

ANCIENT DOCUMENTS AND
THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Dr. Hugh W. Nibley, professor emeritus of ancient scripture at Brigham Young University, gave the following twenty-six lectures in an honors class on The Pearl of Great Price. This class was videotaped with two cameras in the Maesar Building during winter semester 1986. The text was transcribed from audiotapes of the course and is included here as a guide to the videotapes and a reinforcement to the learning process.

Dr. Nibley talks very fast and covers an amazing variety of material to support his ideas. In some places it was difficult to determine exactly what he said. We have spent considerable time and effort to make the text as accurate as possible; however, it does not have the accuracy of a printed publication. We checked the spelling of all the words for which we could find reference works. In his effort to include a tremendous amount of material in the course, Dr. Nibley occasionally made minor misquotes. He corrected some of these in subsequent lectures, and we have corrected others when we could obtain the source.

Dr. Nibley was involved in numerous projects and did not have time to review this material. We express appreciation to Robert Smith of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies and Robert Smythe of the Translation Department of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for reviewing the text and making corrections.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Lecture	Page
1. Restoring What Was Lost	1
2. Allegory and Rhetoric.	11
3. Literalism	21
4. Preexistence	35
5. Cosmology	43
6. The Creation	53
7. The Council.	61
8. The Council According to the Shabako Stone	69
9. The Shabako Stone, cont.	77
10. The Babylonian Creation Myth	83
11. The Human Condition	91
12. The Plurality of Worlds	101
13. The Pearl of Great Price on the Plurality of Worlds.	107
14. Treasures in the Heavens	113
15. The Geological Problem	123
16. The Mountain of the Lord's House	131
17. The Heavenly Prologue.	139
18. The Combat	145
19. Adam and Eve	153
20. The Heritage of Cain	157
21. The Eve Theme; The Book of Enoch	165
22. Enoch	173
23. Abraham	179
24. The Destruction	187
25. Joseph Smith--Matthew.	195
26. Joseph Smith	201

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 1

We're crowded now but we won't be for long. It never fails; by the third week this will be half empty. That's true. They see no reason why they should hang around, and so they don't come. Or they wisely drop. And I have a cold which is very unphotogenic.

This is a class in religion, and it is frankly, unashamedly, unabashedly religion. The teaching is hortatory and protreptic. You know what protreptic means, don't you? It urges, it persuades, it says, "Come in my direction." **Trepo**, of course, is "to turn" and **pro** is "to turn in a direction, to go forward, to urge forward, to urge to come over here." **Protreptic** is come over to this side. It's a snake oil pitch, a carnival pitch. That's protreptic or exhortatory or hortatory. Protrepic is the word that Aristotle uses. The Latin is hortatory--exhortation, that type of hortatory. We are going to try to persuade you to do something. We're going to try to twist your arm. Such courses are not to be found in public institutions and should not be because they frankly pressure people. But they do have courses elsewhere that deal with religion that is historical, and philosophical, and cultural.

I just had lunch with I.E.S. Edwards who is a very eminent Egyptologist, and, of course, you can't get out of religion in that. If they forbid the teaching of religion in public schools and have a course in Egyptology, you say, "forget it," because Egyptian is nothing but religion. But at Chicago they try to teach Egyptian without religion. (I've got to slow down, don't I?) It's like teaching *Hamlet* with Hamlet left out. Oh, it's deadly. I mean they won't touch it with a forty-foot pole because they don't want to get involved in anything like that, although it's a private institution. So they all have to deal with religion if the courses are historical or philosophical or cultural; it's indispensable.

But this is not that kind of religion. The gospel is not religion as it is commonly understood. It is an interesting thing that in all modern European languages, they all use the same word for religion, whether it's in Russian, or Spanish, or Dutch, or English. You don't use the native language. There is no native word. Everybody says just religion. And why is that? Why don't they appeal to the roots of their native language, their native idiom, to tell what they want? Because that would force them to define what they were thinking about, and if we just use this common word "religion," it's a great help. It's a safe word. There's no agreement on the source at all. It has been very much studied, of course. The ancients argued about where it came from. The moderns do, and they still don't agree what the source is. There are two main theses. Well, the roots are very clear. Some say there are the two: **religio**, **religo**. But it's generally agreed today that the word is **religare**, which is strange. What it means, of course, is to bind the ligaments, ligation, and this sort of thing--anything you bind together.

!p2

And **religio** means to bind back to something, to tie together with something else; and nobody knows what it is we are supposed to tie back to. St. Augustine and all had their theories about it. The one accepted today is that it always ties up with another world, or with heaven, or it ties you up with something beyond this world. You get out of this world, and so that puts it in a department by itself. You see, in any subject at all, you must deal with a thing that you can deal with--that you see, hear, handle, talk about, etc. But when you talk about religion, you've brought in an element that you are not allowed to bring in in any other subject. And yet this is the most important thing there is.

And so we borrow this safe word that comes from the Romans—religion, which we leave undefined. The Roman religion was a state religion of forms and observances, the Book of Mormon says. It was relieved by unmitigated superstition. That's a very interesting thing, you see. There was superstition, but how religious were they? It was also interesting going through hundreds and hundreds of the effects in the pockets of German soldiers, prisoners of war taken on the battlefield. That's where they're the most accessible. They will tell you anything you want. But it's important to have them turn their pockets out and show what they have. They were just loaded with charms and rabbits' feet, and all sorts of superstitious trinkets, etc. Very superstitious. In about one out of two or three hundred you would find a Bible.

