forgot the details of their previous lives, for it was necessary that all be under the same law, and that no strength be derived from the memory of pre-existent experiences.

John A. Widtsoe, Priesthood and Church Government, p. 85
Woman's Grave Responsibility. The training of the human soul for advancement and joy here and hereafter calls for the greater possible powers of mind and heart. Psychologists and students generally admit that the first years of life are crucial in determining what shall be the future of the child, physically, mentally and spiritually; that grave responsibility belongs, by right of sex, to the women who bear and nurture the whole race. Surely no right thinking woman could crave more responsibility nor greater proof of innate powers than that! Such power entrusted to women proves conclusively that they have been recognized and trusted. Our Father even chose a Daughter of Eve to be the earth-mother and guide of His Only Begotten Son, and thus honored womanhood for all time and eternity!

Eve
Encyclopedia of Mormonism, Vol.2, EVE
Eve, first woman of earthly creation, companion of Adam, and mother and matriarch of the human race, is honored by Latter-day Saints as one of the most important, righteous, and heroic of all the human family. Eve's supreme gift to mankind, the opportunity of life on this earth, resulted from her choice to become mortal.

Eve, Adam, Abraham, and others were among the noble and great ones involved with the creation of the earth (Abr. 3:22-24; cf. McConkie, p. 59). God foreordained her and named her Eve, "the Mother of All Living"; in the Garden of Eden Adam called her Eve, reflecting that calling (Moses 4:26). She was created spiritually and physically in the same manner as was Adam (MD, p. 242). God called their name Adam, and "in the image of his own body, male and female, created he them" (Moses 6:9).

Eve and Adam faced a dilemma as they sought to obey God's commandments. They could not keep the primary commandment to have children as long as they remained nonmortal in the Garden (2 Ne. 2:22-23). The instruction not to eat of the fruit of knowledge of good and evil, however, was uniquely modified with the words "nevertheless, thou mayest choose for thyself" (Moses 3:16-17), and becoming mortal was expressly stated as the consequence.

Satan was present to tempt Adam and Eve, much as he would try to thwart others in their divine missions: "And he sought also to beguile Eve, for he knew not the mind of God, wherefore he sought to destroy the world" (Moses 4:6; cf. Matt. 4:3-11; Moses 1:12-22; JS—H 1:15-16). Eve faced the choice between selfish ease and unselfishly facing tribulation and death (Widtsoe, p. 193). As befitted her calling, she realized that there was no other way and deliberately chose mortal life so as to further the purpose of God and bring children into the world.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints strongly affirms that in partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, Eve along with Adam acted in a manner pleasing to God and in accord with his ordained plan (see Fall of Adam), Brigham Young explained: "The Lord knew they would do this and he had designed that they should" (JD 10:103). "We should never blame Mother Eve, not the least" (JD 13:145). Adam and Eve "accepted a great challenge.... They chose wisely in accordance with the heavenly law of love for others" (Widtsoe, p. 194). Afterward, in one of the earliest recorded statements in scripture, Eve recounted the Plan of Salvation as she expounded on the joy prepared for humankind in eternity: "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" (Moses 5:10-11).

Loving parents in heaven prepared Eve and Adam for their roles in mortality. After the Fall, God gave Adam and Eve the law of sacrifice so that they could obtain forgiveness of sins committed in mortality (Moses 5:5). He placed enmity (an abhorrence of evil) between Eve's seed and Satan and his followers (Moses 4:21). God granted to Eve the powers of motherhood, disclosing the difficult labor of childbirth. The Hebrew word rendered "sorrow" (Gen. 3:16-17) does not connote "sadness," but "labor," or "sweat," or "pain."

Adam and Eve were husband and wife. While in the Garden, God sealed them in eternal marriage (Gen. 2:22-24). God instructed Eve, "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee" (Gen. 3:16). President Spencer W. Kimball explained that the Hebrew word translated as "rule" would better be understood as "'preside' because that's what he does" (Ensign [Mar. 1976] 72), and the husband presides only in righteousness (see Family: Teachings About). Correlated, God introduced Eve to Adam in terms that are rendered into English by the phrase "an help meet for him"; these words mean "to be strong, to help, rescue, or save" and "to meet, to correspond to, to be equal," thus indicating that Eve was to be a strong, saving partner in righteousness (Gen. 2:18).

The Lord himself made coats of skins and clothed Adam and Eve (Moses 4:27). Eve bore unto Adam sons and daughters. She worked with Adam. They prayed to the Lord and heard his voice (Moses 5:4-5). They made "all things known" to their children and taught them to read, write, and to keep records of family remembrance (Moses 5:12; 6:5-6).

Eve is a "joint-participant with Adam in all his ministry, [and] will inherit jointly with him all the blessings appertaining to his high state of exaltation" (MD, p. 242). President Joseph F. Smith saw her in
vision in 1918: among the great and mighty ones in the celestial congregation of the righteous, he beheld "our glorious Mother Eve, with many of her faithful daughters who had lived through the ages and worshipped the true and living God" (D&C 138:39).

The fall of Eve and Adam is profoundly significant: they opened the way of mortality for all humankind, and they subjected themselves to death in order to make continued progression toward eternal life possible. Mother Eve bestowed upon her daughters and sons a heritage of honor, for she acted with wisdom, love, and unselfish sacrifice.

Bibliography
Widtsoe, John A. "Was the 'Fall' Inevitable?" Evidences and Reconciliations, pp. 192-95. Salt Lake City, 1987.

**Eve and the Fall**

Elder Bruce R. McConkie

The three most important things to occur in all eternity; the three things that transcend in importance anything that has ever occurred in the infinite past or will ever occur in the endless future; the three things without which either all things would vanish away, or the whole purpose of existence would come to naught—these three, an eternal trinity of superlatives, are as follows:

1. The creation of all things by God the Father, assisted by Jehovah, Michael, and others.
2. The fall of man, as accomplished by Adam and Eve.
3. The atonement of Christ, which was made possible because the Son of God had an immortal Father and a mortal mother.

These three, the crowning events of the eternities, are united as one. They are inseparably intertwined. The fall of man was made possible because of the nature and kind of creation that rolled forth by the hand and word of the Almighty; and the atonement of Christ, through which salvation comes, is built on the foundation of Adam's fall.

God our Heavenly Father is the Creator, Upholder, and Preserver of all things. By His Only Begotten He made the worlds, the sidereal heavens, the universe, and all things that are in them. As we shall see, he made this temporal planet as a home for Adam and Eve and all His worthy spirit children. And he created it in an immortal or paradisiacal state and placed on it two immortal personalities whose bodies were made from the dust of the earth, so that through their acts the earth would become a mortal sphere and thus a fit abode for mortal men.

Adam and Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden to carry out the purposes of the Eternal Father—to introduce mortality to this earth, and to begin the process of providing mortal bodies for the spirit children of their Eternal Father.

The Lord Jesus Christ came in the meridian of time to ransom men from the effects of the fall—to reclaim them temporally and spiritually.

Thus if there had been no creation, there could have been no fall, no temporal and spiritual death, no mortal probation, no course that prepares the offspring of God to become like him and to reign with him in immortal glory forever.

And if there had been no fall of man—no change in his constitution; no temporal death, which is the separation of body and spirit; no spiritual death, which is death as pertaining to the things of righteousness and of the Spirit—there could have been no atoning sacrifice, no deliverance, no resurrected immortality, and no eternal life or exaltation in the kingdom of God.

We have thus singled out the three most transcendent events of all eternity—the creation, the fall, and the atonement—and have mentioned the intertwined relationship that binds them together, so that as we consider the fall of man (the fall of Adam and the fall of Eve) we may have all things in their proper perspective and relationship to each other.

Now let us consider the position of Eve in this eternal scheme of things.

1. Eve Before Eden.

Who was Adam and who was Eve when they twain dwelt in the presence of the Father in that premortal life before the foundations of this earth were laid?

They were spirit children of the Father. Adam, a male spirit, then called Michael, stood next in power, might, and dominion to the Lord Jehovah. Eve, a female spirit, whose premortal name has not been revealed, was of like stature, capacity, and intelligence.

Christ and Adam were companions and partners in preexistence. Christ, beloved and chosen of the Father, was foreordained to be the Savior of the world; Adam, as the great Michael, led the armies of heaven when Lucifer and one-third of the spirit hosts rebelled. The Lord Jesus, then reigning as the Lord Jehovah, was the number one Spirit Son; described as being "like unto God" (Abraham 3:24), he then ascended the throne of eternal power; and with him, by his side and serving under his direction, was Michael, who is Adam, and who was then foreordained to be the first man and the head of the human race.

And we cannot doubt that the greatest of all female spirits was the one then chosen and foreordained to be "the mother of the Son of God, after the manner of the flesh." (1 Nephi 11:18.) Nor can we do other than suppose that Eve was by her side, rejoicing in her own foreordination to be the first woman, the mother of men, the consort, companion, and friend of mighty Michael.

Christ and Mary, Adam and Eve, Abraham and Sarah, and a host of mighty men and equally glorious women comprised that group of "the noble and great ones," to whom the Lord Jesus said: "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." (Abraham 3:22-24. Italics added.) This we know: Christ, under the Father, is the Creator; Michael, his companion and associate, presided over much of the creative work; and with them, as Abraham saw, were many of the noble and great ones. Can we do other than conclude that Mary and Eve and Sarah and myriads of our faithful sisters were numbered among them? Certainly these sisters labored as diligently then, and fought as valiantly in the war in heaven, as did the brethren, even as they in like manner stand firm today, in mortality, in the cause of truth and righteousness.

2. Eve in Eden.

From the Celestial Presence to a garden planted eastward in Eden; from life as a spirit in the presence of God to life on this earth in a tabernacle of clay; from the realms of eternal light to the dark recesses of life on planet earth—this was one giant step forward for Adam and Eve. By first obtaining bodies made of the dust of the earth, our first parents commenced the course whereby they could obtain resurrected bodies like those of other exalted beings, including the exalted Father of us all.

How did Adam and Eve gain their temporal bodies? Our revelations record Deity's words in this way: "And I, God, said unto mine Only Begotten, which was with me from the beginning: Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." (Moses 2:26.) Man on earth—Adam and Eve and all their descendants—was to be created in the image of God; he was to be in his image spiritually and temporally, with power to convert the image into a reality by becoming like him. Then the scripture says: "And I, God, created man in mine own image, in the
image of mine Only Begotten created I him; male and female created I them." (Moses 2:27.) Also: "And I, the Lord God, formed men 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." (Moses 3:7.)

For those whose limited spiritual understanding precludes a recitation of all the facts, the revealed account, in figurative language, speaks of Eve being created from Adam's rib. (Moses 3:21-25.) A more express scripture, however, speaks of "Adam, who was the son of God, with whom God, himself, conversed." (Moses 6:22. Italics added.) In a formal doctrinal pronouncement, the First Presidency of the Church (Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder, and Anthon H. Lund) said that "all who have inhabited the earth since Adam have taken bodies and become souls in like manner," and that the first of our race began life as the human germ or embryo that becomes a man. (See Improvement Era, November 1909, p. 80.)

Christ is universally attested in the scriptures to be the Only Begotten. At this point, as we consider the "creation" of Adam, and lest there be any misunderstanding, we must remember that Adam was created in immortality, but that Christ came to earth as a mortal; thus our Lord is the Only Begotten in the flesh, meaning into this mortal sphere of existence. Adam came to earth to dwell in immortality until the fall changed his status to that of mortality. Those who have ears to hear will understand these things. All of us, however, must know and believe that when Adam and Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden, there was no death. They were immortal. Unless some change occurred they would live forever, retaining all the bloom, beauty, and freshness of youth. Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Orson Pratt, and our early brethren preached many sermons on this.

Also, though they had been commanded to multiply and fill the earth with posterity, Adam and Eve, in their then immortal state, could not have children. Nor could they be subject to the tests, trials, and probationary experiences of mortality. Hence, came the need—the imperative, absolute need—for the fall, for the change in status that would bring children, death, and testing into the world.

3. The Fall of Adam and Eve.

As to the imperative need imposed upon our first parents to undergo that change of status which bears the name "the fall of Adam" or "fall of man," and as to the rationale that underlies it, I have written elsewhere:

To "the first man of all men" (Moses 1:34), who is called Adam, and to "the first of all women," who is Eve, "the mother of all living" (Moses 4:26)—while they were yet immortal and thus incapable of providing mortal bodies for the spirit children of the Father—the command came: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." (Moses 2:28.)

Be fruitful! Multiply! Have children! The whole plan of salvation, including both immortality and eternal life for all the spirit hosts of heaven, hung on their compliance with this command. If they obeyed, the Lord's purposes would prevail.

If they disobeyed, they would remain childless and innocent in their paradisiacal Eden, and the spirit hosts would remain in their celestial heaven—denied the experiences of mortality, denied a resurrection, denied a hope of eternal life, denied the privilege to advance and progress and become like their Eternal Father. That is to say, the whole plan of salvation would have been frustrated, and the purposes of God in begetting spirit children and in creating this earth as their habitat would have come to naught.

"Be fruitful, and multiply." Provide bodies for my spirit progeny. Thus saith thy God. Eternity hangs in the balance. The plans of Deity are at the crossroads. There is only one course to follow: the course of conformity and obedience. Adam, who is Michael—the spirit next in intelligence, power, dominion, and righteousness to the great Jehovah himself—Adam, our father, and Eve, our mother, must obey. They must fall. They must become mortal. Death must enter the world. There is no other way. They must fall that man may be. Such is the reality. Such is the rationale. Such is the divine will. Fall thou must, O mighty Michael. Fall? Yes, plunge down from thy immortal state of peace, perfection, and glory to a lower existence; leave the presence of thy God in the garden and enter the lone and dreary world; step forth from the garden to the wilderness; leave the flowers and fruits that grow spontaneously and begin the battle with thorns, thistles, briars, and noxious weeds; subject thyself to famine and pestilence; suffer with disease; know pain and sorrow; face death on every hand—but with it all bear children; provide bodies for all those who served with thee when thou led the hosts of heaven in casting out Lucifer, our common enemy.

Yes, Adam, fall; fall for thine own good; fall for the good of all mankind; fall that man may be; bring death into the world; do that which will cause an atonement to be made, with all the infinite and eternal blessings which flow therefrom. And so Adam fell as fall he must. But he fell by breaking a lesser law—an infinitely lesser law—so that he too, having thereby transgressed, would become subject to sin and need a Redeemer and be privileged to work out his own salvation, even as would be the case with all those upon whom the effects of his fall would come. (The Promised Messiah, Deseret Book, 1978, pp. 220-21.)

4. The Man Adam and the Woman Eve.

When we speak of the fall of Adam, do we have reference to the man Adam as an individual? Or to Adam as a generic term for the human race? Or to the term Adam as meaning both the man Adam and the woman Eve? When we speak of the fall of man are we talking about the fall of a male individual? Or of man in the generic sense that includes women as part of mankind? What of the woman Eve and her fall?

God, meaning the Father, created Adam and Eve in his own image; male and female created he them. (Moses 2:27.) The woman was given to the man in eternal marriage, for there was no death. They were commanded not to partake of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But "when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it became pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make her wise," as the figurative language has it, "she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and also gave unto her husband with her, and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened." (Moses 4:12-13.)

It is of this event that Paul says: "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Timothy 2:14.) Thus we read of the transgression of Eve. Our revelations also say: "The devil tempted Adam, and he partook of the forbidden fruit and transgressed the commandment." (D&C 29:40.) Indeed, many scriptures speak of "Adam's transgression" (Romans 5:14), though we are left to conclude that Eve fell first and then Adam, speaking of these two as individuals.

Our understanding of the fall comes into true focus when we ponder these words from the book of the generations of Adam: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; In the image of his own body, male and female, created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created and became living souls in the land upon the footstool of God." (Moses 6:8-9. Italics added.)

Thus the name of Adam and Eve as a united partnership is Adam. They, the two of them together, are named Adam. This is more than the man Adam as a son of God or the woman Eve as a daughter of the same Holy Being. Adam and Eve taken together are named Adam, and the fall of Adam is the fall of them both, for they are one.

5. Eve After Eden.
We are led to believe that the name Adam means first father and reason therefrom that the name Eve means first mother. We know that Adam was the first man of all men and that Eve is "the mother of all living." (Moses 4:26.)

Lehi says, "If Adam had not transgressed he would not have fallen, but he would have remained in the garden of Eden." Then he adds: "And they"—meaning Adam and Eve—"would have had no children." Hence the epigrammatic conclusion: "Adam fell that men might be." (2 Nephi 2:22-25.)

Thus it was that Adam knew his wife, and she bare unto him sons and daughters, and they began to multiply and to 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." (Moses 5:2-3.) Eden was behind them and the earth before them. The purposes of the Lord were underway.

While Adam and Eve were yet in Eden, the Lord "gave unto them"—meaning the revelation came to both of them—"commandments that they should love and serve him, the only living and true God, and that he should be the only being whom they should worship." (D&C 20:19.) Then came the fall.

After the fall "Adam and Eve, his wife, called upon the name of the Lord, and they heard the voice of the Lord . . . speaking unto them . . . and he gave unto them commandments, that they should worship the Lord their God," including the offering of sacrifices. Be it noted that both the man and the woman prayed; both heard the voice of the Lord; and both were commanded to worship him.

Then Adam offered sacrifices, an angel appeared and bore record of Christ, the Holy Ghost fell upon Adam, and Adam prophesied many things. "And Eve, his wife, heard all these things and was glad, saying: Were it not for our transgression we should never 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." Then Adam and Eve "blessed the name of God," taught the gospel to their children, and continued in prayer and devotion. (Moses 5:4-12.)

Again, be it noted that the Lord is not dealing with Adam alone. Both of the eternal partners are glorying in the wonders of the gospel and walking in the light of heaven. Eve is a full partner; she is a helpmeet to her husband in both temporal and spiritual things.


In a not distant day this "earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory." (Article of Faith 10.) The Edenic, paradisiacal state that covered the face of the whole earth in a primeval day will be restored, and the millennial era will be ushered in as the Lord Jesus returns in all the glory of his Father's kingdom.

Before that day Adam, who is the Ancient of Days, will preside at a great conference to which all those of every dispensation who have held keys and positions of presidency on earth will come. The appointed place for this assembly is Spring Hill, Daviess County, Missouri, which is named by the Lord "Adam-ondi-Ahman, because, said he, is the place where Adam shall come to visit his people, or the Ancient of Days shall sit, as spoken of by Daniel the prophet." (D&C 116.)

Daniel's testimony is: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. "A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. . . ."

"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.

"And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." (Daniel 7:9-10, 13-14.)

That is to say, after all to whom the keys of God's earthly kingdom have been given have reported their stewardships to Adam, after Adam has received back again the keys delegated to his descendants, then Christ will come, take them unto himself, and reign personally on earth for the space of a thousand years. This is a great initial day of judgment at which Adam presides.

Now what of Eve? Will she and the sisters play a part in this and other great events that lie ahead? The scriptures are silent on the point. We are left to formulate an answer that accords with the great and eternal principles that have been revealed. We know, to some extent, the part she played—at Adam's side—in the past. We cannot believe that she is other than by his side now, or that she will depart therefrom in future days.

In our hymnbook we have the song "Sons of Michael, He Approaches," in which we raise our voices in glad acclaim to Adam and sing of what he will do at Adam-ondi-Ahman. One of the verses is a paean of praise to Eve.

Mother of our generations,
Glorious by great Michael's side,
Take thy children's adoration;
Endless with thy Lord preside;
Lo, lo, to greet thee now advance,
Thousands in the glorious dance!

This of course, assumes that she and other faithful women will continue to stand and serve at the sides of their husbands in the glorious events ahead.

Speaking of the eternal state of exaltation and of those who then live in the married state, the Lord says, "Then shall they be gods, because they have no end; therefore shall they be from everlasting to everlasting, because they continue; then shall they be above all, because all things are subject unto them. Then shall they be gods, because they have all power, and the angels are subject unto them." (D&C 132:20. Italics added.)

What shall we say, then, of Eve—as an individual and as a generic name for all women who believe and obey as she did? Would we go far astray if we came up with such conclusions as the following? Eve—a daughter of God, one of the spirit offspring of the Almighty Elohim—was among the noble and great in preexistence. She ranked in spiritual stature, in faith and devotion, in conformity to eternal law with Michael, who participated in the creation of the earth and who led the hosts of heaven when Lucifer and his rebels were cast out. As she was at Michael's side before the foundations of the earth, so she came with him into Eden. The two of them there performed for all men the inestimably great service called the fall of man. Thus, mortality, the begetting of children, the probation of this life, and the hope of eternal life and exaltation—all these become available to all of the children of the Father of us all.

After the fall, Eve continued to receive revelation, to see visions, to walk in the spirit. As Adam became the pattern for all his sons, so did Eve for all her daughters. And as they twain have gone on to exaltation and sit upon their thrones in glorious immortality, so may all, both male and female, who walk as they walked.

As there are no words to extoll the greatness of the Ancient of Days unto whom thousands of thousands shall minister and before whom "ten thousand times ten thousand" shall stand in a day of judgment, so there is no language that can do credit to our glorious mother Eve. Let God be praised for the glorious plan of creation, redemption, and exaltation. And let Adam and Eve be praised for the infinitely great part they have played in the eternal plan of the Eternal One.
A widow with her mite taught us how to tithe. An impoverished and starving widow with her hungry son taught us how to share, as she gave her meal and oil to Elijah. The divine maternal instincts of an Egyptian woman retrieved Moses from the bulrushes, thereby shaping history and demonstrating how a baby is a blessing—not a burden.

What greater conversation of anticipation has there been than that of Elisabeth and Mary when also the babe in Elisabeth leaped in recognition of Mary? (Luke 1:41.) Does it not tell us much about the intrinsic intelligence of women to read of the crucifixion scene at Calvary? "And many women were there beholding afar off." (Matthew 27:55.) Their presence was a prayer; their lingering was like a litany.

And who came first to the empty tomb of the risen Christ? Two women. Who was the first mortal to see the resurrected Savior? Mary of Magdala. Special spiritual sensitivity keeps the women of God hoping long after many others have ceased.

The charity of good women is such that their "love makes no parade"; they are not glad "when others go wrong"; they are too busy serving to sit thoughtfully about, waiting to be offended. Like Mary, they ponder trustingly those puzzles that disable others. God trusts women so much that he lets them bear and care for his spirit children. In our modern kingdom, it is no accident that women were, through Relief Society, assigned compassionate service. So often the service of women seems instinctive, while that of some men seems more labored. It is precisely because the daughters of Zion are so uncommon that the adversary will not leave them alone.

We salute our sisters for the joy that is theirs as they rejoice in a baby's first smile and as they listen with eager ear to a child's first day at school, which bespeaks a special selflessness. Women, more quickly than others, will understand the possible dangers when the word self is militantly placed before other words like fulfillment. They rock a sobbing child without wondering if today's world is passing them by, because they know they hold tomorrow tightly in their arms.

So often our sisters comfort others when their own needs are greater than those being comforted. That quality is like the generosity of Jesus on the cross. Empathy during agony is a portion of divinity. I thank the Father that his Only Begotten Son did not say in defiant protest at Calvary, "My body is my own!" I stand in admiration of women today who resist the fashion of abortion by refusing to make the sacred womb a tomb!

When the real history of mankind is fully disclosed, will it feature the echoes of gunfire—or the shaping sound of tattles? The great armistices made by military men—or the peacemaking of women in homes and in neighborhoods? Will what happened in cradles and kitchens prove to be more controlling than what happened in congresses? When the surf of the centuries has made the great pyramids so much sand, the everlasting family will still be standing, because it is a celestial institution, formed outside telestial time. The women of God know this.

No wonder the men of God support and sustain our sisters in their unique roles, for the act of deserting home in order to shape society is like thoughtlessly removing crucial fingers from an imperiled dike in order to teach people to swim.

We men love them for meeting inconsiderateness with consideration, and selfishness with selflessness. We are touched by the eloquence of their example. We are deeply grateful for their enduring us as men when we are not at our best because—like God—they love us not only for what we are, but for what we have the power to become. We have special admiration for the unsung but unsullied single women, among whom are some of the noblest daughters of God.

These sisters know that God loves them, individually and distinctly. They make wise career choices even though they cannot have the most choice career. Though in their second estate they do not have
their first desire, they still overcome the world. These sisters who cannot now enrich the institution of their own marriage so often enrich other institutions in society. They do not withhold their blessings simply because some blessings are now withheld from them. Their trust in God is like that of the wives who are childless, not by choice, but who in the justice of God will receive special blessings one day.

To wives who, for one reason or another, cannot have children of their own—but who love and care enough to reach out through the process of adoption to make deserving children their own—our admiration is also expressed. Childless wives can render much significant service to the children of our Father in heaven even if they cannot, naturally or through adoption, have children of their own. I, along with my brethren of the priesthood, express undying gratitude to our eternal partners. We know that we can go no place that matters without you, nor would we have it otherwise. When we kneel to pray, we kneel together. When we kneel at the altar of the holy temple, we kneel together. When we approach the final gate where Jesus himself is the gatekeeper, we will, if faithful, pass through that gate together.

The prophet who presides over us today could tell us of such togetherness, when at the time of his overwhelming apostolic calling he was consoled by his Camilla, who met his anguish, sobbing sense of inadequacy and, running her fingers through his hair, said, "You can do it, you can do it." He surely has done it, but with her at his side.

May our brethren notice how all the prophets treat their wives and honor women, and let us do likewise!

Finally, remember: When we return to our real home, it will be with the "mutual approval" of those who reign in the "royal courts on high." There we will find beauty such as mortal eye hath not seen; we will hear sounds of surpassing music which mortal ear hath not heard. Could such a regal homecoming be possible without the anticipatory arrangements of a Heavenly Mother?

Meanwhile, there are no separate paths back to that heavenly home. There is just one straight and narrow way, at the end of which, though we arrive trailing tears, we shall at once be "drenched in joy."

(Woman [Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1979]. 94.)

Chapter 5
Patriarchy and Matriarchy
Collected Works of Hugh Nibley, Vol.1, Ch.5, p.87 - p.88
My story begins with Adam and Eve, the archetypal man and woman, in whom each of us is represented. From the most ancient times their thrilling confrontation has been dramatized in rites and ceremonies throughout the world, as part of a great creation-drama rehearsed at the new year to celebrate the establishment of divine authority on earth in the person of the king and his companion. There is a perfect unity between these two mortals; they are "one flesh." The word rib expresses the ultimate in proximity, intimacy, and identity. When Jeremiah speaks of "keepers of my tsela (rib)" (Jeremiah 20:10), he means bosom friends, inseparable companions. Such things are to be taken figuratively, as in Moses 3:22 and Genesis 2:22, when we are told not that the woman was made out of the rib or from the rib, but that she was the rib, a powerful metaphor. So likewise "bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh" (Genesis 2:23), "and they shall cleave together as one flesh"—the condition is that of total identity.

"Woman, because she was taken out of man" (Moses 3:23; italics added) is interesting because the word woman is here mysteriously an extension of man, a form peculiar to English; what the element wo- or wif- means or where it came from remains a mystery, according to the Oxford English Dictionary. Equally mysterious is the idea of the man and woman as the apple of each other's eye. Philological dictionaries tell us that it is a moot question whether the word apple began with the eye or the fruit. The Greek word is kora or korasion, meaning a little girl or little woman you see in the eye of the beloved; the Latin equivalent is pupilla, from pupa or little doll, from which we get our word pupil. What has diverted me to this is the high degree to which this concept developed in Egypt in the earliest times. The Eye of Re is his daughter, sister, and wife—he sees himself when he looks into her eye, and the other way around. It is the image in the eye that is the ideal, the wjdat, that which is whole and perfect. For "it is not good that man should be alone"; he is incomplete by himself—the man is not without the woman in the Lord. (See 1 Corinthians 11:11.)

p.87 - p.88
The perfect and beautiful union of Adam and Eve excited the envy and jealousy of the Evil One, who made it his prime objective to break it up. He began by making both parties self-conscious and uncomfortable. "Ho, ho," said he, "you are naked. You had better run and hide, or at least put something on. How do you think you look to your Father?" They had reason to be ashamed, because their nakedness betrayed their disobedience. They had eaten of the forbidden fruit. But Satan wanted to shock them with his pious show of prudish alarm—he had made them ashamed of being seen together, and that was one wedge driven between them.

p.87 - p.88
His first step (or wedge) had been to get one of them to make an important decision without consulting the other. He approached Adam in the absence of Eve with a proposition to make him wise, and being turned down he sought out the woman to find her alone and thus undermine her resistance more easily. It is important that he was able to find them both alone, a point about which the old Jewish legends have a good deal to say. The tradition is that the two were often apart in the Garden engaged in separate tasks to which each was best fitted. In other words, being one flesh did not deprive either of them of individuality or separate interests and activities.

p.88 - p.89
After Eve had eaten the fruit and Satan had won his round, the two were now drastically separated, for they were of different natures. But Eve, who in ancient lore is the one who ouits the serpent and trips him up with his own smartness, defeated this trick by a clever argument. First she asked Adam if he intended to keep all of God's commandments. Of course he did! All of them! Naturally! And what, pray, was the first and foremost of those commandments? Was it not to multiply and replenish the earth, the universal commandment given to all God's creatures? And how could they keep that commandment if they were separated? It had undeniable priority over the commandment not to eat the fruit. So Adam could only admit that she was right and go along: "I see that it must be so," he said, but it was she who made him see it. This is much more than a smart way of winning her point, however. It is the clear declaration that man and woman were put on the earth to stay together and have a family—that is their first obligation and must supersede everything else.

p.89 - p.90
Now a curse was placed on Eve, and it looked as if she would have to pay a high price for taking the initiative in the search for knowledge. To our surprise the identical curse was placed on Adam also. For Eve, God "will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception. In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children." (Genesis 3:16.) The key is the word for sorrow, atsav, meaning to labor, to toil, to sweat, to do something very hard. To multiply does not mean to add or increase but to repeat over and over again; the word in the Septuagint is plenynomai, as in the multiplying of words in the repetitious prayers of the ancients. Both the conception and the labor of Eve will be multiple; she will have many children. Then the Lord says to Adam, "In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life" (that is, the
bread that his labor must bring forth from the earth). The identical word is used in both cases; the root meaning is to work hard at cutting or digging; both the man and the woman must sorrow and both must labor. (The Septuagint word is λυπή, meaning bodily or mental strain, discomfort, or affliction.) It means not to be sorry, but to have a hard time. If E EV must labor to bring forth, so too must Adam labor (Genesis 3:17; Moses 4:23) to quicken the earth so it shall bring forth. Both of them bring forth life with sweat and tears, and Adam is not the favored party. If his labor is not as severe as hers, it is more protracted. For Eve's life will be spared long after her childbearing—"nevertheless thy life shall be spared"—while Adam's toil must go on to the end of his days: "In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life!" Even retirement is no escape from that sorrow. The thing to notice is that Adam is not let off lightly as a privileged character; he is as bound to Mother EVE as she is to the law of her husband. And why not? If he was willing to follow her, he was also willing to suffer with her, for this affliction was imposed on Adam expressly "because thou hast hearkened unto . . . thy wife and, hast eaten of the fruit."

p.90

And both their names mean the same thing. For one thing they are both called Adam: "And [he] called their name Adam" (Genesis 5:2; italics added). We are told in the book of Moses that Adam means "many," a claim confirmed by recent studies of the Egyptian name of Atum, Tem, Adamu. The same applies to Eve, whose epithet is "the mother of all living."

p.90 - p.91

And what a woman! In the Eden story she holds her own as a lone woman in the midst of an all-male cast of no less than seven supermen and angels. Seven males to one lone woman! Interestingly enough, in the lost and fallen world that reverses the celestial order, the ratio is also reversed, when seven women cling to one righteous man. This calls for an explanation: God commanded his creatures to go into the world "two and two," and yet we presently find the ancient patriarchs with huge families and many wives. What had happened? To anticipate our story, it so happened that when the first great apostasy took place in the days of Adam and Eve, the women, being wise after the nature of Mother Eve, were less prone to be taken in by the enticements of the Cainite world. For one thing they couldn't—they were too busy having children to get into all that elaborate nonsensical mischief. Seven women could see the light when only one man could.

p.91

The numerical imbalance in the Garden is caused by the presence of all the male heavenly visitors on the scene. Why are all the angels male? Some very early Christian writings suggest an interesting explanation. In the earliest Christian poem, "The Pearl," and in recently discovered Mandaean manuscripts (the Berlin Kephala), the Christian comes to earth from his heavenly home, leaving his royal parents behind, for a period of testing upon the earth. Then, having overcome the dragon, he returns to the heavenly place, where he is given a rousing welcome. The first person to greet him on his return is his heavenly mother, who was the last one to embrace him as he left to go down to earth. "The first embrace is that which the Mother of Life gave to the First Man as he separated himself from her in order to come down to earth to his testing." So we have a division of labor. The angels are male because they are missionaries, as the Church on the earth is essentially a missionary organization; the women are engaged in another, but equally important, task: preserving the establishment while the men are away. This relationship is pervasive in the tradition of the race—what the geographer Jean Bruhnes called "the wise force of the earth and the mad force of the sun." It is beautifully expressed in an ode by Sappho:

p.91

The evening brings back all the things that the bright sun of morning has scattered