In World War I, they tell me, every soldier had a Bible. It was routine for everyone to have a Bible. But in World War II they didn't have Bibles; they didn't believe in anything in particular, but were they superstitious! Did they cling to their rabbit's foot! It's a surprising thing, you see. The two aren't the same. That comes nearer to religion as we understand it there. But the Romans would accept anything under the name of religion without arguing. Ludwig Deubner in his work on Roman religion in Chantipiesays it is true to say that there is not another civilization of the ancient world whose religion is not somewhere or other involved in the religious life of the Romans. They borrowed anything they could. They would just pick it up, but wouldn't take it too seriously. If it was nice they used it, etc. They had everything. Apuleius and Petronius, writings like that, remind you so much of rock stars. Those stories are about the typical Roman novella in the time of Augustus in the Golden and then in the Silver Age. They were about wandering tramps. Most novels are wandering stories. But they were typical rock stars. They would wear these outrageous outfits, etc. They were very superstitious. It was always a matter of horoscopes, and stars, and charms. Everything that happened they interpreted as having some superstitious connection that had to do with them. But their dress, their action, their morals were exactly like that particular element today, the MTV people. But you read something, as I say, in Apuleius, or better still in Petronius (a marvelous work), or any of the five satirists, and you see that that's the level of their religion. They're quite pious really, like some of their songs are quite pious. That's the nice thing about it; anything goes. Horace jokes genially about it, you know. Horace is the greatest of the satirists. Everyone is talking religion, and he says in his famous ode called **Nil Admirare**, "Don't get excited; don't worry about anything, the next world or anything like that."

|p3

It starts out, "Nil admirarie, not to get worried or upset. That's my religion; that's about all you can worry about. If you come over and visit me, we will have a nice time chatting. And you will find that I'm just a pig from the sty of Epicurus." Epicurus taught just enjoy yourself. There is nothing else to do. If you die, there is nothing you can do about it. If there is going to be a hereafter, oh so good; you will be that much ahead. But that was the philosophy of Epicurus, you know, and they were Epicureans. And so Horace says good naturedly, "Come over." He tells about a miracle story, and he says, "Let the Jew, Apelles, believe that."

This was the time of Augustus, you see. This was the very time that Christ was born, and anybody who believed anything was a Jew. The reason he uses Apelles is that Apelles was a famous actor. Everybody was wild about Apelles because he was a clever actor. (You see I've already started wandering from the subject; we'll get back to it.) The people at that time were obsessed by theatromania, the theater mania. Everything was spectator sports. It's TV today. But they were just as obsessed as we are today. It is a sign of ultimate decline and fall, this theatromania. All those notes I've collected on theatromania and never used I'm going to use sometime. Theater mania; **theatron**, of course, means "to look at, to watch, to show." We're all watchers and viewers today. Very few participants in sports or anything else, thanks to TV. They had the techniques for it too. It wasn't TV, you may have known; but they had their setups for that. But as George Wissowa, which is the standard twentieth century work on Roman religion, says, it's all public. Everything is public. And it's all cult, and it's what everybody did and everybody went along with. There was plenty of reverence.

I say this religora, it binds you to something. There's a famous work of Lucretius, **De rerum natura**, on the real nature of things. He says if you get to know what things really are, you'll give up religion and all its foolishness. The purpose of his writing, as he says, is to liberate the spirits of men from the bonds or ties, the nodes, but it's a knot in which you are tied. But it's the same word as this one, **religio**, you see. **Religio** is really a knot that ties people up. They can't be free; they can't think freely; therefore, by giving you a scientific picture of the world, I will liberate you, as he puts it; I'll dissolve, I'll untie the knots.

Well, suffice it to say that we have gone one way and the world the other. We're not taking that idea of religion at all. So what we begin with is this one theme. They have taken many precious things away from the scriptures, from the record. We have one book that restores them, and only one. It is not the Book of Mormon. It's not the Doctrine and Covenants. It's the Pearl of Great Price that restores the many precious things that were taken away and cause people to stumble.

I collected a number of relevant passages years ago. There are just a couple of short ones here from the Book of Mormon. I Nephi 13:23. He sees the book in a vision, and he says it is very close to the Old Testament we have now, but they have taken away a lot of it and there is not much left. "The book that thou beholdest is a record of the Jews, which contains the covenants

|p4

of the Lord, which he hath made unto the House of Israel and it also containeth many of the prophecies of the holy prophets; . . ." So they had a good edition of the Old Testament. ". . . it is a record," he goes on here, "like unto the engravings which are upon the plates of brass, . . ." Remember the bronze plates which were brought down. That was the record that Lehi had. He says that's about the same thing. He saw that later the Gentiles would have the Bible, the Old Testament, very much like the bronze plates that his father had, except that there are not so many. We don't have even as many as he had, and lots of people came after him, you see. His friend was Jeremiah, and there was a lot written after him that wasn't recorded in the Book of Mormon. Well, ". . . nevertheless, they contain the covenants of the Lord unto the House of Israel; wherefore, they are of great worth unto the Gentiles [as well as the Jews]." They are of great worth to everybody.

And then Professor Albright, who has talked here and has an honorary degree from here; the most distinguished biblical scholar America ever produced, William Foxwell Albright. I'll never forget what he said as we came from the airport, "My, it feels good to get away from those anemic Protestants," he said. Well, the Pearl of Great Price is not anemic. It carries a wallop. As Professor Albright puts it, "Our Hebrew texts have suffered more from losses than from glosses." Glosses are changes and corrections by scribes—alterations, notations, those things. That isn't what has damaged the Bible. It's losses, the stuff that has been removed. That's where it really suffers. And he proceeds to illustrate the point from a number of books showing he says, "Future translations will have to expand the text substantially, including some passages of great importance in their content that are missing from the Bible because they have been removed." They are being restored now.

And this is our original proposition in the Book of Mormon: "They have taken away," says Nephi, "many parts that were most precious." And these are to be restored by bringing forth other books and records, he says. Well, do we have them?