You bring back the sheep, and the goat and the little boy back to his mother.

p.91 - p.92

Odysseus must wander and have his adventures—it is his nature. But life would be nothing to him if he did not know all the time that he had his faithful Penelope waiting for him at home. She is no stick-in-the-mud, however, as things are just as exciting, dangerous, and demanding at home as on the road. (In fact, letters from home to missionary husbands are usually more exciting than their letters from the field.)

p.92

So who was the more important? EVE is the first on the scene, not Adam, who woke up only long enough to turn over to fall asleep again; and then when he really woke up he saw the woman standing there, ahead of him, waiting for him. What could he assume but that she had set it all up—she must be the mother of all living! In all that follows she takes the initiative, pursuing the search for ever greater light and knowledge while Adam cautiously holds back. Who was the wiser for that? The first daring step had to be taken, and if in her enthusiasm she let herself be tricked by the persuasive talk of a kindly "brother," it was no fault of hers. Still it was an act of disobedience for which someone had to pay, and she accepted the responsibility. And had she been so foolish? It is she who perceives and points out to Adam that they have done the right thing after all. Sorrow, yes, but she is willing to pass through it for the sake of knowledge—knowledge of good and evil that will provide the test and the victory for working out their salvation as God intends. It is better this way than the old way; she is the progressive one. She had not led him astray, for God had specifically commanded her to stick to Adam no matter what: "The woman thou gavest me and commanded that she should stay with me: she gave me the fruit, and I did eat." She takes the initiative, and he hearkens to her—"because thou hast hearkened to thy wife." She led and he followed. Here Adam comes to her defense as well as his own; if she twisted his arm, she had no choice either. "Don't you see?" he says to the Lord. "You commanded her to stay with me. What else could she do but take me along with her?"

p.92 - p.93

Next it is the woman who sees through Satan's disguise of clever hypocrisy, identifies him, and exposes him for what he is. She discovers the principle of opposites by which the world is governed and views it with high-spirited optimism: it is not wrong that there is opposition in everything, it is a constructive principle making it possible for people to be intelligently happy. It is better to know the score than not to know it. Finally, it is the "seed of the woman" that repels the serpent and embraces the gospel: she it is who first accepts the gospel of repentance. There is no patriarchy or matriarchy in the Garden; the two supervise each other. Adam is given no arbitrary power; EVE is to heed him only sofar as he obeys their Father—and who decides that? She must keep check on him as much as he does on her. It is, if you will, a system of checks and balances in which each party is as distinct and independent in its sphere as are the departments of government under the Constitution—and just as dependent on each other.

p.93 - p.94

The Dispensation of Adam ended as all great dispensations have ended—in a great apostasy. Adam and EVE brought up their children diligently in the gospel, but the adversary was not idle in his continued attempts to drive wedges between them. He had first to overcome the healthy revulsion, "the enmity," between his followers and "the seed of the woman," and he began with Cain, who went all the way with him "for the sake of getting gain." And Adam and EVE blessed the name of God, and they made all things known unto their
sons and their daughters. And Satan came among them, saying: Believe it not. And men began from that time forth to be carnal, sensual, and devilish." (Moses 5:12-13.) Even in the garden mankind were subject to temptation; but they were not evil by nature—they had to work at that. All have fallen, but how far we fall depends on us. From Cain and Lamech through the Watchers and Enoch to the mandatory cleansing of the Flood, the corruption spread and engulfed all the earth. Central to the drama was a never-ending tension and conflict between the matriarchal and patriarchal orders, both of which were perversions. Each has its peculiar brand of corruption.

p.94

The matriarchal cultures are sedentary (remember that the mother stays home either as Penelope or as the princess confined in the tower), that is, agricultural, chthonian, centering around the Earth Mother. The rites are mostly nocturnal, lunar, volup tuous, and licentious. The classic image is that of the great, rich, corrupt, age-old, and oppressive city Babylon, queen of the world, metropolis, fashion center, the super mall, the scarlet woman, the whore of all the earth, whose merchants and bankers are the oppressors of all people. Though the matriarchy makes for softness and decay, beneath the gentle or beguiling or glittering exterior is the fierce toughness, cunning, and ambition of Miss Piggy, Becky Sharp, or Scarlett O'Hara.

p.94

The patriarchal order lends itself to equally impressive abuses. It is nomadic. The hero is the wandering Odysseus or knight errant, the miles gloriosus, the pirate, condottiere, the free enterpriser—not the farmer tied to wife and soil, but the hunter and soldier out for adventure, glory, and loot; not the city, but the golden horde, the feralis exercitus that sweeps down upon the soft and sedentary cultures of the coast and the river valley. Its gods are sky gods with the raging sun at their head. Its depredations are not by decay but by fire and sword. As predatory and greedy as the matriarchy, it cumulates its wealth not by unquestioned immemorial custom but by sacred and self-serving laws. The perennial routine calls for the patriarchal tribes of the mountains and the steppes to overrun the wealthy and corrupt cities of the plain only to be absorbed and corrupted by them in turn, so that what we end up with in the long run is the worst of both cultures.

p.94 - p.95

In this great apostasy a new relationship of men and women is the keynote. Lamech got the same degree of Master Mahan as Cain did. These dier operations entail great secrecy, and Lamech's wives "rebelled against him, and declared these things abroad, and had not compassion; wherefore Lamech was despised, and cast out, and came not among the sons of men, lest he should die. And thus the works of darkness began to prevail among all the sons of men." (Moses 5:53-55; italics added.) Thus with infullable insight the book of Moses introduces us into the perennial year-drama, which in the past fifty years has become a central theme of comparative world religion and literature. We cannot pursue this fascinating subject here, except to note that from now on the king in his ambition has to cope with equally ambitious females. Robert Graves takes us through all the primal myths of the Greeks, where this deadly rivalry is the name of the game. "In this archaic religious system," he begins, "there were as yet neither gods nor priests, but only a universal goddess and her priestesses, woman being the dominant sex and man her frightened victim." Not a healthy relationship; but matriarchy and patriarchy must always be mortal enemies. Why? Because of the last part of the word, the -archy. In Bailey's dictionary, the first definition given for the word -archy is "beginning, specifically the origin of a quarrel or a murder"; the second definition is "command, power, authority," which is what the quarrel is about. The suffix archy means always to be first in order, whether in time or eminence; the point is that there can only be one first. To be first is Satan's first principle: "Better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heav'n." Whatever the game, the object is to be Number One.

p.95 - p.96

Why do we lay more emphasis on the patriarchal order than the matriarchy in our world today? That is unavoidable if we would maintain a balance between the two, for the matriarchal succession enjoys a great natural advantage that, where it prevails, renders the other all but helpless. There is rarely any doubt as to who a baby's mother is, but patriarchy may always be challenged. In the end the only assurance we have of a true patriarchal succession is the word not of the father but of the mother, as the Egyptians well knew—Maat is the official approval of the mother, without which no dynasty could be secure. To assure a true patriarchal succession therefore requires something in the way of checks and controls on the women, a stricter moral code than that required by the matriarchy, which, as we have noted, tends to become lax and promiscuous with the passing of time. With close rules, safeguards, and vigilant surveillance it was only too easy for the patriarchs to become arrogant, dictatorial, self-righteous, and oppressive. The gospel sets absolute limitations beyond which patriarchal authority may not be exercised—"the least hint of unkindness acts as a circuit-breaker. "Amen to the priesthood or the authority of that man." (D&C 121:37.) Without that sacred restraint, patriarchal supremacy has ever tended to become abusive.

p.96

A wonderful insight into the archaic order in the bad days after the flood is found in the book of Ether:

p.96

Now Jared became exceedingly sorrowful because of the loss of the kingdom, for he had set his heart upon the kingdom and upon the glory of the world.

p.96

Now the daughter of Jared being exceedingly expert, . . . thought to devise a plan whereby she could redeem the kingdom.

p.96

Now the daughter of Jared was exceedingly fair. And. . . she did talk with her father, and said unto him: Whereby hath my father so much sorrow? Hath he not read the record which our fathers brought across the great deep? . . . an account concerning them of old, that they by their secret plans did obtain kingdoms and great glory?

p.96

And now, therefore, let my father send for Akish, . . . and behold, I am fair, and I will dance before him, . . . he will desire me to wife, . . . then shall ye say: I will give her if ye will bring unto me the head of my father, the king. [Here the younger king, at the instigation of the princess, a daughter of Jared, seeks the head of the old king, following the ancient practice.]

p.97

And Akish did administer unto them the oaths which were given by them of old who also sought power, which had been handed down even from Cain.

p.97

And they were kept up by the power of the devil, to help such as sought power to gain power, and to murder, and to plunder, and to . . . commit. . . whoredoms. (Ether 8:7-10, 13, 15-16; italics added.)

p.97

And. . . Jared was anointed king. . . and he gave unto Akish his daughter to wife.

p.97

[Akish is now next in line.] And. . . Akish sought the life of [Jared] . . . and [he] obtained the head of his father-in-law, as he sat upon his throne.

p.97

And. . . Akish began to be jealous of his son [and so starved him to
death in prison]...

p.97

Now the people of Akish were desirous for gain, even as Akish was desirous for power; wherefore, the sons of Akish did offer them money...

p.97

And there began to be a war between the sons of Akish and Akish...unto the destruction of nearly all the people of the kingdom. (Ether 9.4-5,7,11-12; italics added.)

p.97

And it all began with a woman: Dux femina facti.

p.97

According to the oldest mythologies, all the troubles of the race are but a perennial feud between the matriarchy and patriarchy; between men and women seeking power and gain at each other's expense.

p.97

With infallible instinct Shakespeare takes us into a timeless world of elemental spirits where a fairy king and queen are found shamelessly bickering over a piece of property—a little slave. Proud Titania and jealous Oberon are playing a silly game of one-upmanship—silly, but with appalling results. All nature is blasted and blighted, and the only progeny of the squabbling pair is universal sterility, described in harrowing detail by the queen: "And this progeny of evil comes of us, we are its parent and original!" What dismal parenthood! And it all comes of ambition and greed, to which gods and goddesses as well as kings and queens are prone.

p.98

As a sampling of what goes on and on and on, take the Olympian creation myth: "At the beginning of all things Mother Earth emerged from chaos and bore her son Uranus as she slept"; the two of them united to beget a race of monsters as "earth and sky parted in deadly strife," which, according to Graves, "must refer to the clash between the patriarchal and matriarchal principles." The giant children revolted against their father, Uranus, who threw them into Tartarus; in revenge the mother persuaded their leader, Cronus, to murder his father; upon coming to the throne, Cronus in turn imprisoned his own sons and married his sister Rhea. Jealous of his children, he destroyed them to keep them from deposing him until their mother conspired with her son, Zeus, to dispatch Cronus exactly as he had his father, Uranus. Prometheus became chief advisor to Zeus, the new king, who chained him to a mountain for being "too philanthropic." On the mountain Prometheus had a conversation with the girl Io, who was fleeing for her life; Zeus had brutally attacked her in his lust, and his jealous wife, Hera, to avenge herself on him, ordered that Io should be pursued forever by a gadfly. Prometheus prophesied to her, however, that Zeus, the supermacho tyrant, would fall in turn before a hero descended from Io herself. And so it goes, on and on. There must be a better way, and there is.

p.98 - p.99

It was Abraham and Sarah who restored the state of our primal parents, she as well as he, for in the perfect balance they maintained, he is as dependent on her as she on him. With them were restored the covenants and promises of our first parents. The world did everything to force them apart, and if they had thought in terms of power and gain it would certainly have succeeded. What was it that kept them together? The patriarchal narratives bring a new and surprising element into world literature. In the most brutal of worlds they are unique as romantic love stories, in which the female lead enjoys a billing equal if not superior to that of the male, with her own name, genealogy, royalty, and fortune, and as much bargaining power as the man. True, all the marriage brokerage is carried on by families and dynasties, with ambitious parents and arrogant monarchs trying to spoil the love match, but God approves of the romance, and for once the dire attempts at substituting family and dynastic business interests for affection are frustrated. From Abraham and Sarah down through Isaac and Jacob and to Joseph and Asenath, that is the plot of the story.

p.99

Thus Pharaoh (Nimrod) feared Abraham's power and priesthood (as predicted by Nimrod's astrologers) and so first attempted to prevent Abraham's birth by putting to death all the male infants born in the kingdom and then by imprisoning him as a child and finally by putting him on an altar from which he was delivered by an angel. Finally the proud monarch surrendered and conceded that the God of Abraham had all the power after all.

p.99

It was also a pharaoh who sought the hand of Sarah, the true princess, in order to raise up a royal progeny by her. Upon a royal bed identical in form with the altar of Abraham, she too prayed for deliverance and was rescued by an angel while the king was constrained to recognize Sarah's true marriage and heritage, bestowing upon her regal insignia and a royal escort. At God's command. Abraham humbled himself to ask Sarah as a favor to declare herself to be his sister, eligible to marry another and thus save his life. This is only part of the deference that Abraham had to make to his wife, and it left no place for his male pride. Sarah, on the other hand, with equal humility, went to Abraham confessing God's hand in her childlessness and actually begging him to have children by another woman. Can one imagine a greater test of her pride? When both sides of the equation are reduced, the remainder on both sides is only a great love.

p.99 - p.100 - p.101

Again the apostasy. Recently scholars have compared Sarah with Helen of Troy, and the latter can show us as well as anyone how the romantic tradition of the patriarchs went sour. It begins with attempts at seduction—wanton perversion of the forbidden fruit. Queenly Hera offers Paris power and gain to get the golden apple from him while Aphrodite promises him the ultimate—sex and prestige, the world's most beautiful woman for a wife; as for Athena, she is a freak, invented by the patriarchal interests to expedite their takeover of the matriarchal claims: she was not of woman born, but sprung in full masculine armor from the head (not the heart) of the All-Father Zeus—a very masculine damsel, indeed, who always votes with the male contingency; and of course she is ever-virgin and never a mother. Aphrodite got the award—the golden apple—and procured Paris his beautiful wife, who was already married to an obnoxious male chauntiwick, who was a king and a serious business rival to her new husband (for the Achaeans and Trojans had long waged old war for the control of the rich grain trade that passed through the straits from Russia). It was Menelaus' brother Agamemnon, head of the whole vast conglomerate, who led the expedition against Troy. The opening lines of the Iliad show this bully-boy insisting that the hero Achilles turn over to him the fair daughter of the priest Chyseus, whom Achilles has won in battle. Agamemnon's claim to the girl is very simple: he is the boss, and he wants her. To the girl's father, who comes to ransom her, he bawls out: "No, I am not going to let her go! She's going to get old and gray in my house, far from her home in the weaving department, and she's going to bed with me whenever I feel like it. Now you get out of here; don't bug me—if you want to leave in one piece!" That is the kind of a great leader Agamemnon is. Note here that Greek women were treated like captives because originally they were captives; when the warrior hordes overran the ancient people of the coast, they subjected their matriarchal society to perpetual suppression, though from time to time the smoldering fires broke out fiercely. It is not surprising that Agamemnon, to expedite his journey to Troy, sacrifices his young daughter Iphigenia to Poseidon. But this gave a moral pretext to his wife, Clytemnestra, as ambitious and unscrupulous as he, to connive with her lover in murdering her husband on the day of his return. For which the son,
Orestes, murdered his mother and the king who ruled by her sufferance. While the avenging Furies pursued Orestes, the gods took a vote to decide whether his avenging of his father justified the killing of his mother. Not surprisingly, the vote split on party lines, every god voting to acquit the defendant and every goddess voting to convict him--another showdown between male and female. The tie was broken by the vote of Athena, invented for the express purpose, it is believed, of tipping the scales for the patriarchy. She also holds the balance between imperious Zeus and relentless Hera in their ceaseless feuding at the expense of poor Odysseus and Penelope. "Zeus and Hera bickered constantly. Vexed by his infidelities, she often humiliated him by her scheming ways. . . . He never fully trusted Hera. . . . She therefore resorted to ruthless intrigue." (Iliad 1, 53.)