I Nephi 13:26: ". . . they have taken away from the gospel of the Lamb many parts [in the New Testament, you see] which are plain and most precious; and also many covenants of the Lord have they taken away." This is all from the thirteenth chapter. And it is the great and abominable church, but remember they were all taken away before the Roman Catholic Church appeared at all. By the great and abominable church, he tells us, in I Nephi 22:13, that designates any who fight against Israel. It doesn't pinpoint any particular church here. Any who fight against Israel are the great abominable, he tells us. I Nephi 13:29: "And After these plain and precious things were taken away, it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles; . . ." The records didn't go forth from Palestine until after they had been plundered and the objectionable parts removed.

Now this is the result of it. Next verse: ". . . because of these things which are taken away out of the gospel of the Lamb, an exceeding great many do stumble, . . ." That's what happens, of course. We walk; we are able to get along, but we stumble. We don't agree on what we read.

|p5

We can't get over passages, etc. And because of this disagreement it shows that we are not walking in a straight and simple path, in the plain path, as the scripture says; in the plain way, which incidentally is a good Egyptian expression. "Today, the whole scholarly world is, by its own admission, stumbling around in the dark." I'm quoting from C.H. Dodd who has also visited here. He says, "A new integrating pattern is what we need." He wonders what can possibly be the point of the entire corpus. We've lost everything is what he is telling us here in editing that big book on the New Testament. And, Nephi tells us again here that there were certain things he was not allowed to write down because he said they would be written down by John. I Nephi 14:26: ". . . and they are sealed up to come forth in their purity, according to the truth which is in the Lamb, in the own due time of the Lord, unto the House of Israel."

Well, has that time come? Yes it has. We had a lot given us from the very first. That's in the fourteenth chapter of Nephi. So we have here these books of restoration. The most important restoration of books to date has been the Pearl of Great Price because it contains nothing but manuscripts, firsthand writings purportedly, just brief excerpts, but adequate for their purpose. Some of them are not so brief, but they are excerpts from the writings of the founders of the great dispensations of the past. Eight different writers have contributed what purport to be their original writings. Now in 1830 nobody could test anything like that, but this is what is so significant about the Pearl of Great Price now.

The Book of Mormon doesn't restore lost parts of the Bible. It contains passages not handed down in our Bible that they had from their bronze plates. You find them quoted by Abinadi and Helaman and 3 Nephi, and they've come up in documents that have been found since the Book of Mormon came forth. But its purpose was not to restore these lost passages of the Bible. They come in incidentally when Abinadi quotes the Book of Enoch. Helaman and 3 Nephi quote some marvelous passages. And it was all written after the Old Testament. Malachi was the only book that had to be added. The Old Testament had already been completed then, so the Book of Mormon is not going to give us anything new. And the great doctrinal teachings--such as those of Alma, Nephi, Ammon, Moroni, Mormon--are all direct revelations. They are not restored from old books. We're not talking about that particular theme now. These are direct revelations we have coming down. And the Jaredite story; that's very interesting because that deals with the scattering. That's one of the most interesting books we have. You notice I use the word scattering, not the dispersion. That's used of the other dispersions of Israel when it was scattered. That's the scattering of the people at the fall of the Tower of Babel when the nations were scattered at that early time after the Flood. That's a very important period, the scattering. I say it's not a diaspora. It's not the spreading abroad of Israel. The scattering is the best word to use because it distinguishes that particular period.

Now the interesting thing is, incidentally, that there is no literature from the scattering. We don't have any Jewish or Christian literature from that at all. The only book we have of the scattering is the Book of Ether in the Book of Mormon. That's from the scattering. But another

|p6

interesting thing. We don't have from any holy sources books on the scattering. Yet it is the most richly documented of all subjects in the other literature, in the secular literature, of the Babylonians and the Greeks--and especially contemporary literature, I mean the old stuff, Egyptian and Babylonian. There you really get into it. They talk about it in detail. They talk about the wanderings and the scatterings all over the place; of course, the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, but that's before the Tower of Babel. This is the big scattering we are talking about. So again the Book of Mormon is unique there, but this is not what we are talking about. It doesn't restore what was lost from the Bible because that story never was told in the Bible. That's one by itself; it is peculiar. Likewise, the Doctrine and Covenants is for the modern church. In your own time sections have been added to the Doctrine and Covenants from the vision of Joseph F. Smith. But it is the Pearl of Great Price alone to date that restores precious parts that were removed from the scriptures.

Now, how do you know that anything has been taken out of the Bible? Well, the **genizas** are good example of that. We used to say a lot about **genizas** in Book of Mormon courses especially. You know what a magazine is. It comes from **makhzan** or **makhza** from the root "to store." We put things in a magazine. It is the same root. But a **geniza** is a peculiar institution, a Jewish institution. You are not supposed to destroy a text of the Old Testament, the holy writings. The copies were used in the synagogues, and when they were used up and worn out they had to be replaced. But you could never write a word from memory. You had to copy down exactly as it was there word for word. So it was actually the continuation of the same manuscript. There was no loss whatever. But what would you do with the old manuscript? It couldn't be burned. It couldn't be thrown away. It couldn't be cut up. So what you did is make a **geniza**. That was a hole in the wall (and there are many of these) of the synagogue, in the mud or brick or stone. You put the old text in there and you covered it up. In the beginning of this century, Paul Kahle and others started looking for **genizas**. The Damascus fragment was discovered, which belongs to the Dead Sea Scrolls, which indicated that these things were there. They started tapping the walls around old synagogues in Cairo. Cairo is a very important one because it produced a valuable **geniza**. And in Romania and all the places where there had been old synagogues. There are some very old ones scattered all over the place. Many of them had been converted to mosques, you see, but the walls were still intact. And so by hearing the hollow sound you could come out with a text that was a thousand or two thousand years older than any text that had been known. Then you could see if they had altered or changed anything. So the Cairo Geniza is perhaps the most valuable. It serves the same purpose as the Dead Sea Scrolls. They were salted away in caves. Here you have the cave number four, which is the most interesting when you go in there.

First, they made careful copies on new clean sheets of parchment or sometimes papyrus. Usually it was parchment. Then they rolled them up carefully and put them in a linen bag. They tied the bag up and covered it with pitch, just as if there was a funeral and someone was being buried.

!p7

Incidentally, the **Ascension of Moses** confirms this. Then they were put into specially made jars. You've seen pictures of these Dead Sea Scrolls jars with a lid that seals hermetically. They put lead or pitch around the top and sealed it hermetically. Then the jars were lined up at the back of a dry cave in the Judean desert where it never rains. It's as dry as Death Valley. Then the jars were covered with dry sand. Then it would be preserved until a later time, as the texts tell us themselves, "until the due time of the Lord when these things shall come forth again." It was thought formerly that they never did anything like this. I used to teach for four years at Scripps College before the war, and shared a class, the junior humanities, with Edgar Goodspeed who had retired from the University of Chicago. He had come out there to teach in California where it was nice. So we shared this junior humanities class. He'd have it one day of the week and I would have it the next. He insisted at that time that nothing was written in the New Testament before the fourth century. The New Testament was not an ancient book at all. It didn't go back to the apostles in the time of Christ because they didn't have writing. The Jews didn't write at the time of Christ. According to him, there was no writing at that time. And then he died, and a month later they started discovering the Dead Sea Scrolls. Ten thousand different documents have been found, all written by Jews at the time of Christ in a very flowing, free hand. Scriptures and all sorts of things, tremendous treasures, came out all of a sudden. They didn't think it was so, but all of sudden there it was.

So we know that things have been taken out of the Bible now. It's a remarkable thing. One of the very first discovered was a text of Isaiah, which, of course, was the most important. They thought more of that, just as we do. It's the number one Old Testament prophet and text. It has more to do with the restoration of the gospel. This text was complete and in perfect condition. We still have it. I have a photographic copy of it. The interesting thing, though, is that in three thousand places it reads differently from the Masoretic text, the Hebrew text, we have now. Nonetheless, nothing really basic has been changed. It was handed on with remarkable faithfulness and veracity, and it's a correct and reliable document. Two thousand years didn't spoil it at all. Until the 1950s, about 1951, the oldest text we had of the Old Testament was a ninth century text. We didn't have anything older than ninth century A.D. Here was a text a thousand years older than any other text of the Bible to tell us what had been lost and what had been changed. Now, remember that over three hundred caves have been found with documents in them, all over the place. Just imagine, before then nobody knew there was anything at all there. But this answers the question, how do we know things have been taken out of the Bible. You can find out there.

How do we know they were precious? Now, Catholics and Protestants insist that anything really important was never lost. Of course, they have to insist that because if something really was lost, they would be in an awkward situation. They don't believe in revelation, and a serious loss would mean that the present-day teachings are to be called into question. How do they know their interpretations are correct? The Jesuit formula is what you preach, preach from the housetops. They say, "See, the Lord told the disciples to preach from the housetops. No secrets, nothing held behind."

|p8

And yet when he met with them behind closed doors, he said, ". . . it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. . . . Therefore, speak I to them in parables: . . . (Matthew 13:11,13). Well, I have collected and written extensively on that subject of the reticence of the apostles and the teachings that were held back—and they were always the most important ones. Of course, as the Lord says, you do not cast your pearls before swine or your dessert to the dogs. This was not a term of contempt for the animals at all, but the pigs wouldn't have any particular use for pearls. And if you give your dessert to the dog (he uses the word **kunarion**, a word of affection for your pet puppy dog), it will make him sick. It's not for him; he can't digest it. So these things are held back.

Well, that's very clear here. Now you can tell. These documents that come forth show us that a great deal was not divulged by the apostles. Remember, in 1948, the same time the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, the Nag Hammadi texts were also discovered. The Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered at Qumran and the others at Nag Hammadi, the blessed female camel. This is on the middle Nile. Seven years ago two of our men, Kent Brown and Wilfred Griggs, went back and dug a couple of seasons in the Nag Hammadi site. We don't really know where the texts were found. They turned up in the markets. Peasants found them, and they had been burning these documents to heat their huts for untold years. They were found in much the same condition as the Dead Sea Scrolls, buried in the same way. They go back to the first or second century, and they are in book form--real books with leather bindings and all the rest going way back. They are codices. And they just found one new codex, not a very big one. It's supposed to be a James. Well, there are other Jameses in there--the writings of James going way back to the time of Christ. I hear it's up for sale for three million dollars. If you want to go over to the Bookstore, they will give you a slight reduction.

You see, these things are still coming up. But these things were not all preached from the housetops. They were precious, and they were held back. The more precious, the more they were held back because you are not to kick these things around. They are not to be made known to everybody. That's why we keep the temples closed to the general public, not that people can't find out what goes on if they make any effort at all. But that isn't the point at all. The point is that you keep your own private integrity, and these things are not to be made what the Jews called **hellal**. There's a lot in the Old Testament about that. You must not make these things **hellal**. It means vulgar, for regular discussion, etc. because what does it do? Well, it distorts things. Everybody starts arguing about it. They give their own interpretations. Then things become distorted, and they are treated as trivia, subjects for popular conversation, or movies, or anything else. That's what **hellal** means. It means defiled by regular public use. It has lost its sacred nature.