p.101 - p.102
In Egypt, Israel lived under a patriarchal monarchy from which they were delivered under Moses. Moses' romantic career parallels that of Abraham to a remarkable degree. The tension between patriarchy and patriarchy begins with the Hebrew midwives refusing Pharaoh's command to put to death all the male babies, an order which the Egyptians carry out with a will. Moses is rescued by his mother, placed in a reed float, and rescued and brought up in the rushes of the Delta swamp by two women, a nurse and a princess-mother (exactly like the infant Horus, protected and raised by Isis and Nephthys in the same swamp of Chemmis). Then Moses marries one of seven water-drawing maidens, who declares her independence and to whose father (not his own father, but his wife's) the hero always defers. He bALKS at assuming the role of the pharaoh he has overcome in the sea--and indeed it was not he but Miriam who celebrated the victory over the waters and the rival king. When he turns Nile water into blood, he is performing an age-old rite reserved to the women of Egypt celebrating the founding of the nation by a woman who discovered the land. He leads the people to a place of twelve wells and seventy palms, the symbolic number reminding us that Sarah figures as a palm tree in Abraham's dream in the Genesis Apocryphon, as Nausicaa does in Odyssey's fantasy. When the tables are turned against the Egyptians, it is their male first born who perish-another blow to male succession. Surprisingly, it is not Moses but his wife Zipporah who circumcises their first born son and proceeds to rebuke her husband with stinging contempt. Plainly the attempt at patriarchal assertion met tough resistance. The people rejected Moses as their leader even after he had saved them (Exodus 16:2; 32:23) and plunged with a will into the licentious matriarchal rites led by the wives and daughters and their sons under their influence (there is no mention of husbands or brothers), who contributed their gold earrings to make the golden calf! That was Ka Mutef, "Bull of His Mother," who represented to the Egyptians the youthful pharaoh's submission to his mother. While they were singing and dancing in the best matriarchal tradition, Moses ordered the death of every male participating in the rites; they were to "slay every man his brother" if he caught him at the party. (This third liquidation of males was followed by a solemn reedication to the patriarchal order: "Consecrate yourselves. . . . even every man upon his son, and upon his brother; that he may bestow upon you a blessing this day." [Exodus 32:29; italics added.])

p.102
This apostasy had been one of the fastest yet: "They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them," said the Lord to Moses. (Exodus 32:8; italics added.) "My people have sold themselves for gold and silver." That, along with total depravity, completes the picture and brings the world order back to normal.

p.103
After Moses, the romantic David had his women-trouble, as we all know. Like Aaron, he danced in the manner of Pharaoh before the altar, and the queen, looking on, "despised him in her heart." What need be said of Solomon and the ladies? That supermacho male chauvinist met his match in the Shulamite woman, who outwitted the all-wise Solomon and thoroughly humiliated him. A whole epic cycle revolves around Solomon's Benedict-and-Beatrice, Petruccio-and-Catherine game with the Queen of Sheba, who, as Bilqis (the name designates her as a ritual hierodulie), matches wits with him for throne and empire, in which he cheats shamelessly but is beaten just the same.

p.103
Years ago I collected some hundred versions of the story. Beginning with the account of how Jacob took advantage of the helpless Tamar, who turned his sin against him and came out winner, I was struck to find a whole line of ancient queens doing the same sort of thing--and usually going under the same name. Thus when Cyrus, having conquered all the world but one country, that of the Amazon Massagatae, ignored the wise counsel of his advisor Croesus and invaded that land, its queen Tomyris trapped him at a banquet, where she cut off his head and sloshed it around in a bag of blood. I do not talk about such things for their sensationalism but for their extreme frequency in myth and history--they form a regular pattern, a constant groundwork for history. (In the long line of tragicomic Odí et amó ["I can't live with you and I can't live without you!"] confrontations, man and woman stage an endless tournament of dirty events with survival as the prize, in all of which there is something very wrong, however much we have come to relish it in novels and TV programs. Can this be the purpose of the marvelous providence that brings men and women together? If we must all live together in the eternities, it can never be in such a spirit.)

p.103 - p.104
And so we find the celestial order of marriage resorted to again in the meridian of time. From the earliest writings both defending and attacking Christianity, it is clear that the relationship between the sexes was something very special with them. Outsiders were shocked and scandalized, for example, by the promiscuity implied in the Christian practice of calling each other brother and sister. A more-than-ordinary emphasis on family life is apparent in the warnings of First Clement to the leaders of the church that they are neglecting to pay sufficient attention to their own families and the bringing up of their children in the church. The more recent discoveries of early Christian documents allow us insights into the nature of the teaching that incurred the wrathful criticism of an immoral age that did not understand it at all. Thus we learn in the Gospel of Philip and the Apocalypse of Adam how Adam and Eve were united in celestial union before the creation of the world but, upon descending to the earth, became separated, with death entering into the scene. Christ came to earth, says the Gospel of Philip, "for the express purpose of bringing them together in eternal life. Thanks to him those who are united in the Bridal Chamber will never more be separated." The ordinances here are symbolic, but the images are important models to be followed. Let us recall how often the Lord refers to himself as the Bridegroom. The symbols we have here are indeed meager compared with the perfect glory. The things we do in symbols merely hint at things as they are, "for there is glory above glory and power upon power. . . . The Holy of Holies and the Bridal Chamber, these are the ultimate. . . . Though sin still enslaves us, when the truth is revealed the perfect life will flow for everyone. . . . those who were separated may be united and fulfilled. . . . All who enter the Bridal Chamber may beget in the light--not after the manner of nocturnal mating. . . . Whoever becomes a Son of the Bridal Chamber will receive the light. . . . and when he goes out of the world he shall already have received the true instruction through types and images."

p.105 - p.106
That early Christian ideas of marriage were far from the conventional ones is plain enough from the difficult solution to the problem
arrived at in the fourth century, when the ceremonies of the church were widely accommodated to those of the world: "Was the church conquering the world," asks the great Catholic historian Duchesne, "or was it the world rather conquering the church?" The solution was to accommodate a difficult concept of marriage with the practices of the world and to accept that ancient and established cop-out, celibacy. In the Christian literature of the early centuries, when Christianity was splitting up into many sects, each claiming to possess alone the gnosti, the secret teaching of the Lord to the apostles after his resurrection, one reads much of the tribulations of Sophia, who is equated with Zoa or Eve. Once long ago, she tried to become perfectly independent and go it alone. She was Wisdom, as her name signifies (the Hebrew Hokhma), who is almost a person in the scriptures, but not quite. If the woman is life she is also Wisdom. Well, Sophia thought that she, as the mother of all, could not only produce but govern the universe all by herself; the result was a ghastly abortion. Chastened and terrified, she was rescued by Jesus Christ, the Bridegroom, who reached out his hand to her and took her back again, for he needed her too, and only when the two worked together in perfect accord could God's purpose go forward in the universe. Jesus was born when Caesar Augustus was inaugurating the long line of emperors while his wife Livia was initiating the long and fateful line of imperial wives and mistresses. She poisoned right and left to get her son Tiberius on the throne, not because she loved him, but because that was the way of preserving and increasing her own power--and wealth. (Nobody knew better than the Romans that when the treasury is empty the emperor is finished.) Most of the Roman emperors were murdered by their successors, who in turn were murdered by their successors. Rome's one original contribution to letters was a brilliant and perceptive line of satirists telling us all about life in the Roman world: the theme, of course, was money and sex.

p.106

From the confused jumble of traditions and beliefs of late antiquity (the heritage of very ancient times indeed), there emerged at the beginning of the Middle Ages such mysteries as the Round Table, in which we find rejuvenated the romantic ideal of the hero who is never ambitious for himself, and the lady pure and holy whom he serves. A more dramatic contrast to the reality of the times (as we see in the ten books of Gregory of Tours' Frankish History) would be hard to imagine. What put a quietus to the Round Table was partly the stress and tension of perpetual dalliance under the code of chivalry--if Lynette snotshirly humiliated her knight, so Galahad prudishly denied his favors to the ladies--but mostly the failure was brought on by the jealousy and ambition (personified by the sinister Mordred) that poisoned the minds of true lovers.

p.106

Shakespeare has given us a classic study in sex and power in Macbeth. There is a beautiful relationship between the lord and his lady, until they both start reaching for power. The moral of the play is that the lust for power and gain inevitably destroys the true and proper nature of the sexes. It begins with the archaic matriarchy--dark, chthonian Hecate, no less--who sets three women (the witches) to trap and destroy the hero. But they are unnatural women: "You should be women," says the hero's companion when he sees them. But what can these bearded creatures be? Full of confidence, the hero brushes them aside, and yet he is fascinated by them--"Speak to me, who neither beg nor fear your favors or your hate." Proudly independent, he has already taken the bait and is in the trap. Their prophecies get him all excited, and he writes to his wife, who reads his letter and sees right off that in order to promote themselves she and her husband will have to forget all about their natural roles as man and woman:

p.106

Yet do I fear thy nature.

It is too full the milk of human kindness...

p.107

For Macbeth was a kind man to begin with (the spark of his former self flashes through from time to time during the play), and the lady was known as a sweet and gentle woman. But now she must get down to business:

p.107

Hie thee hither,
That I may pour my spirits in thine ear,
And chastise with the valour of my tongue,
All that impedes thee from the golden round.

p.107

It is the crown they are after. Why settle for less? In view of such a prospect, all their former values are violently wrenches in a new direction as a messenger comes in and tells the lady that they are about to have a royal guest--the king is already in power:

p.107

Come you spirits
That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here...
[She must be unsexed to follow her ambition.]

Come to my woman's breasts
And take my milk for gall, you murdering ministers.

p.107

Already milk again: that is the human side of them; both of them share the milk of human kindness--but they must get rid of it to get ahead. Next, flinching from the murder, Macbeth shows his old human self when he is stopped short by the thought of "pity, like a naked newborn babe." But Lady Macbeth pushes him on by telling him to become a man. He doesn't like that; a man is one thing, a monster is another: "I dare do all that may become a man. Who dares do more is none."

p.107

You are wrong, she says; I am trying to make a man of you now. That means going all the way:

p.107

When durst do it, then you were a man, And to be more... would Be so much more the man.

p.107

Then she gets back to milk again, and says a terrible thing:

p.107-1.08

I have given suck, and know
How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me.
I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have plucked my nipple from his boneless gums and
dashed the
brains out, had I so sworn as you
Have done to this.

p.108

Unsexed as a woman, unnatural as a mother--if that's what it takes to get what she wants. And what does she want? Power. She wins the argument.

p.108

Bring forth men-children only,
For thy undaunted mettle should compose
Nothing but males.

p.108

[She is too good to be a woman! Women are weak.]

But Lady Macbeth has her moment of weakness: "Had he not resembled my father as he slept, I had done 't." The next words she cries out are, "My husband!" Later she takes him to task: "My hands are of your color, but I shame to wear a heart so white."

p.108

MacDuff tells Lady Macbeth he cannot tell her what has happened:

p.108
A most miraculous work in this good king... to the succeeding royalty he leaves
The healing benediction. With this strange virtue
He hath the heavenly gift of prophecy,
And sundry blessings hang about his throne
That speak him full of grace.

p. 110
This scene sets forth the conditions upon which power may be enjoyed without satanic corruption—only by those who are totally unworliday; for one in a position of power the only alternative to becoming devilish in this world is to be holy.

p. 110
In the same scene, when MacDuff learns the news, Malcolm says, "Dispute it like a man."

p. 110
MacDuff replies:

p. 110
I shall do so,
But must also feel it as a man.

p. 110
For the Macbeths, on the other hand, to be a man was to have no feelings. What does the lady care about such things?

p. 110
Fie, my lord! A soldier, and afeard? What need we fear

p. 110
who knows it, when none can our power to account?

p. 110
Get enough power and you can forget about things like feelings and conscience—what can anybody do to you?

p. 110
As it turns out, Macbeth's undoing is his contempt of women; the witches, "lying like truth," have told him to do whatever he pleases "since none of woman born can harm Macbeth." What's humanity to him? And he keeps harping on that: no mere woman's sons can get the best of him!

p. 110 - p. 111
What's the boy Malcolm?
Was he not born of woman? What's he
That was not born of woman? Such a one.

p. 111
Am I to fear, or none.
But swords I smile at, weapons laugh to scorn,
Brandished by man that's of a woman born.

p. 111
So everything collapses when it is plain that the sisters have played him a rare trick:

p. 111
Accursed be the tongue that tells me so,
For it hath cowed my better part of man!

p. 111
In the last scene the new king calls for punishing "the cruel ministers of this dead butcher and his fiendlike Queen." A woman unsexed as she was can no longer be called human.

p. 111
With the rise of commercialism at the end of the Middle Ages came a feeling of liberation—a romantic release for love, and a free field for acquisition. The relationship of the sexes became both romantic and calculating.

p. 111
From Shakespeare's and Molière's comedies down to Agatha Christie, there is nothing wrong with the beloved's expectations of ten
thousand dollars a year. Gilbert and Sullivan got away with exposing the deep and pious Victorian situation by making great fun of its absurdity: "I'd laugh my pride to scorn in union holy," says the fair maid, perfectly willing to forget rank and wealth and marry a poor sailor for love alone--on one condition: "Were he more highly born, or I more lowly." For inevitably it was not true love that triumphed, as sentimental audiences made themselves think, but the ten thousand a year.

p.111
Actually the situation had not changed for thousands of years. The standard plot of modern comedy was that of the New Comedy, which Plautus and Terence got from Menander, where the obstacle to true love is overcome not by sacrifice, but by the manipulation of a clever servant who gulls a rich old man or woman, or, even more delightfully, by the discovery of a token that proves after many years that the poor youth or maiden was nobly born all along and is the heir to a handsome fortune: so now they can get married because they are both rich!

p.112
And so we come down to the present-day sitcom (where we can laugh freely at everything but the money) and the heavy prime-time show (crime, of course, with single-minded dedication to really big money heavily spiced with the super status symbol: plenty of expensive sex).

p.112
One of my daughters has a little book with these words on the cover: "The College Survival Kit: Fifty-One Proven Strategies for Success in Today's Competitive College World. Survive and succeed--Don't take chances with your college career." Survival, success, competitive, career--the dictionary defines strategy as "deception practiced on an enemy." The word is well chosen. No deception is too shameful to use against an enemy, and whatever the game, your competitor--even the reluctant customer--is the enemy. What a seedbed of mischief this is! The result of this philosophy in terms of human values has recently been the subject of numerous studies. One of the pioneer studies was S. Whyte's Organization Man, which told us how the company man would never think of wooing or marrying anyone not approved of by his superiors. So much for true love.

p.112 - p.113
A recent summary of many of these investigations is Michael Macoby's The Gaitesman. The section called "The Head and the Heart" is relevant to our discussion: "A corporate president remarked that if he thought of one word to describe his experience with managers over a period of thirty-five years, that word would be fear." (There is the cloven hoof again!) "Why are corporate managers fearful?" Mr. Macoby asks, and he discovers that if the corporate individual could penetrate to the causes of this paralyzing fear and anxiety, he would find careerism. (Can we improve on Satan's formula as a definition for that? Careerism is the determination to reign in hell rather than serve in heaven.) "From the moment a person starts treating his life as a career, worry is his constant companion. . . . Careerism results not only in constant anxiety, but also in an underdeveloped heart . . . . The careerist constantly betrays himself, since he must ignore idealistic, compassionate, and courageous impulses that might jeopardize his career."

p.113
"Perfect love casts out all fear," said the Lord, but who wants that if it jeopardizes one's career? Satan's promise to split Adam and Eve was accomplished when God declared, "My people have sold themselves for gold and silver."

p.113
The few scattered case studies introduced here are merely straws--but they show where the fatal wind is ever blowing. Thinking back, what was Satan's express purpose in inaugurating a rule of blood and horror, power and gain on this earth? It was to breach that wall of enmity that protected "the seed of the woman" from his direct attack. Only the covenants of Adam and Abraham and the church of God can overcome it. Though nothing is to be gained by men and women in fighting for the whip handle, that disgraceful tussle will continue until God cuts it short in righteousness.

p.113
So one must choose between patriarchy and matriarchy until the Zion of God is truly established upon the earth. It is that old Devil's dilemma, in which we are asked to take sides with Gog or Magog as his means of decoying us away from our true dedication to that celestial order established in the beginning.

Collected Works of Hugh Nibley, Vol.1, Ch.4, p.85

NOTES to chapter 5

p.113
1. Nibley, Hugh, The Roman Games as the Survival of an Archaic Year-Cult (Berkeley: University of California, 1939).

p.87
"Patriarchy and Matriarchy" was first delivered on February 1, 1980, to the annual women's conference at Brigham Young University.