Well, how highly valued were they in that case? The answer is that they were valued highly enough that people fought furiously to defend them from being removed from the scriptures. There was a tremendous fight about that. Fight against whom? Who wanted to remove them? Well, the swarming sectary teachers in the second century.

|p9

Everybody claimed that he had the only teaching that was given to the apostles. This is what the Gnostics did, you see. Secretly, after the resurrection, the Lord came and taught the apostles, and Eusebius tells us--quoting Hegesippus, a very early historian--that as soon as the last eye witness to the old church had died, then all these people who had been lying low came out of the woodwork. They all claimed they had the original teachings, the secret teachings that had been passed by. These are who the Gnostics were. They claimed to have the secret knowledge, the secret teaching which Gnosticism is. Everybody had his own version and claimed to be the only one. The same thing happens later in Free Masonry. They didn't want these things. Why did they want them out? Why did they want them to be done away with? The pretenders.

And there were no winners in this fight. The winner, of course, was the one who was taken over by the schools that had the big backing, the big money, etc. And some of them were pretty good people--smart, serious and conscientious. But why did the pretenders want these precious things to be done away with? Because they were afraid of them. Why were they afraid of them? Because they deal with the terrible questions. And I'll say a good deal about the terrible questions here. Why the terrible questions? Because they were fundamental and they had no answers to them. Why didn't they have any answers? Because there was no revelation. Why no revelation? Well, let's go back to our I Nephi, the passage we started out with. And Moroni is good on that. Yes, the last book in the Book of Mormon tells us why they were having no more revelation. And don't think they didn't miss it. They just were wild. They did anything they could to get revelation. They used drugs and hypnosis and everything else. There are good accounts of that in Irenaeus and Epiphanius. But right at the end here, he says, "And I would exhort you my beloved brethren, that ye remember that he is the same yesterday, today, and forever, and that all these gifts of which I have spoken, which are spiritual, never will be done away, even as long as the world shall stand, only according to the unbelief of the children of men (Moroni 10:19)." If they start misbehaving themselves and not believing, these things will become lost. And then he tells us in verse 24 here. "And now I speak unto all the ends of the earth--that if the day cometh that the power of the gifts of God shall be done away among you, it shall be because of unbelief. And wo be unto the children of men if this be the case; [and this is a marvelous statement here]for there shall be none that doeth good among you, no not one."

In the oldest and best account of the First Vision that we have, what the Lord said to Joseph right at the beginning of the conversation was, "Behold, the world at this time lieth in sin, and there is none that doeth good, no not one. And mine anger is kindling against the inhabitants of the earth to visit them according to this ungodliness." Now we are going to see the results of that.

So, many precious things were taken away from the Old Testament as from the New Testament. For example, the Pearl of Great Price is such a clear-cut case. R.H. Charles who was the principal editor of the Book of Enoch for many years, says that nearly all writers of the New Testament were familiar with it.

|p10

He discovered that there were no less than 128 quotations in the New Testament from the Book of Enoch. But the world didn't have any Book of Enoch. What had happened to it? It is quoted as a genuine production of Enoch by Jude in the New Testament and as scripture by Barnabas, one of the seven apostolic fathers. And with the early fathers and apologists it had all the weight of a canonical book. It was scripture as far as the early church was concerned. It was included in the Bible and belonged there, but there is not a trace of it there now.

But when the men of the schools became the leaders of the church, accommodating to the contemporary philosophy, there were many things in Enoch that they did not like. Charles himself doesn't like them; he puts it as tactfully as possible here. He says, "But our book contained much of a questionable character." This was the fourth century, of course. That was the time when the University of Alexandria won a complete victory over everything. That's the Athanasian Creed. The Book of Enoch fell into discredit. Under the ban of such authorities as Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine (three of the four Latin doctors of the church—their highest authority), it gradually became lost. Notice, they banned it. They would not allow people to use the Book of Enoch, and they were the authorities. It was Hilary who made more decisions than anybody else. He said that if a thing isn't found in the scripture, you can be sure that it never happened. Unless a thing is mentioned in the Bible, it didn't happen. Now that is absolute dependence on the infallibility of the scriptures.

Joseph Smith started elaborating and bringing all these other things in, and it offended people sorely. It was the worst offense he could possibly have made. "Why do we need all this stuff?" they say. I've heard members of the Church say the same thing. But under their ban it fell into discredit and became lost to the knowledge of western Christendom until over a century ago when Sir James Bruce brought some copies back from his expedition to the sources of the Blue Nile, which he actually discovered. He brought fragments of the Book of Enoch back with some big texts, beautiful ones. And nobody knew anything about it before that. It was lost completely. But the early church treasured it as a regular scripture. It is quoted in the Book of Mormon too. This is an interesting thing, you see, because it wasn't known at that time.

But the objection to it when it came back in our own time was almost as strong as in ancient times. What was the reason for this? R. H. Charles says that the law had claimed to be the highest and final word from God. They could tolerate no fresh message from God. Again, you can see why. We have to regard the Bible as complete, final and total without one word of error because as soon as we admit that there might be one verse wrong here and there, or something incorrect, then we are in the soup because we never know when a verse is really telling us what we are supposed to learn. Is it right or is it wrong? This leads to all sorts of stuff. After all you have eight thousand ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, and no two are alike. Now which one are you going to follow? Well, you start introducing things like that and you are in trouble. So there are many precious things to be restored.

|p11

The Latter-day Saints have never realized what they have here. Neglect, I think, is an understatement as far as that goes. When the Joseph Smith papyri were acquired by the Church in 1967, a high authority, a relative of my wife, in fact, who was editor of the *Deseret News* at that time, said, "Why did Joseph Smith do that crazy thing? Why does he have to get us involved in all this Egyptian stuff?" Why does that bother us? His idea of what was important and news was a new mall or a fashion salon opened in ZCMI or something like that. Now that's news, but why are we bothered with all this ancient stuff?

And another thing is that we have always treated it as something that can be tossed off in three easy lessons. It's only sixty pages long. When I first came to BYU, many professors felt that you couldn't possibly find enough in the Pearl of Great Price to fill a whole quarter of instruction. So they divided it up with the Doctrine and Covenants. I see that we haven't taken it seriously. That is an understatement; contempt is a better word.