Journal of Discourses, Vol.10, p.312, Brigham Young, June 11, 1864
Some may regret that our first parents sinned. This is nonsense. If we had been there, and they had not sinned, we should have sinned. I will not blame Adam or Eve, why? Because it was necessary that sin should enter into the world; no man could ever understand the principle of exaltation without its opposite; no one could ever receive an exaltation without being acquainted with its opposite. How did Adam and Eve sin? Did they come out in direct opposition to God and to His government? No. But they transgressed a command of the Lord, and through that transgression sin came into the world. The Lord knew they would do this, and He had designed that they should. Then came the curse upon the fruit, upon the vegetables, and upon our mother earth; and it came upon the creeping things, upon the grain in the field, the fish in the sea, and upon all things pertaining to this earth, through man's transgression. This was not through an angel. Now then what have we to do? We have to labor to remove the curse from the earth, from the vegetation, from every creeping thing, and from ourselves, by the help of God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.
Elohim and Jehovah in Mormonism and the Bible

Boyd Kirkland

Currently, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints defines the Godhead as consisting of three separate and distinct personages or Gods: Elohim, or God the Father; Jehovah, or Jesus Christ, the Son of God both in the spirit and in the flesh; and the Holy Ghost. The Father and the Son have physical, resurrected bodies of flesh and bone, but the Holy Ghost is a spirit personage. Jesus’ title of Jehovah reflects his pre-existent role as God of the Old Testament. These definitions took official form in “The Father and the Son: A Doctrinal Exposition by the First Presidency and the Twelve” (1916) as the culmination of five major stages of theological development in Church history (Kirkland 1984):

1. Joseph Smith, Mormonism’s founder, originally spoke and wrote about God in terms practically indistinguishable from then-current protestant theology. He used the roles, personalities, and titles of the Father and the Son interchangeably in a manner implying that he believed in only one God who manifested himself as three persons. The Book of Mormon, revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants prior to 1835, and Smith’s 1832 account of his First Vision all reflect “trinitarian” perceptions. He did not use the title Elohim at all in this early stage and used Jehovah only rarely as the name of the “one” God.

2. The 1835 Lectures on Faith and Smith’s official 1838 account of his First Vision both emphasized the complete separateness of the Father and the Son. The Lectures on Faith did not consider the Holy Ghost to be a personage at all, but rather defined it to be the mind of God: “There are two personages who constitute the great, matchless, governing, and supreme power over all things. . . . the Father and the Son — the Father being a personage of spirit, glory and power, possessing all perfection and fullness, the Son . . . a personage
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all subject to the God of Israel who reigned over them in the divine "council of the gods" (Anderson 1981, 427–28; Rankin 1962, 92–93; Robinson 1944, 151–57). This belief was eventually modified into extreme monotheism, or the belief in only one God. At this stage, the one true God was granted many of the divine appellations associated with the other previously recognized deities, and earlier biblical records were edited to more closely conform with this monotheistic point of view. Monotheism achieved its apex in the writings of Isaiah and is carried on through the end of the Old Testament. The New Testament continues with the monotheistic theme by teaching the supremacy of one true God, now called the Father, but it also introduces two additional subordinate divine personalities: Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Holy Ghost or spirit of God.

Since theological evolution and diversity characterize both biblical and Mormon history, it would be unusual for current Mormon definitions of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah to coincide with the Bible's usage of those names. This essay examines how Elohim and Jehovah are used in the Bible and compares this with the current Mormon definitions and position that the pre-existent Jesus Christ was Jehovah, the God of the Old Testament.

Most Latter-day Saints do not realize how often the names Elohim and Jehovah appear in the Old Testament because they have been translated from Hebrew into English. Elohim occurs 2,570 times and is closely related to El, which occurs some 238 times. Jehovah is by far the most frequently used Hebrew name for God in the Old Testament, occurring some 6,823 times. King James translators translated Elohim and El as "God" and Jehovah as "LORD," (all caps) and used "Lord" for the Hebrew Adonai, which Hebrew biblical editors often substituted for Jehovah in the prophetic books out of respect for the divine name (Stone 1944, 10, 18; Anderson 2:409–14, 3:150; Roberts 1976, 256–58; Rankin 1962, 96).

While Elohim and Jehovah appear very frequently in the Old Testament, these divine names do not designate two different gods with a Father-Son relationship as they do in Mormonism. Depending upon the intentions of the author, God may be referred to as Elohim, Jehovah, or Jehovah-Elohim. Elohim has the Hebrew masculine plural ending, īm, and can designate gods generally, the gods of Israel's neighbors, one of these gods (despite its technical plurality), or Israel's God. Jehovah is the personal name of Israel's God as revealed to Moses (Ex. 6:3) and hence is never used in a plural sense or ever designates anyone but Israel's God. Jehovah is used in combination with, parallel to, and as a synonym for El or Elohim (Anderson 1981, 409–14; Rankin 1962, 96).

1 A more proper expression of the divine name is Yahweh, but I will use Jehovah, the more common term in Mormonism. The origin of "Jehovah" is, according to Rankin: "In the sixteenth century (1520) Christian theologians — not without the protest of certain scholars — combining the vowels of Adonai with the consonants JHVH, produced the form Jehovah, a purely fictitious name which has become hallowed by four centuries of use. But the evidence of the pronunciation of the divine name as Jahuw is particularly good, for it is founded on the tradition handed down by Theodoret that the Samaritans pronounced the name as Iahe and upon Clement of Alexandria, who wrote "the mystic name of four letters as Iaoue" (1962, 96).
the New Testament almost exclusively of the Father indicates that the Christians equated the Father (not the Son) with the God of Israel.

Adding further confusion to sorting out the biblical usage of these words, the Hebrew word *adon* also becomes *kyrios* in Greek. *Adon* is used in the Old Testament and *kyrios* is used in the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament to designate men who are in a superior position to others (kings, commanders, slave owners, teachers, etc.); it is also often used as an address of courtesy and respect (Barclay 1980, 409–14; Campbell 1962, 130–31). Thus, when “Lord” appears in English translations, we may not automatically assume connotations of divinity. The context must be considered as well as whether the translated word is *kyrios*, *adon*, Jehovah, or *Adonai*. For example, scholars have noted a difference between the application of Lord to Jesus during mortality and following his resurrection. They generally concur that during his lifetime, *Kyrios* nearly always means “sir” or “master,” while after his resurrection, *Kyrios* becomes a divine appellation, a title of God which he bestows upon Jesus (Barclay 1980, 414–16; Cullman 1963, 180, 203–18).

There is a dramatic contrast between the Old and New Testament concepts of God as Father. God is spoken of as Father in the Old Testament only fifteen times and never in the sense of ancestor or progenitor of mankind, an idea common in Near Eastern myths. God is Father in the sense of creator (Deut. 32:6; Mal. 2:10; Ps. 103:13–22; as Father of Israel (God’s first-born), the nation he adopted out of all peoples (Deut. 14:1–2; Ex. 4:22; Jer. 31:9); and also as having Israel’s kings as adopted sons (2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7). There are no examples in the Old Testament of God (whether Elohim or Jehovah) being explicitly invoked in prayer as Father (Jeremias 1979, 23–29). There are likewise no Old Testament references to God as Father of a divine Son through whom he creates and makes contact with the world.

In the New Testament, however, the four Gospels alone quote Jesus calling God Father some 170 times. Jesus also apparently introduced the idea of calling God *Abba* (Mark 14:36), an intimate Aramaic equivalent of “Daddy” or “Dad.” There are no precedents from the entire literature of Jewish prayer prior to the New Testament for God being so addressed, for the Jews would have considered it disrespectful. Thus, Jesus’ use of the term indicates an extremely close relationship with God. Within the first century, *Abba* became the favorite Christian name for God and Paul explains its significance in Galatians 4:4–7 and Romans 8:14–17 (Jeremias 1979, 29–35, 58, 62–63).

Early Christians reserved “Father” for God alone (Matt. 23:9). Jesus bears witness of the name of the Father (John 5:43; 17:6), but he is never called Father himself in the Bible. The name of God bestowed upon Jesus...
thou hear in the morning. O Jehovah, in the morning will I direct my prayer unto thee (Ps. 5:1-3).

Jehovah hath heard my supplication; Jehovah will receive my prayer (Ps. 6:9).

Jehovah promises his people who pass through the refining fire: "Then they will invoke me by name, and I myself will answer them; I will say, 'They are my people,' and they shall say, 'Jehovah is our God.' " (Zech. 13:9, New English).

The New Testament likewise does not mention any god superior to Jehovah. Its overall message seems to be that the God of the Old Testament sent Jesus as his son into the world to redeem it. For example, Peter tells the Israelites: "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his son Jesus, whom ye delivered up" (Acts 3:13; cf. 25-26; 5:30; 22:14; Heb. 1:1-4).

Evidence suggests that Jesus himself accepted Jewish monotheism, and considered Jehovah to be his father. The New Testament contains no evidence that he ever taught his disciples of a God superior to Jehovah, the God of Israel. In light of Jesus' desire to bear witness of the Father, and to advocate his true worship (John 4:23; 17:3), it would seem peculiar that he did not instruct the Jews to worship a God superior to Jehovah if he considered himself to be, in fact, Jehovah. On the contrary, he consistently advocated the worship of the God of Israel by citing the Old Testament commandment: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God (Jehovah thy Elohim), and him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4:10; cf. Deut. 10:20).

As a Jewish male, Jesus would have been taught from his youth to recite the Shema at least twice daily. This liturgical creed was understood to be a confession of monotheism, that is, there is no other God than Jehovah (Jeremias 1979, 67-69). Jesus answered a scribe's question concerning the greatest commandment by citing a portion of it: "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah, and thou shalt love Jehovah thy Elohim with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" (Mark 12:28-30).

The scribe affirmed that there was "one God; and there is none other but he," to which Jesus responded: "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God" (vs. 32, 34). This one God, according to Jesus, was the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob (vs. 26). In John 8:54, Jesus identified the God of Israel as his Father, saying to the Jews: "It is my Father that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God." Of course, Jesus knew that the God of the Jews was Jehovah.

Jesus' pattern of worship and prayer followed the Jewish practices current in his day. He considered the temple which the Israelites had built for Jehovah, to be his Father's house (John 2:16). He was familiar with and probably practiced the three daily times of formal prayer, all of which were addressed to Jehovah. According to Jeremias (1979, 72-78), the Tephilla, or afternoon prayer, contained the following "two striking solemn invocations of God": "Blessed be thou, Lord (our God and the God of our fathers), the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob (God great, mighty and fearful), most high God, master of heaven and earth. . . ." Jeremias com-

ments: "When Jesus, Isaac, and the God of Abraham are named in the use of divine names in 11:25, this twofold context of Tephilla indicates Jesus' identification of himself as Elohim.

Beyond these personally, addressing God by invoking, "God, (Eloï, Eloï)," why not a quotation of Psalms at several points? The uncompromising spirit of the Christians. Paul "There is none other name except that of Jesus which is able to save, "is not unique: 8:4, 6; Bruce 1980, 2 Thess. 1:2; Gal. 1:1, 4; Phil. 1:2; Philippians, and God but saw Jesus 3:23; Barclay 1975, 5.

For Paul, Jesus was rather the Son of God in submitting himself to God and giving. Rom. 1:4; Acts 2:36, the Father himself: 1 2:11; Cullman 1963, from the Father to Christ, in the role of God (Ho became cosmic in scope of God the Father" (speaking of Jesus' thro

At this stage of I. calling Christ Kyrios was originally referring to Jesus' divine character. For Greek-speaking C,

for it was an easy matter.

Mark 1:2-3/Mal. 3:1; Cor. 10:4/Deut. 32:15 "The Rabbis as the Rof 10:1-4) is perhaps best. "According to the tradition of water in their wilderness. ever after. That is a miracle of the Rabbintic tradition. 2:415; Cullman 1963, 294.
Him. If again, actions ascribed to Yahweh in the Exodus wilderness narratives are elsewhere ascribed to His angel — the one of whom he said ‘my name is in him’ (Ex. 23:20; cf. 14:19; 32:34; 33:2, 14ff) — then the interpretation of this special angel in terms of the Son of God before His incarnation presented no difficulty (1969, 35–36; 1979, 89–91).

Jesus, however, never quoted Old Testament passages about Kyrios with reference to himself, but always with reference to God the Father. Cullman summarized the effect of Jesus’ receiving the name “Lord” this way: “The designation of Jesus as Kyrios has the further consequence that actually all the titles of honour for God himself (with the exception of ‘Father’) may be transferred to Jesus. Once he was given the name which is above every name, God’s own name (‘Lord’, Adonai, Kyrios), then no limitations at all could be set for the transfer of divine attributes to him (1963, 234, 236–37).

Thus both the Father and the Son are ascribed the roles and titles of Lord, Savior, Redeemer, Creator, Judge, I Am, Alpha and Omega, etc., in the New Testament. Interestingly, most passages referring to Jesus as Savior also designate God the Father as Savior in the Old Testament sense of the word which have no connotation of atonement but instead refer to rescue from pain, trouble, or enemies (1 Tim. 1:1, 2:3, 4:10; Titus 1:3, 2:10, 3:4; Luke 1:47; Jude 25; Cullman 1963, 241–42; Barclay 1980, 217).

John’s gospel, written late in the first century, goes far beyond the synoptic gospels in attributing divinity to Jesus and perhaps comes closest to identifying Jesus with the God of the Old Testament by having Jesus refer to himself in John 8:58 and other verses (8:16, 24, 28) as ego eimi (I Am). Since Jchovah gave his name to Moses as “I Am” (Ex. 3:14–15), many have concluded that Jesus was attempting to identify himself as the God of Israel. Harner interprets John’s intent, not as identifying Jesus as the same “I Am” who revealed himself to Moses, but rather as implying that Jesus was also divine and shared the divine nature of the Father, John’s theme throughout his gospel (“the word was with God [ho theos], and the word was god [theos]” 1:1). He attributes John’s “I Am” to the septuagint translation of aní hu and anoki anokí hu (I am He) in monotheistic Isaiah (41:4; 43:10, 13, 25; 45:18; 46:4; 51:12; 52:6) rather than to Exodus and stresses John’s emphasis of subordinate and obedient relationship of the Son to the Father whenever he had Jesus saying ego eimi (1970, 36–15, 38–48, 51–58, 60–62; Barrett 1982, 19–34).

Many biblical scholars have noted the important role of Psalm 110:1 in influencing early Christians to apply “Lord” to Christ (Houlden 1977, 78; Cullman 1963, 222–26; Hay 1973, 15, 42, 104–8): “The LORD (Jehovah) said unto my Lord (adoni), Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.”

7 On the Father as Lord, see Luke 1:15, 16, 32, 46, 68; 2:9, 26, 29; Acts 2:34, etc.; on the Father as Savior, see Luke 1:47; 1 Tim. 1:1; 2:3; 4:10; Titus 1:3; 2:10; 3:4–7; Jude 25; on the Father as Redeemer see Luke 1:68; on the Father as creator see Acts 17:24; Eph. 3:9; Heb. 1:2; on the Father as judge see Acts 17:31; Rom. 2:16; 3:6; Heb. 12:23–24; 1 Thess. 3:13; 1 Pet. 2:23; on the Father as Alpha and Omega see Rev. 1:8; 21:6.

In the Septuagint, (1963, 131). The New (adoni) who was invited authors quote or mention passage (some 15; Cullman 1963, 22; and under the earth be “Lord” (Kyrios), just when Jehovah invites him that Jesus is both Kyrios the right hand of God then, the new Testament of in this psalm with God.

Jesus himself cited: They say unto him, The

David in spirit call him on my right hand, till I him Lord, how is he his

The New Testament with the suffering servant the convenant between of us all. He was oppressed he is brought as a lamb him; he hath put him to sin . . . ” (53:5–7, 10; Matt. 12:14–21; Isa. 53:6–9/2 Cor. 5:21; Isa. 60–68).

In the Gospels, Jesus of a militant, political terms similar to Isaiah’s things, and be rejected (Mark 8:31; Luke 17:1:4). Version of the Ethiopian belief that Jesus was the reads this passage to the the New Testament Ch of Jehovah would not earth.

8 Further, Jesus specific Isaiah 61:1: “The Spirit

Biblical scholars have shobar of Isaiah’s suffering servigation application of these pass Barclay 1980, 163–86; Smith
me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken
hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the
blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised” etc. (Luke 4:18–21/Isa. 11:1–2).

The Jews expected their Messiah to be “the anointed one of Jehovah,” follow-
ing the designation of Israel’s kings by that title (1 Sam. 9:16; 24:6; 2 Sam. 7:12–14). As Jehovah’s anointed, the Messiah would turn all nations to the worship of Jehovah, the true God (Jer. 30:8–9; Ps. 2; Ezek. 37:21–28; Cullman 1963, 113–15; Jenni 3:365; Barclay 1980, 95–112). Micah thus predicted:

But you, O Bethlehem Ephratha, who are little to be among the class of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from old, from ancient days... And he shall stand and feed his flock in this strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah his God. And they shall dwell secure, for now he shall be great to the ends of the earth; and he shall be a man of peace” (Micah 5:2–5, Revised Standard).

Thus, neither the Old Testament’s messianic prophesies, nor its discussions of a suffering servant which the New Testament authors applied to Jesus support the idea of Jehovah coming to earth himself to enact these roles. Instead they portray Jehovah, God, as sending the Messiah, his servant, into the world.

Thus, the current Mormon definitions of Elohim and Jehovah, with Jesus identified as the God of Israel, differ from the biblical record. Efforts of Mormon expositors to harmonize these definitions with the Bible have led to much misunderstanding and manipulation of the scriptures. For example, biblical passages which refer to Jehovah in the context of being the Father have been

9 The thought that Jehovah himself could suffer and die would have been inconceivable to the Jews. Often Mormon writers have quoted Isaiah 26:4, 19 and Zechariah 12:10 as evidence that Jehovah himself had prophesied to Israel: “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise,” and “they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him,” etc. For example, see Bruce R.McConkie 1969, 392; 1978, 535, 535; and B. H. Roberts 1932, 16, 17, 23–29, 32, 34, 50–52. Unfortunately, both of these passages have problems in the original Hebrew texts, which have made accurate translations very difficult, if not impossible and it is the poor King James translations of these passages which have led to these erroneous expositions. Although Roberts defended his exposition of Isaiah 26:19 when the inadequacies of the King James translation were pointed out to him, his arguments are unconvincing, and he relied most heavily on Book of Mormon prophecies to support his thesis (1932, 23–34). This passage in Hebrew literally reads, “Thy dead ones shall live; my corpse, they shall arise,” and is obviously garbled in the original. The Septuagint tried to resolve it by deleting “my corpse.” The New English Bible renders Isaiah 26:19 more accurately than the King James: “But thy dead live, their bodies will rise again.”

Hebrew Zechariah 12:10 literally reads: “When they shall look unto me, he whom they pierced, they shall mourn because of him.” Biblia Hebraica proposes that the accusative particle (not translatable in English) be amended by one letter to read “dead one” and that the vowels of the word translated “unto me” be changed to make it the poetic “unto.” This would give us: “When they shall look unto the dead one whom they pierce, they shall mourn because of him.” Borsch translates Zechariah 12:10 as “when they look on him whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him,” and notes that “If the Hebrew is correct to read me instead of him, the reference is probably to Yahweh: i.e., “They shall look unto me on account of the one whom they have pierced...” (Borsch 1967, 130). (I would like to thank John A. Tvedtines for much of the information in this footnote.)
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Further, biblical passages which refer to Jehovah as the Father have been moved from their Old Testament contexts to fit these same titles of Jesus.

10 Bruce R. McConkie 1969, 392; 1978, 535, 535; and B. H. Roberts 1932, 16, 17, 23–29, 32, 34, 50–52. Unfortunately, both of these passages have problems in the original Hebrew texts, which have made accurate translations very difficult, if not impossible, and it is the poor King James translations of these passages which have led to these erroneous expositions. Although Roberts defended his exposition of Isaiah 26:19 when the inadequacies of the King James translation were pointed out to him, his arguments are unconvincing, and he relied most heavily on Book of Mormon prophecies to support his thesis (1932, 23–34). This passage in Hebrew literally reads, “Thy dead ones shall live; my corpse, they shall arise,” and is obviously garbled in the original. The Septuagint tried to resolve it by deleting “my corpse.” The New English Bible renders Isaiah 26:19 more accurately than the King James: “But thy dead live, their bodies will rise again.”

Hebrew Zechariah 12:10 literally reads: “When they shall look unto me, he whom they pierced, they shall mourn because of him.” Biblia Hebraica proposes that the accusative particle (not translatable in English) be amended by one letter to read “dead one” and that the vowels of the word translated “unto me” be changed to make it the poetic “unto.” This would give us: “When they shall look unto the dead one whom they pierce, they shall mourn because of him.” Borsch translates Zechariah 12:10 as “when they look on him whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him,” and notes that “If the Hebrew is correct to read me instead of him, the reference is probably to Yahweh: i.e., “They shall look unto me on account of the one whom they have pierced...” (Borsch 1967, 130). (I would like to thank John A. Tvedtines for much of the information in this footnote.)
identification (McConkie 1978, 107–10; Petersen n.d. 2–10; Old Testament 1980, 47). The “divine investiture” harmonizing concept (where the Son speaks and acts in the first person as if he were the Father) has been invoked whenever the scriptures report that God makes appearances and gives revelations to human beings. This has been made necessary because of the current Mormon concept that all revelation since the fall of Adam has come through the Son (“Christ” 1979–80, 92–97; Smith 1:27–30). Interestingly, however, these same scriptural passages are often cited in Mormonism as evidence of the Father’s physical, anthropomorphic nature. Although B. H. Roberts argued persuasively that Jesus was Jehovah in Rasha — the Jew (1932), his earlier work, The Mormon Doctrine of Deity, (1903, reprint ed. by Horizon publishers, Bountiful, Utah, n.d.) argues (perhaps only for the sake of polemics?) that the anthropomorphic references to God in the Old Testament are evidence of the true nature of God the Father (see pp. 21, 22, 79, 80, 83, 90, 156–9).

Whatever argument is possible for the current LDS definitions of Elohim and Jehovah from Mormon sources, it must be admitted that these definitions do not accord with the biblical usage of those terms. Apologists aware of this problem have been forced to conclude that the entire biblical record as we now have it has been so systematically corrupted and edited through the centuries, that all indications of a theology more in conformity with current Mormon definitions have been obliterated. Modern textual criticism and comparisons of the many available ancient manuscripts of the Bible do not lend much support to such a radical thesis, however. Likewise, efforts to show parallels between Mormonism and the polytheism of the patriarchal era also seem misdirected (Seach 1983, 12–28). This approach is similar to the “parallelomania” which intrigued many Church members during the late ’60s and ’70s with the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi gnostic texts. Although parallels between Mormonism and these documents seem to exist, their significance greatly diminishes when these passages are returned to their original historical and literary context. The vast majority of the theology and religious practices of the groups which produced them would shock and confound most Mormons. The same may be said of the early Near Eastern polytheistic mythology.

Although we might hope it would be otherwise, religious history clearly demonstrates that perfect doctrinal harmony cannot be found within the Bible, within Mormonism, or in a comparison of the two. Although God may be infallible, human beings are not. Even inspired men in their canonized writ-

13 Mormon authors attempting to find scriptural evidence supporting the identification of Jesus with Jehovah inevitably lament the paucity of information in the Bible, and generally cite the Book of Mormon as the major source for that conclusion. See Roberts 1932, 28–29, 32–34; Smith 1979, 1:13–21; Talmage 1963, 32–41. Seach, however, bases most of his arguments for the Jehovah/Christ doctrine on the premise that the vast majority of the Godhead theology of the Old and New Testaments is unreliable, and turns to extra-biblical writings for his arguments (1983, III-V, 7–22).
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THE RESURRECTION

DISCOURSE
Delivered by Joseph E. Taylor as part of the Logan Temple Lectures, held in the Logan Temple, June 2nd, 1888.

There is no one subject involving consequences of greater moment to the human family than that of the resurrection; and, considering its vast importance, perhaps no other subject is so poorly comprehended by humanity generally. This may be due to the fact that, without the aid of revelation, it is impossible to understand the correctness of this principle in any degree whatever; and the tendency in the present age is to deny revelation rather than accept it. Consequently, large numbers of otherwise intelligent men look upon the doctrine of the resurrection as a myth, a chimera of the brain, altogether contrary to the principles of true philosophy, and, as scientifically demonstrated, an utter impossibility. In support of this the most ingenious and seemingly logical arguments are used, embodying physiological and chemical proofs which are considered incontrovertible.

It is not my purpose in this discourse to discuss the subject of the resurrection with unbelievers; for in the language of Paul, "If Christ be not risen—to which may be added, "If there is no resurrection"—"then is our faith vain, and we are yet in our sins."

Joseph Edward Taylor—(1830-1913) At the time of this discourse Elder Taylor was first counselor to President Brigham Young in the General Assembly of Stake Presidents. While President Young served time for unlawful cohabitation, Elder Taylor served as acting Stake President.

views it as an assured fact; for every religious labor they perform, together with every ordinance they receive (and more especially those that pertain to Holy Temples), points directly and bears a close relationship to our resurrection from the dead. Prominent among them may be mentioned our marriages for eternity as well as time, making possible the continuation of the seeds throughout endless ages; thus preserving and perpetuating that patriarchal order which was established by heaven in the early periods of this earth's existence, and which is the pattern of family relationship in the heavens.

It has been remarked, and truly so, that after the fall we were temporally and spiritually dead, and must for ever have remained in that condition but for the atonement wrought out by our elder brother; which atonement made possible, or, in other words, brought to pass, the resurrection from the dead. For as in Adam all died, even so in Christ all were made alive.

Our father Adam realized this when he prophesied concerning the families of the earth, saying, "In this life I shall have joy, and in the flesh I shall see God" (Pearl of Great Price, page 10); while Eve rejoiced over the prospect of redemption and the eternal life promised them for their posterity. This could not have been realized but for the fall, by which the evil and the good were made manifest, and their children were left free from that time to choose for themselves.

Assuming, then, at the outset the doctrine of the resurrection to be an established fact, we will launch at once upon the broad ocean that lies before us, and in our researches into some of its details will go no farther than the light of revelation will justify. There is so much pertaining to this subject that has not, as yet, been revealed, and there is such an intense desire to learn more in relation thereto as to provoke considerable speculation in theory, which is always dangerous as applying to heavenly things.

It must be remembered that in our mortal state, without the aid of a quickening power, we cannot at all comprehend the glorified condition of a reunion of the constituent elements of the mortal tabernacle and the immortal spirit which have been separated by death; and we shall never fully realize that condition until after the powers of the resurrection have been brought to bear upon us. For experience alone will furnish full and complete knowledge either as to the glories of a resurrection to eternal life, or the sufferings and torments of the sons of perdition. The revelation says concerning the latter, "And the end thereof, neither the place thereof, nor their torment no man knows; neither was it revealed, neither is, neither will be revealed unto man, except those who are made partakers thereof."

Nevertheless, I, the Lord, show it by vision unto many, but straightway shut it up again. Wherefore the end, the width, the height, the depth, and the misery thereof they understand not, neither any man except those who are ordained unto this condemnation.

It is also undoubtedly wisdom in the Almighty to hide from us the glories of a resurrected state; for such knowledge would unquestionably have a tendency to make us dissatisfied with our present condition, there being no genuine joy upon this earth; neither can there be separate from anticipations of a glorious future—not merely in spirit life in the paradise of God, but more especially after the resurrection from the dead. Paul sensed this when he exclaimed, "If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable."

The vision which the prophet Joseph had of the glories of the three kingdoms makes very plain Paul's statement that "There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars;" and that the glory of the stars is as varied as the stars themselves vary in brightness. Joseph's description is more minute than Paul's; and it would seem that he had at this and other times a more extended view than Paul. He remarked at one time that, "Paul said he knew a man who was caught up to the third heaven." "But," said he, "I know a man who was caught up to the seventh heaven." That man I have always believed to be Joseph himself, for the reason that no man living could supersede him.

Therefore, if it was not himself who was thus caught up, it must have been one of the ancients with whom he had conversed. Seeing that Joseph held the keys of the last dispensation, his privileges were certainly equal to those who had heretofore held similar authority and power. This being the dispensation when everything is to be revealed, so that likely as the head of this dispensation, seeing that he is made the channel of communication to us?

We may, therefore, fully rely upon what he saw in vision on various occasions in regard to the future, and we
presume to say that these visions were often before him when in after times he spake upon the subject of the future. His words may consequently be accepted as unquestionable authority.

There are different periods spoken of when a resurrection from the dead should take place, and although very little is said concerning the resurrection of any other since our Savior’s ascension (this being the commencement of the first resurrection), yet any subsequent resurrection would simply prove that the first resurrection was continued after His ascension. We will speak further upon this as we proceed, for we wish now to consider the death of our great progenitor.

It is recorded in the 5th chapter of Genesis that Adam died at the advanced age of 930 years. But it is often asked, “Did Adam lie in the grave until he was redeemed therefrom through the death and resurrection of the Only Begotten?” I will ask a question in reply: “Did Jesus have power to lay down His life and take it up again?” He so declared (Joel 2:32). It might be well at this point to enquire who was the Savior of the world; and what relation did He bear to our father Adam? For the veil of the mysterious past has been lifted just a little to enable us to see within. I will first quote from a discourse preached by President B. Young, in Salt Lake City, April 9th, 1852, (see Journal of Discourses Vol. 1, page 50):

The question has been often asked who it was that begot the Son of the Virgin Mary? I will tell you how it is. Our Father in heaven begat all the spirits that ever were or ever will be upon this earth, and they were born spirits in the eternal world. Then the Lord by His power and wisdom organized the mortal tabernacle of man. We were made first spiritual and afterwards temporal. Now hear it, Oh! ye inhabitants of the earth, Jew and Gentile, Saints and sinner. When our Father Adam came into the Garden of Eden he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this earth. He is Michael, the Father of all begotten, and about whom holy men have written and spoken. He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do.

Every man upon the earth, whether professing or non-professing christian, must hear it and will know it sooner or later. They came here, organized the raw material, and arranged in their order the herbs of the field, the trees also. The seed was brought from another sphere, and planted in this earth. The thistle, the thorn, the briar, and the obnoxious weed did not appear until after the earth was cursed.

When Adam and Eve had eaten of the forbidden fruit their bodies became mortal from its effects; and therefore their offspring were mortal. When the Virgin Mary conceived the child, the Father of all begotten, He, by means of the Holy Ghost, was to be born in His own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the Father? He is the first of the human family. When he took a tabernacle it was begotten by His Father in heaven, after the same manner as the tabernacle for the body and the rest of the sons and daughters of Adam and Eve. From the fruits of the earth the first earthly tabernacles were originated by the Father, and so on in succession.

I could say much more about this, but were I to tell you the whole truth, blasphemy would be nothing compared to it in the estimation of the superstitious and over-righteous of mankind. However, I have told you the truth so far as I have gone.

It is true that the earth was organized by these three distinct characters, viz.: Eloheim, Jehovah and Michael. These three formed a quorum as in all heavenly bodies, and in organizing elements perfectly represented in the Deity, as Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Jesus our elder-brother was begotten in the flesh by the same character as was in the Garden of Eden, and who is our Father in heaven, at all who may hear these things pause before they make light of them or treat them with indifference; for they will prove their salvation or damnation.

We will now quote some of the sayings of Joseph Smith upon this point, as uttered by him in Nauvoo, April 6th, 1844:

It is the first principle of the Gospel to know for a certainty the character of God, and to know that we may converse with Him as one man converses with another. This was made a man like us. Yea, that God Himself, the Father of all us, dwelt on our earth the same as Jesus Christ did. I will show it from the Bible. I wish I were in a suitable place to tell it, and that I had the trump of an archangel, so that I could relate the story in such a manner that persecution would cease forever. What did Jesus say? Mark it, Elder Rigdon, the Scriptures inform us that Jesus said, “As the Father hath power in himself, so hath the Son power.” To do what? Why, what the Father did. The answer is obvious, in a manner, to lay down His body and take it up again. “Jesus, what are you going to do?” “To lay down My life and take it up again.” Do you believe it? If you do not believe it, you do not believe the Bible. The Scriptures tell it, and I defy all the learning and wisdom and all the combined powers of earth and hell together to refute it. What did Jesus do? Why, I do the things I saw My Father do when worlds came rolling into existence. My Father worked out His Kingdom with fear and trembling; and I must do the same; and when I get My Kingdom I shall present it to My Father, so that He may obtain Kingdom upon Kingdom and it will exalt Him in glory. He will then take a higher exaltation and I will take His place, and thereby become exalted Myself; so that Jesus trends in the track of His Father and inherits what God did before.

I think these two quotations from such a reliable authority fully solve the question as to the relationship existing between Father Adam and the Savior of the world, and prove beyond question the power that Adam possessed in regard to taking his body again after laying it down—which power he never could have attained unless he had received first a resurrection from the grave to a condition of immortality. We further say that this power was not forfeited when as a celestial being he voluntarily partook of the forbidden fruit, and thereby rendered his body mortal in order that he might become the father of mortal tabernacles, as he was already the father of immortal spirits—thus giving opportunity to the offspring of his own begetting to pass through the ordeals necessary to prepare them for a resurrection from the dead, a celestial glory.