But we must affirm the gospel on two fronts, and this is where it's particularly valuable. The removal of the precious things by the teachers who didn't like them plunged students of the scriptures into endless theological argument. Because of the removal of the precious things, they do stumble. A very interesting case of that is Gregory the Great in 600 A.D. He was a great man and was bishop of Rome at that time. He was also called **Pater Superstitionum**, the Father of Superstitions. Well, why? Because he added all sorts of things that were not in there before. He was the one that made official the doctrine of purgatory, **igneus pergatorius**, the purgatorial fires. He noticed that people weren't completely good or completely bad. The idea was very simply that when you die you go straight to heaven or straight to hell. There's no place in between. This was the teaching of the Alexandrian School that was simplifying everything. People aren't one hundred percent good or one hundred percent bad. We are all in between. That's why we all need repentance. It's not the good guys and the bad guys—that syndrome we have today. That simplifies things, doesn't it?

So in between was purgatory where you go to be tested and tried. This was a teaching of the early church, but it wasn't purgatory there. The fires and flames purge out all impurities and sin acquired in life as Hamlet's father said. Then you are ready to pass on because you have been purged. There's why it was called the **purgatorium**. Early Christians had the same thing, but they didn't call it purgatory. They called it the **anapausus**, the **frigidarium**. The Egyptians use much the same expression. There's a very eloquent picture of it up in the museum now in the Ramses exhibit.* **Anapausus** means pause a little, take a little rest. After this life, you go to a place where you rest and take a breather. No judgment or anything at that time. But if you haven't been very good, you're going to worry at that time just the same. Alma makes it very clear when he talks about that to his son, as you know. The Roman term for it was **refrigarium**, the refrigerator, the place where you cool off, rest and relax. It was a green room. Just as we pass into this world through a Garden of Eden, we pass out of it through a garden into another world.

!p12

To soften the culture shock, you go through this state. There are some very interesting writings on that. No one pays any attention to them.

But notice that Gregory way along in 600 not only introduced that, he introduced all sorts of doctrines. They started paying more attention to miracles. They started having masses for the dead. He's the first person who introduced that. Why? Because there were great gaps. People asked questions, and there was no answer they could get from the Bible. Why not? Because they had removed all those parts. It all comes back to us now in these later documents, you see, what he was trying to supplant.

But that isn't the big thing now; that isn't the thing we value the Pearl of Great Price for. What is this big brouhaha, the scientific one, that has come forth? It burst out with particular fury in 1859 and after. That's when *The Origin of the Species* was published, and from then on to this very day, that has been the big issue. Why? Again because precious things have been taken out of the scriptures. What is the merit of The Pearl of Great Price? It has restored those precious things to the scriptures that will answer about any question you can ask about prehistoric man, time schedules of millions of years, and all that sort of thing. You would be surprised how well it handles them.

So if we had some of the precious things, it might be a different story, we might say. We wouldn't have to have this argument, this evolutionary conflict and the like. But we do have the precious things in The Pearl of Great Price, so we do tell a different story. And as a result of that we do get ourselves into trouble with the world. A good example right now of what The Pearl of Great Price has given us is that movie called "The God Makers." It just shows how offensively out of line our teachings are with conventional Christianity which wants to play it safe.

I'm going to use Hempt now. Now the purpose of religion, as I said, is to answer the terrible questions, so-called. They still bear that name. And the best definition I know of is found here in the **Clementine Recognitions**, a very old work. This is the first volume of the **Patrologia**, published in 1857. This is a battered one. We have the **Patrologia** here, about one thousand volumes of the writings of the early fathers. The purpose of the **Patrologia**, which was sponsored by the Vatican many years ago, was to publish every scrap of early Christian literature there was in chronological order. What an advantage that would be. It would be the earliest writings of all, and the earliest writing in them is where we begin here. This first volume is the writings of the so-called Clementines. Clement was the first, some say the third, bishop of Rome. The Recognitions is a novel, the first Christian novel. It is very early in the second century. It is called Recognitions because it deals with a very popular form in the ancient world. As the ancient world began to collapse (and it is so much like our own), the recognition became the most moving form of literature, and it became very common. It becomes the main theme in the comedy of manners, in the Latin comedy of Plautus and Terence, taken over from Menander, the Greek popular writer.

|p13

These were the popular plays, the popular TV soaps. But they always dealt with recognition. Families are scattered and they come together and recognize each other—the glad moment of recognition. Always moving, a real tear jerker. The parted lovers meet in the end. And so they were called the Recognitions.

This one is about a family that was scattered and was brought together by the church. This was at the time of Christ. How easily they were scattered because life was so insecure. There was no security for anybody, not even the very rich. They were in greater danger than anybody as you read from Varro. There was no defense against terrorism. And since that has become a theme in our day, let me refer you to the beginning of his great work **De re rustica**, on farming. In the days of the Republic before the Empire came in, a great land owner by the name of Varro wrote a book on farming. It begins with a number of exceedingly rich men, met in the lobby of an office building in Rome. There is a large map of Italy on the wall. They start pointing out their various holdings in it. One man says very casually, "This is my river." Another says, "This is my range of mountains here." The lands were worked by sharecroppers who were cheaper than slaves because they wouldn't have to feed them. The sharecroppers would have to feed themselves. They were the old Roman soldiers.

The wealthy men are waiting for the big man to come before the consultation can begin. He is the chairman of the board. They wait and get impatient as they talk about their business affairs. A servant comes in very upset and says, "I'm sorry, he has been murdered." They ask what happened, and the servant says, "Well he was going through the crowd with his attendants, and one of the little knife people came out of the crowd and slipped a knife into him and said, 'Oh, my, I've made a mistake; I'm sorry.' Then he ran off and disappeared into the crowd."