All that Father Adam did upon this earth, from the time that he took up his abode in the Garden of Eden, was done for his posterity’s sake and the success of his former mission as the savior of a world, and afterwards, or now, as the father of a world only added to the glory which he already possessed. If, as the savior of a world, he had the power to lay down his life and take it up again, therefore, as the father of a world which is altogether an
advanced condition, we necessarily conclude that the grave was powerless to hold him after that mission was completed. All those who have now for the first time taken upon themselves mortality, must wait for their resurrection through Him who alone possesses the power to bring it to pass. It is these, and these only, whose resurrection we here wish to consider. But we will now resume the consideration of the question, viz., the times when the resurrection did and will take place.

King Mosiah, whose writings are recorded in the Book of Mormon, declares that

There cometh a resurrection, even a first resurrection. Yea, even a resurrection of those that have been, and which are, and which shall be, even until the resurrection of Christ; for so shall He be called. And now the resurrection of the Prophets and all those that have believed in their words, or all those that have kept the commandments of God, shall come forth in the first resurrection; therefore they are the first resurrection. There are those who have part in the first resurrection, and these are they that have died in their ignorance before Christ came, not having declared the name of the Lord. Thus He cometh about the restoration of these, and they have part in the first resurrection, or have eternal life, being redeemed of the Lord. And little children also have eternal life. The Lord redeemeth none such as rebellious against Him and die in their sins; yea, even all those that have perished in their sins ever since the world began that have wilfully rebelled against God, that have known the commandments of God, and would not keep them; these are they who have no part in the first resurrection.

Alma also, in speaking to his son Corianton upon this subject, says:

And behold again it hath been spoken that there is a first resurrection, a resurrection of all those who have been or which are, or which shall be down to the resurrection of Christ. Behold! I say unto you it meaneth the reuniting of the soul with the body of those from the days of Adam down to the resurrection of Christ. Now, whether the souls and the bodies of those which have been spoken of shall all be reunited at once, the wicked as well as the righteous, I do not say; let this suffice, that I say they shall all come forth, or, in other words, their resurrection cometh to pass before the resurrection of those who die after the resurrection of Christ. Now, whether there shall be one time, or a second time, or a third time that men shall come forth from the dead it mattereth not, for God Himself knoweth all these things; and it sufficeth me to know that there is a time appointed when all shall rise.

We gather from the above that at the time of the resurrection of Christ the righteous were to come forth from their graves, also those who had died in their ignorance, as well as little children; but it was questionable in Alma's mind at what time the wicked would come forth. As to what did actually transpire at the time of and immediately succeeding the Savior's resurrection we will refer to the record.

Matthew the Evangelist, says (Chap. 27, ver. 52-53) "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the Saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves after His resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

Jesus, when He appeared to the Nephites upon this continent, quoted the prophecy of Samuel, the Lamanite, and showed that it had been fulfilled (3rd Nephi, 23:10). He upbraided them for neglecting to write the same, and said: "How be it that ye have not written this thing—that many Saints did arise and did appear unto many, and did minister unto them?" We have here two testimonies concerning the Saints rising from the dead—one in regard to those upon the eastern continent, and Jesus' testimony in regard to those upon the western continent. Whether there were any of those who constituted the ten lost tribes who had died previous to this time and who were resurrected during this period is nowhere recorded; and while we might justly suppose that such was the case, I would much prefer to wait the coming forth of their history, when the facts concerning them will be fully made known.

Moses, in describing Enoch's vision upon this subject, records: "And the Saints arose and were crowned at the right hand of the Son of Man with crowns of glory, and as many of the spirits as were in prison came forth and stood on the right hand of God, and the remainder were reserved in chains until the judgment of the great day" (Pearl of Great Price, page 20). These Scriptures establish the fact that the resurrection which took place at and immediately after the resurrection of Christ was the first resurrection, and that this was the period upon which the expectation, faith and hope of all Saints was centred. Further, that those who know no law, or, in other words, had died without a knowledge of the plan of salvation, had part in the first resurrection through the redemption of Christ.

The question next arises, "Did the resurrection cease when this was accomplished; or was it continued for some time after the Savior's ascension into heaven? If so, how long was it continued?" In the Book of Doctrine of Covenants (Sec. 27) it is recorded that the Savior told Joseph: "I will drink of the fruit of the vine with you upon the earth." The others He names who should be present at that time, (with some of whom Joseph was acquainted, for they had committed to Him the power and authority of the Priesthood which they held) were Moroni, Elias, John the Baptist, Elijah, Joseph, Jacob and Abraham. Except Moroni, these all lived previous to the death of Jesus; consequently, we can readily believe that these faithful men were among the first to come forth in the resurrection of which we have been speaking, and that in ministering to Joseph and others they did so in their resurrected bodies. To these may be added Moses, who appeared to Joseph and Oliver in the Kirtland Temple on the 3rd day of April, 1836, and committed the keys of the gathering of Israel from the four parts of the earth, and the leading of the Ten Tribes from the North. In addition to these it is said: "And also with Peter, James and John whom I have sent unto you, by whom I have ordained you and confirmed you to be Apostles and special witness of My name, and bear the keys of your ministry, and of the same things which I revealed unto them." We all understand that John was translated; so that he would necessarily appear in his translated body, as the final change will not take place with him until after the second coming of the Savior. But Peter and James had both been executed as martyrs. Therefore they must have appeared in spirit form unless they had received their resurrection; and we have shown in a former lecture upon Priesthood that it is contrary to the order of heaven for spirit to minister to flesh to confer the authority of the Holy Priesthood, which was done by Peter.
and James in connection with John at the particular time mentioned. Hence we conclude that Peter and James did appear and minister to Joseph and others in their resurrected bodies.

The Prophet Moroni closed his record 421 years after the coming of Christ. In speaking of himself he says: “And now I bid unto all farewell. I soon go to rest in the paradise of God, until my spirit and my body shall again reunite, and I am brought forth triumphant through the air to meet you before the pleasing bar of the Great Jehovah, the Eternal Judge of both quick and dead; amen.” His words certainly indicate that he would die; and yet when this individual appeared to Joseph, he did so in the form of a man. Joseph's description of him is very full and complete. He says: “A physician appeared to me, standing in the air; for his feet did not touch the floor. He had on a loose robe of the most exquisite whiteness. It was a whiteness beyond anything earthly I had ever seen; nor do I believe that any earthly thing could be made to appear so exceedingly white and brilliant. His hands were naked and his arms also, a little above the wrists; as also were his feet naked a little above the ankles. His head and neck were also bare. I could discover that he had no other clothing on but this robe, as it was open, so that I could see into his bosom. Not only was his robe exceedingly white, but his whole person was glorious beyond description; and his countenance was truly like lightening. The room was exceedingly light, but not so very bright as immediately around his person. When I first looked upon him I was afraid; but the fear soon left me. He called me by name and said unto me that he was a messenger sent from God unto me, and that his name was Moroni.”

On the ninth day of October, 1843, Joseph Smith makes the following explanation: “Spirits can only be revealed in flaming fire or glory. Angels have advanced further, their light and glory being tabernacled; hence they appear in bodily shape.” This agrees with the revelation given on February 9th, 1843, wherein three grand keys are given by which good or bad angels or spirits may be known:

There are two kinds of beings in heaven, viz., angels, who are resurrected beings, having bodies of flesh and bones. Second, the spirits of just men made perfect—they who are not resurrected, but inherit the same glory. When a messenger comes saying he has a message from God, offer him your hand and request him to shake hands with you. If he be an angel he will do so, and you will feel his hand. If he be the spirit of a just man made perfect, he will come in his glory; for that is the only way he can appear. Ask him to shake hands with you, but he will not move, because it is contrary to the order of heaven to deceive; but he will still deliver his message.

It certainly appears from this that Moroni was a resurrected being, for he appeared to Joseph in bodily shape, and he it was who delivered to him the plates and afterwards received them from his hands, as Joseph himself testified, on the 2nd day of May, 1838. And without question he still holds them in his possession. The testimony of the three witnesses, and more especially that of David Whitmer, many times repeated, was that the angel Moroni not only brought and laid the plates before them, but also turned over the leaves of the record one by one, in the presence of himself, Oliver Cowdery and Martin Harris. But, to place the matter beyond all dispute, we will quote Joseph’s answer to the question, “How and where did you obtain the Book of Mormon?” as given by him May 8th, 1838: “Moroni, who deposited the plates (from whence the Book of Mormon was translated) in a hill in Manchester, Ontario County, New York, being dead and raised again therefrom, appeared unto me and told me where they were, and gave me directions how to obtain them.”

Seeing, then, that Moroni was resurrected at the time he appeared to Joseph, his resurrection could not have taken place until some time after he deposited the plates in the hill Cumorah, which, as we have shown, was not until four hundred and twenty-one years after Christ; for his last recorded work was “I will go to rest in the Paradise of God.” And as Moroni’s resurrection occurred at so remote a period, why may we not suppose that other faithful Saints who died upon the American continent after the ascension of Jesus have been resurrected also?

We would make especial mention of the Prophet Nephi who was the grandson of Helaman; also his son Amos, who took charge of the records; and the son of Amos, who was named after his father, who in turn received and transferred them to his brother Ammaron, which Ammaron hid them up in the hill Shim, they being afterwards obtained by Mormon according to the directions of Ammaron, which records were all finally hidden by Mormon in the hill Cumorah, except the abridged records which he delivered to his son Moroni. We would also include nine of the twelve disciples whom Jesus chose, and to whom He gave a promise that “after they were seventy and two years old they should come into His Kingdom and find rest.” The other three whom Jesus chose obtained a promise that they should not taste of death, but should be changed to immortality when Christ should come in His glory; consequently, they still remain in the flesh as translated beings.

We may also ask why many of the Saints upon the Eastern Continent who did not die until after the resurrection of Jesus should not have their bodies resurrected also, including all the Apostles save John, who, like the three Nephites, will tarry until Jesus comes? Although there is no direct revelation that I am aware of declaring this to be the case, yet I see no reason why it should not be, seeing the keys of the resurrection were revealed in the days of the Savior, and not before His time. That dispensation is not completed, neither can it be until the dead who belong thereto are raised from their graves, as well as those who died before it was ushered in; although the work of that dispensation, as far as it pertains to mortality, may have ceased long ago.

True, each succeeding dispensation has either resumed or continued much of the labor of the former one; and the same authority which was held by men in previous dispensations has to a greater or lesser extent been by them conferred upon others in the dispensations succeeding, and in this manner are dispensations linked to each other. Yet there is a labor peculiar to each dispensation, and belonging thereto, which will not be at all interfered with, even by the heads of other dispensations, except to assist if needs be.

Unquestionably there remains much unfinished work belonging to the several dispensations preceding this; and while it may be completed during the period of this dispensation, yet that labor will be directed by those whose right it is to dictate by virtue of the authority still held by them, although
they themselves may have passed away centuries ago. Joseph says (Journal of Discourses, Vol. vi, page 238): "All these authoritative characters will come down and join hand in hand in bringing about this work. We therefore conclude that an authority once conferred is always retained until the labor necessary to be performed under that authority shall have been fully completed."

For instance, Joseph Smith held possession of the plates no longer than was necessary to translate the record which they contained. They were then delivered to their former custodian Moroni, who still has them in his keeping. It appears that the twelve Apostles whom Jesus chose in Palestine have not finished their mission; for in September 1830, the Lord said to Joseph the Seer: "And again, verily, verily, I say unto you, and it hath gone forth in a firm decree by the will of the Father—till mine apostles, the Twelve which were with me in my ministry at Jerusalem, shall stand at my right hand at the day of my coming in a pillar of fire, being clothed with robes of righteousness, with crowns upon their heads, in glory even as I am, to judge the whole house of Israel, even as many as have loved me and kept my commandments, and none else."

This is in accordance with the promise Jesus made to His disciples previous to His death (Matt. xix:28). Elijah still holds the keys of the sealing power, though he himself has conferred this authority upon others, as Moses still holds the keys of the gathering, although he has appeared at two distinct times to confer the keys of this power—once in Jesus' day and afterwards upon Joseph in this dispensation. Michael, the Ancient of Days, will sit to confirm the acts of the rulers of these several dispensations, and to make the final awards, when the work pertaining to each dispensation shall have been fully completed, and not before.

We are now living in what is termed the last dispensation, at the head of which the Prophet Joseph stands. And as Joseph was the first to receive the manifestation, revelation, key of power, and authority of the Holy Priesthood, why should he not be the first to receive a resurrection from the grave, and thus be prepared to resurrect his brethren? Elders in Israel and all faithful Saints are anxiously anticipating this glorious time, which we all believe is very nigh, though the exact period has not been revealed to the Church. It is believed by many that His resurrection will be simultaneous with the coming of Christ, because of the promises made concerning those who had previously been sleeping in their graves. But this need not necessarily be; seeing that the keys of the resurrection can be used at any time to bring from their graves all those whose resurrection becomes essential for any purpose whatever; more especially the head or ruler of the dispensation of the fulness of times.

Whenever it becomes necessary for Joseph to be resurrected—not to minister again to the common multitude, as he did during his mortal life, but to direct his brethren in those labors so needful to be performed for the accomplishment of the great work of the last days—the grave will be powerless to hold him longer, and he will appear in Temples and other places to the great joy of those who are worthy to come into his presence and listen to his voice. Then will be revealed a power as pertaining to the redemption of Zion that even the Latter-day Saints as a whole will not of; while the revelations concerning the dead will make manifest such a stupendous labor to be performed in their behalf as to demand the erection of many Temples in various parts of the land for the receiving of ordinances for the vast multitude who are awaiting their redemption.

The inspiration which particularly rested upon Joseph during the latter part of his life was concerning the dead. After mingling with them so long in the spirit world, that same inspiration will necessarily be increased among those who still remain, when he shall make known to what extent the Gospel has been received by them, and their desire to have the ordinances vicariously administered. In view of these things I am led to ask myself, "Are we prepared for Joseph's resurrection so as to be ready to respond to the demands that will be made upon us, both of our time and our means, to carry on the great work of the redemption of the living and the dead, and also the redemption of the land of Zion?"

We wish next to speak upon another great and important event which Prophets, Apostles and righteous men have made their theme from the earliest periods of this earth's history, viz., the second coming of Christ, at which time will be developed powers in connection with the great power of the resurrection that are altogether beyond our conception. For then not only will the worthy dead be raised, but the Saints who are alive will be quickened, so as to enable them to meet Him in the air as He shall descend with an innumerable throng composed of those who have been valiant for the truth in all the ages past, and have already received their resurrection. The signs of the near approach of the coming of our Savior are certainly unmistakable; but the exact time we cannot determine. Some Latter-day Saints have expressed themselves in a very positive manner upon this point, and have based their sayings upon statements made by Joseph the Prophet, to which we will refer.

On the fourteenth day of February, 1835, the members of Zion's Camp assembled in Kirtland by the commandment of God and were then addressed by Joseph Smith, who, among other things, said "it was the will of God that they should be ordained to the ministry, and go forth to prune the vineyard for the last time, or the coming of the Lord, which was nigh, even fifty-six years should wind up the scene." At one time, Joseph says, he was praying to know concerning the coming of the Son of Man, when he heard a voice repeat the following words: "Joseph, my son, if thou livest until thou art eighty-five years old, thou shalt see the face of the Son of Man; therefore let this suffice, and trouble me no more on this matter." Joseph says concerning this: "I was left thus in doubt, without being able to decide whether this coming referred to the beginning of the Millennium, or to some previous appearing, or whether I should die and thus see His face. I believe the coming of the Son of Man will not be any sooner than that time." Had Joseph lived until December 23rd, 1890, he would then have been eighty-five years of age. The fifty-six years spoken of that should wind up the scene will terminate February 14th, 1891.

While these are very important sayings, they are to some extent ambiguous, and require further explanation, if not further revelation, to make them plain. And when the Prophet himself expresses doubt upon one of them, as to what was really meant, it would certainly be presumptuous on
my part to conclude that it is sufficiently explicit to base a decision upon. In regard to the fifty-six years just alluded to might it not be interpreted to mean that the fulness of the Gentiles should then come in; or does the expression refer only to the second coming of Christ? These are questions I do not feel myself competent to answer. Jesus says: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels in heaven, but my Father only." (Matt. 24:36). The new translation says, "Neither the Son but the Father only."

We come now to the question: "Is the resurrection that will take place at the second coming of Christ anything more than a continuation of the first resurrection, and not separate from that which took place when He Himself came forth from the tomb and afterwards?" For all our blessings relate to "the first resurrection," John says: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." This certainly refers to all the faithful, irrespective of the time they lived upon the earth. Of the wicked it is said: "They shall not have part in the first resurrection." We therefore conclude that the resurrection at the second coming of Christ is a continuation of the same resurrection which took place at his first coming, and relates to all His faithful Saints as well as those who have died without law. Of those who died without law previous to Christ's first coming, King Mosiah says: "And thus the Lord bringeth to pass the redemption of those, and they shall have part in the first resurrection, or have eternal life, being redeemed of the Lord." The Lord, in speaking to Joseph in regard to the redemption of this class of individuals who have lived and died since the time of our Savior, uses the following language: "And

part in that prison which was prepared for them, that they might receive the gospel, and be judged according to men in the flesh."

Those who have to remain are thus described (ver. 100-101): "Then cometh the spirits of men who are to be judged, and are found under condemnation. And these are the rest of the dead, and they live not again until the thousand years are ended; neither again until the end of the earth."

There still remains another class, who seem to have no part either in the first or last resurrection, at least to inherit any degree of glory. When they are brought up it will only be to receive a greater condemnation. These are also the only ones whom the second death shall have any power. For a full description of this class I will refer you to the Doc. and Cov., Sec. 76, ver. 31-44, inclusive. In another revelation it is said that "they remain filthy still." Joseph said of them: "Those who commit the unpardonable sin are doomed to Gnohom, to dwell in hell, worlds without end. As they commit scenes of bloodshed in this world, so they shall rise to that resurrection which is as the lake of fire and brimstone. Some shall rise to the everlasting burning of God, for God dwells in everlasting burnings; and some shall rise to the damnation of their own filthiness, which is as exquisite a torment as the lake of fire and brimstone." But we will leave the consideration of the utter hopelessness of these sons of perdition, and turn our attention to a more pleasing subject. The redemption wrought by the Savior extends to those who have died before reaching the years of accountability, and who are termed children. It is said by King Mosiah concerning them: "If it were possible that little children could sin, they could not be saved; but I say unto you that they are blessed; for behold as in Adam, or by nature, they fall, even so the blood of Christ atoned for them." It is an accepted doctrine by all Latter-day Saints that "Little children are redeemed before from the foundation of the world." Or, in other words, that their redemption is brought to pass through the atonement of Christ, which redemption was determined upon before the foundations of this earth were laid. Joseph Smith says: "They shall have eternal life; for their debt is paid." Therefore, children belong to that class who come forth in the first resurrection and inherit the glory of a celestial kingdom.

But we are met upon the very threshold of this subject by the inquiry, "Will children grow after their resurrection?" This question undoubtedly originated from a feeling that the perfection of glory can only be obtained in connection with a fully developed tabernacle. Hence the anxiety of parents to have opportunity given their children to develop after the resurrection, to the full stature of men and women. I have never heard even a suggestion to the contrary, but that they will rise from the dead with the same stature as when they were laid down. Therefore, any further development of physical growth must be after the resurrection. The only direct answer I have met with to this question is that given by Joseph the Seer in a sermon preached by him, in Nauvoo, at Conference on the sixth day of April, 1844. The sentiments he then expressed were called forth by the death of Elder King Follett, who had been crushed in a well a short time previous. In speaking concerning children, he said: "As the child dies so shall it rise from the dead and be forever living in the learning of God. It
will never grow. It will still be the child, in the precise form in which it appeared before it died out of its mother's arms, but possessing all the intelligence of a God. Children dwell in the Mansions of Glory, and exercise power, but appear in the same form as when on earth. Eternity is full of thrones, upon which dwell thousands of children reigning on thrones of glory with not one cubit added to their stature."

These sentiments have never to my knowledge been flatly contradicted; but they have been most severely criticized at times in private circles. To all the criticisms that I have heard I have one reply to make, which is, that if ever Joseph was inspired by God, he certainly was at this time. For nothing short of the inspiration of the Almighty could have called forth such advanced doctrines as were delivered by him upon that occasion; and I think that this certainly would be one of those times when the visions of the eternal worlds, as seen by him twelve years previously, as well as at other times, would be most vivid in his mind; and he would speak of things as he had seen them in vision, being inspired by the Holy Ghost to do so upon that occasion. For all of his expressions are most emphatic, and bespeak actual knowledge.

A few minutes previous to his speaking upon the condition of children after their resurrection he said concerning Brother Follett: "I am authorized to say by the authority of the Holy Ghost that you have no occasion to fear, for his is gone to the Home of the just, etc." Did Joseph at this particular moment have the Holy Ghost; and the next moment lose it, insomuch that his next utterance was an error? I dare not assume such a position. Again, it is claimed by some that, there being no short-hand reporters present, it was impossible to report correctly; to which I reply that there certainly is a most beautiful harmony in the entire sentiment which I have quoted, as well as in the entire discourse itself. Each part fully agrees with the other. If this sentiment were false, why not have corrected it at the time, or why republish it fifteen years later by inserting it in the "History of Joseph," or publishing it in the Journal of Discourses, and thus perpetuate and extend a serious error, are questions that are certainly worthy of our attention.

Four brethren reported this sermon, viz., President W. Woodruff, Willard Richards, William Clayton, and Thomas Bullock. In comparing notes so serious, an error—had it been one—would certainly have been discovered. The Prophet himself was not in the habit of allowing false doctrines to remain uncorrected, and the fact of his not having corrected, or in any way modified any of his utterances upon that particular occasion during the remaining eleven weeks of his life, is another strong evidence to me of its genuineness; for upon after reflection he certainly would realize the importance of this doctrine. Besides the published report of the discourse mentioned, several persons who were present on that occasion have testified to me that Joseph did utter the sentiment I have quoted upon that particular occasion; and I am certainly not in the wrong in endeavoring to sustain God's prophet. We have already said that we cannot conceive of perfection short of a full development of our physical being; hence our reasonings are all in support of this idea. We will now consider this important point.

The variety of stature of the spirits before tabernacling in flesh has not been revealed, so far as I am aware. But as variety is found in all the works of our Father, we are certainly justified in supposing that a variety, and a pleasing one too, existed in the spirit world. We have supposed that all spirits had attained to what we term a full stature before taking earthly tabernacles; but is not this merely supposition, there being no proof that such was the case? We can easily understand, because we have seen that a man measuring five feet or thereabouts can and does exhibit as much, and often more, intelligence than one who measures six or seven feet, though not necessarily so.

Nephi, the son of Lehi, says of himself that he was "large in stature;" but this did not hinder him from becoming acquainted with the mysteries of heaven; while Paul, who, as Joseph says, was "about five feet high," was also highly favored of the Lord in this particular, inasmuch as he was forbidden to utter many things which he both saw and heard. But seeing that a child in mortality does not naturally exhibit the same intellectual powers as the full grown man—be his stature large or small—we are at a loss to consider how a completeness of intellectual power can be exhibited, even in a resurrected state, short of attaining to a full bodily stature.

I will now ask, "Where do we get our bodies?" The answer is easily given: Upon this earth, which was especially prepared for that purpose. And just such a body as earth has furnished us will rise again. Neither more nor less. The perfection of the earthly tabernacle is complete in the person of eight, seven, six, five, four, or even two feet—with this difference, however—one is an infant, another a youth, the other a man. The only question then is, "Can the resurrected child exhibit intelligence equal to the fully grown resurrected man?" For herein consists the glory of God. Joseph says it will possess "all the intelligence of a God," and "be forever living in the learning of God." Consequently, its progress as a child must be similar to those who are of full stature. It also holds dominion; for he further says, "Eternity is full of thrones, upon which dwell thousands of children reigning on thrones of glory, with not one cubit added to their stature." Mormon, in writing the history of Jesus' ministry to the people upon this continent after his resurrection, uses the following language: "And it came to pass that he did teach and minister to the children of the multitude of whom hath been spoken, and he did loose their tongues, and they did speak unto their fathers great and marvelous things—even greater than he had revealed unto the people, and loosed their tongues that they could utter. * * * Behold it came to pass on the morrow that the multitude gathered themselves together, and they both saw and heard these children; yea, even babies did open their mouths and utter marvelous things. And the things which they did utter were forbidden, that there should not any man write them."

I will here ask, by what power did these children on the first day mentioned speak unto their fathers such great and marvelous things, even greater than Jesus Himself had revealed unto the people? And on the second day, by what power did not these children but babies also utter such marvelous things, which were too precious to be written? The common answer would be "Because Jesus loosed their tongues." But this does not cover the ground. Were these children, as well as the babies, merely machines set in mo-
tion, and their utterances simply mechanical? Or did the children teach their fathers, and the babes utter marvelous things by virtue of the understanding they themselves possessed; the organs of the body being quickened, for the time, by a portion of the power of the resurrection as held by Jesus, to enable them to exhibit these latent powers?” To me the answer is obvious, and I think this is the grand key that unlocks the seeming mystery of the power which children will possess after their resurrection, when as children they will be found seated upon thrones, reigning in glory; the power of the resurrection having made it possible for them to exhibit the full strength of their intellect, or rather, as Joseph says, “All the intelligence of a God.”

We turn next to the classification of all those who will come forth, both in the first and the last resurrection; for it has been revealed that people who have dwelt upon the earth will be classified as follows: First, those who will attain unto a celestial glory are called “the church of the first-born;” and they are said to be “Kings and Priests to God.” Again, they are called Gods, and inherit all things. Joseph has made it known that “in the celestial kingdom are three heavens or degrees,” and that the highest can only be reached by observing the patriarchal order of marriage; or, as he says, “entering into this order of the Priesthood.” This glory is typified by the sun. Thus we see that it is possible for individuals to become partakers of celestial glory without receiving a fulness thereof: for those who would receive a fulness must observe all the law. Second in order are those who have died without law; the spirits of men who have been kept in prison; also honorable men of the earth who did not accept the testimony of Jesus in the flesh, but afterwards received it. These receive of the glory of the Son, but not of the fulness of the Father; and their glory is terrestrial, as typified by the moon. The third class, as defined by the revelations, is a singular admixture, and consists of professing christians, liars, sorcerers, whoresomongers, adulterers, etc.—those who have received neither the Gospel nor the testimony of Jesus at any time. Of these it is said, “They shall not be redeemed until the last resurrection,” and when redeemed can only enjoy a glory which is celestial, which glory is typified by the stars, and varies in degree “as one star differeth from another star in brightness or glory.” These are called servants of the Most High; “but where God and Christ are they cannot come.”

These last complete the vast multitude who will be resurrected to inherit a kingdom of glory; the remainder, or fourth class, are “sons of perdition.” They are vessels of wrath, for whom there is no forgiveness in this world nor in the world to come, and of whom Jesus says, “It had been better for them had they never been born;” “The only ones who shall not be redeemed;” “Wherefore He saves all except them.”

Concerning the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea, these also are all to be restored, for the revelation declares: “All old things shall pass away, and all things shall become new. Even the heaven and the earth, and all the fulness thereof—both man and beast, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, and not one hair, neither mote shall be lost; for it is the workmanship of mine hand.”

A very few words upon the seeming mystery of the same identical body that has been buried in the earth, being raised from the dead and consumed by fire; or whose organization has been in any way whatever destroyed. We declare most emphatically that if this is not the case, there is not a resurrection; neither is there a restoration.

Think you the mother would be satisfied to press to her bosom elements different from those which in mortal life constituted her child; to whom she gave birth, and to whom she supplied nourishment from her own breasts, even though the material of which its body might be composed were quickened by the same spirit which quickened its body in mortality? No, she never would. She would say, and justly too, “Give me my own child;” and unless she is satisfied that the same elements which constituted the tabernacle of her child in mortality were to be restored to her in the resurrection, she would have sorrow instead of joy; for there would be a constant longing for the lost one.

Again: Would the husband be satisfied with anything less than the wife who was given to him by God in mortality, which gift was made eternal not only by promise but also by sacred covenant? We reply, “No, he would not.” So likewise will the wife want her own husband, and the child its own parent. While we have no philosophy to fully explain how this shall be brought to pass, yet the promises made are most emphatic; for all will be restored without the loss of a “single hair or mote.”

Alma says, “Behold it is requisite and just, according to the power and resurrection of Christ, that the soul of man should be restored to the body and that every part of the body shall be restored to itself.” The Prophet Joseph said, “Mothers, you shall have your children again.” He also declared, “There is no fundamental principle belonging to a human system that ever goes into another in this world, or in the world to come, I care not what the theories of man are.”

The Book of Mormon contains a great many other sayings that are most definite upon this subject, as also the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. Joe understood this principle when he explained, “In my flesh shall I see God, and my eyes shall behold and not another.” Ezekiel saw in a vision the literal resurrection of the whole house of Israel. Jesus appeared in the same identical body that was laid in the grave. Paul declared, “He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies.” John the revelator saw, among other things, an innumerable throng of those who had been redeemed out of every nation, who were brought forth from their graves, and were dwelling upon a redeemed earth. All this sustains the doctrine of a literal resurrection from the dead—of man, beast, bird and fowl, as well as the earth itself—a restoration full and complete of every thing that has possessed organic life. Again, we might say if the identical body is not resurrected, wherein would be the justice of God in consigning to happiness or misery some other element made to represent that body? We see at once that this is impossible. In short, every doubt cast upon a literal resurrection tends to cloud the mind, and must, if indulged, in result in a total denial of the possibility of any resurrection whatever.

To deny a literal resurrection is to throw away the only key that unlocks the mystery of the future, makes possible the glory which is beyond the grave, and which never can be obtained unless the identical body is again
their graves and placed in that condition of glory which their own acts have merited. Then, and not till then, will be heard the proclamation of the seventh angel, saying, "It is finished, it is finished!" The Lamb of God hath overcome and trodden the wine-press alone, even the wine-press of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. Then shall the angels be crowned with the glory of His might—the Saints shall be filled with His, glory and receive their inheritance and be made equal with Him." Amen.

HOW TO STUDY THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH

LECTURE

I have long recognized the need of some simple process, or system, that would enable the young of the community to pursue a course of study that would make them, in the shortest time possible, conversant with the principles of the Gospel of the Redeemer. I assert it to be the duty of every youth within the pale of the Church, to place himself in a position that will enable him, whenever occasion shall demand it, to give an intelligent reason for the hope that is in him.

In connection with this question, there is an important reason that has been touched upon by those who have preceded me, and has been specially mentioned in the address of the Superintendency, that has just been read—the magnitude of the work that devolves upon this community of Saints, the burden of which must necessarily and naturally devolve upon the younger element of the people. It is no less a labor than the proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom in all the world, as a witness, that in passing judgment upon the nations, the Lord may be justified.

There should be a preparation for the discharge of this duty, commensurate with its vastness. It is the greatest work ever imposed upon any people. There are now fourteen hundred millions of God’s creatures on the face of the earth entitled to hear the proclamation that has been revealed from heaven in this day. This, of itself, gives a commensurate idea of the scope of the obligation involved. Having spent a number of years in the ministry, I have suffered personally from ignorance; especially when at the outset I undertook, at the call of the servants of God, the performance of this great duty. I have seen bands of young Elders who have left their homes in the mountains, arrive at the port of Liverpool, and have been present when they attended their first meeting abroad, and, perhaps for the first time, endeavored to address a public audience and explain the nature of their message. Many of the scenes have been of a humiliating character, because of the inability of some of them to perform the task that they had undertaken.

I remember one scene, that comes up before my mind vividly now, when perhaps a dozen Elders came into a meeting, the first of their mission. The bench on which they sat rattled on the floor, because of their trembling, so great was their anxiety, as they awaited their turn, to be called upon to speak. There was one who appeared to have more confidence than the rest. He arose with great assurance. When he undertook to address the small audience that had gathered in a small room, everything that he had thought of vanished from his mind—and he had not probably thought of much either. He told me afterwards that, although the room was but a few feet in length, it seemed to him to be at least three miles long. He stood with his mind a perfect blank; but he recollected having heard the Elders, in the old Tabernacle, say when they arose to speak, “Brethren and sisters, I hope I will edify you;” and, after a brilliant pause, he said, “I guess I won’t say any more,”—for the reason that he hadn’t any more to say. It is needless to state that the congregation, in that instance, were not edified by him to any appreciable extent.

In my opinion, in pursuing the study of the doctrines of the Church, there should be a method that will cultivate that class of ability that will enable those who pursue the study, to explain to others the information they acquire. Public speaking should be cultivated largely in this community, because it is by that medium that we reach the people, when we do not reach them through the printing press.

Now, what are the main essentials for a preacher of the Gospel? He should, in the first place, have his mind stored with a knowledge of the doctrines he is sent to deliver. It is said in the Scriptures, “How shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent.” I will add a little more, and say, How shall they preach except they know what to preach about. Therefore, a prerequisite to the success of the preacher is that he should be possessed of the required information, and, secondly, that he should gain the necessary ex-