He had assassinated the wrong man. But here the richest man in Rome couldn't defend himself. That's what happens when you have terrorists. So if you think we are living in new times . . . What did they do about it? They appointed a man called Augustus who was very smart and very capable. He helped things out some. The Roman history is a very interesting one because it parallels our own.

Well, now we get to the terrible questions and the **Clementine Recognitions** which take us right to The Pearl of Great Price. We will continue with that the next time.

* The Ramses II exhibit from Egypt was in the Bean Museum on BYU campus when Dr. Nibley taught this class.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 2

This is the latest I have ever been, but if you are in a conversation with Professor Edwards and he starts reminiscing, when do you break off? He's good though. He's the only man alive who knew all the great ones in the early days of Egyptology.

Now we brought up this proposition that The Pearl of Great Price restores lost teachings of the gospel, the lack of which had caused everybody to stumble. (Is this a Turkish bath in here, or something? I can't see anybody.) Now as a result of these lost parts, we are told that there was great disagreement as to what the scriptures meant, and this has kept the world in turmoil for centuries. After the mid-nineteenth century, an issue largely ignored by laymen (before then it had always come up among the doctors of the schools), became the main object of controversy.

So we have these two, the doctrinal differences and the scientific ones. The question now is whether the scriptures have any value at all. First, it was how to interpret them. Now, do they have any value at all when we are dealing with the real facts of life, besides moral value, of course? The teachings would have to be restored on the basis of scientific reality or dropped entirely. This is what they interpreted. From the second century on, the schoolmen had accommodated their teachings to the teachings of the schools. It was one long, undignified retreat. Every time the school, that is the latest science of the time, changed its opinion, the theologians would change theirs to match it. It has been going on ever since then.

So the teachings of the schools were completely dominated by rhetoric. Anciently, they were the schools of rhetoric. Success schools, business schools, is what they all turned out to be. That's another story, but it's a very important one. Now the first casualty of this loss, of course, was literalism, given rights in the decline and fall. This is the situation. The most learned of the fathers by a very singular condescension have imprudently admitted the sophistry of the Gnostics, acknowledging that the literal sense is repugnant for every principle of faith as well as reason. You must never take anything literally in the Bible. They deem themselves secure and invulnerable behind the ample veil of allegory. You say a thing one way, you mean it another way. Allegory is different meanings. The classic example from the scriptures is where they speak of God coming and going. It can't possibly mean that. It's given another interpretation. It doesn't mean that he has eyes; it just means there's an awareness there. He can't be like us in any sense. When it says we are in His image, they would say that's allegorical. The very first of the fathers that started this, were men like Origen and Irenaeus. Their favorite term was the "visible image of the invisible God." He is in the image of man, but he is invisible. Of course, an image is something that you can see. But an invisible image is

|p2

what God is, they claimed. It's like saying soundless music or odorless perfume. It's a contradiction of terms to say an invisible image. Behind the veil of allegory is where they have lived ever since. Joseph Smith came along and gave us a very different story. He says he really saw the angel and gives us a clinical account, how he looked, where he stood, etc., just like the first chapter of Luke.

Well, there was a limit here. Allegory could not explain what we have mentioned before, the terrible questions. We go to the first volume of the **Patrologia** for that. What made them terrible was the insistence on a literal answer. You have to give me a straight, literal answer to this. Allegory can mean what you say it means. We started with the story of Clement in Rome when he was a young fellow. He was the first and oldest writer after the New Testament. We mentioned before there's this great collection, the **Patrologia**. We have them all, along with the Oriental **Patrologia** and others. It's over a thousand volumes. It's all the writings of the early church in chronological order, and number one is our friend Clement. He's going to be very important here. He tells us his story. And we mentioned that it was a recognition. This was a very common theme and reflects the conditions of the world. We have this today. It began with the new comedy, second and third centuries B.C., with Menander and was picked up by the Romans who made a big thing of it (Plautus and Terence). It was the story of families that had been broken up, and then they recognized each other. Recognition is a big tear-jerker, as you know. The breaking up is interesting, how kids were constantly being kidnapped, little children in crowds at festivals. The new comedy was picked up by Shakespeare. That's *The Comedy of Errors*. It was simply taken from Plautus. It's the two twins separated at different times. Shipwreck was a common one. There were lots of merchants in it, lots of traveling, the recognition by the locket. This was all through the Middle Ages, these tokens of recognition. It was the standard theme of the blood and thunder operas. A spoof by Gilbert and Sullivan makes a big thing of the recognition. The babies got mixed up at birth, and as a result the captain should have been Jack Tarr, and Jack Tarr should have been the captain. But they were twins and the nurse got them mixed up. They were separated, and you recognize them by the letter, or the token, or the wrappings, or things like that. It gives a picture of a restless world. We talked about theatromania. They were always having these big shows, big markets, etc., and children were always getting swiped. Just as people were always getting assassinated, as we mentioned last time Varro's *Re rustica*.

A child in a crowd might easily disappear, and it happened all the time. They were sold as slaves or in the thriving international sex business. It was very much like today, and it got worse and worse. Finally, the whole thing collapsed. But this was a recognition of a family that was broken up and the way they found themselves together. We have stories of this in our church history. Sooner or later they all joined the church, and that brought them all together. They never would have found each other if they hadn't independently joined the church. So he starts out telling his story, and it's a very important one because this tells us what the terrible questions are that only our Pearl of Great Price can answer.

|p3

So he starts out like, "I, Nephi, having been born of goodly parents." He writes, "**Ego Clemens in urba Roma natus.** I, Clement, born in the city of Rome, from my earliest age was a studious child and constantly concerned with certain questions. From my boyhood, I could not break myself away from thinking about these things."

It's quite common. Questionnaires show that the part of the population that worries most about nuclear war is small children. Children six, seven and eight years old worry all the time about it, which surprised the experts. Well, Clement was always worried about the big things. He says, "I don't know exactly where I started doing that or where the idea came from, but I worried about it all the time. My mortal condition bothered me." And these were the questions. First of all the big one: "whether I would have any life after death at all." If you have answered that, you have answered an awful lot, and if you can't, then you are "in the soup." You have nothing much to look forward to, and it becomes very discouraging. But this is the big question we find that nobody can escape from. You think you can, but you can't. We will refer to that later.

Well, that led to another question, a corollary of that. Well, if I live after death, will I remember? Will I be myself after death, or would I turn into some other creature? Transmigration. What's the point of living after death if you cease to be yourself and start to be somebody else? That is part of many religions, as you know, and that wouldn't satisfy him at all. So whether there is any life for me at all after death; and secondly, after I leave will I be the same person? Well, Clement plainly and simply says, "Would I have any memory of this life after, or would I turn into another person entirely?" And the third one was, "or would I forget absolutely everything? Would I simply be going into complete oblivion?" Shakespeare's last stage of all is "second childishness and mere oblivion. "Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything." The last of the seven ages of man is "his second childhood and mere oblivion." Well, the next step from that is into nothing at all, you see. Shakespeare dwells morbidly on that in *As You Like It*. But this worries him, oblivion and silence to look forward to. Or would I probably remember something of this life?

Well, along with this are the conditions which continued existence implies and requires; namely, you have to have a physical substratum, cosmology. So the next question he asks is the normal one: "**quando factus hic mundus.** When was the earth created?" Was it created? And what existed before that? Was there anything before the earth? Notice he goes into questions of cosmology from questions that seem to be theology. But if you are going to live hereafter, this is literalism. It has to be literal, first of all. He is going to tell us that the doctors of the church could give him beautiful allegories, but that didn't mean a thing. As the first apologist of the church says, "You use these things, but to us Christians they mean nothing. A thing is either what you say it is, or it isn't."

What was the world, and what was there before it? It must pass away too if it was created out of nothing. When would that be? Could it exist further?

| p4

Is that something completely beyond our thought, so we just have to drop it and not think about it. He said he would like to have forgotten it, but you can't forget about it. As A. E. Housman says, "When men betimes are sober, they think by fits and starts. And when they think, they fasten their hands upon their hearts." If you didn't have to think about it, that would be fine, but you can't escape from it.

Well, he worried about this. He started to lose weight. He got sick, just from brooding about the big one. It dogged him all the time. "My passion, my desire for this immortality just wouldn't let me alone. It wouldn't let my mind be quiet," he says. He was going around this way, and he went to the schools. His family was wealthy, so he visited the schools of the philosophers to find an answer. "I visited the philosophers' schools, and what did I hear there? Nothing but dogmatic assertions and rebuttals, and nothing but a constant wrangling and display of wits. Always displaying their skill in syllogisms, binding words together. If **A** equals **B**, **B** equals **C**, therefore God is at the end of a chain of syllogisms. And the main purpose was to show off, he says. Everyone showing his versatility. That was what they got paid for, and that's what they did. But they never really came to grips with the subject. They were always giving opinions and definitions, but what about the things themselves? He said it had nothing to do with that. "It wasn't to get into the real nature of things, but simply to show the cleverness of the defenders," he said. The schools didn't please him at all because were they really asking those questions? We're not supposed to ask them. That's really the only question we ask if we have any science, art, literature, which all try to get a picture of the world. We'll see that later.

Well, what did he do then? He started to worry about hell. This is the old Roman hell, the pagan hell. Incidentally, this is at the time of Christ because he is living in the time of the Emperor Tiberius. This is the Golden Age of Rome. Very prosperous, he can have anything he wants; but he is just worried sick. Everybody was worried sick. They started importing all sorts of religions because the state religion didn't satisfy people very much.

But what about going to hell? He heard about that. He heard these stories about **pyriphlegethon**, the fiery flood; and Tartarus, and Sisyphus and Tityus being tormented there. And Tantalus. You know his story. Any way he looked at it, it was scary. In Shakespeare's play *Measure for Measure* (which they are putting on here this spring), when Claudio doesn't want to be executed, he expresses his objections to his sister and says,

Ay, but to die, and go we know not where;
To lie in cold obstruction and to rot;
[That's not a thing to look forward to]
This sensible warm motion to become
A kneaded clod; and the delighted spirit
To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
In thrilling region of thick-ribbed ice;

|p5

You see there's Dante. The hell is ice there. It's not hot. Of course, the conventional Roman hell was fire.

To be imprisoned in the viewless winds,
And blown with restless violence round about
The pendent world . . .

Remember *Francesca da Rimini*; that was their punishment. Satan is the prince of the air. His great curse, according to very early tradition, is that he can't put his feet anywhere. He has no solid ground. He has no body. This can be very annoying. It can give you vertigo.

. . . or to be worse than worst
Of those that lawless and incertain thoughts
Imagine howling!

Notice this is purgatory. He recognizes that it's lawless. It's not in the scripture, and it's uncertain. You can't be sure about purgatory. And it has people howling. Remember Hamlet says, "You churlish priest, a ministering angel shall my sister be when thou liest howling." Then it goes on:

—'tis too horrible!
The weariest and most loathed worldly life
That age, ache, penury, and imprisonment
Can lay on nature is a paradise
To what we fear of death.

It's the worst thing you can possibly think of. So this is what scares the daylights out of him, and this is what he was worried about. What about answering these questions? Philosophy wouldn't touch them at all. And remember that shortly after this, Christian theology went completely over into philosophy. You couldn't be a bishop unless you had been trained in the rhetorical schools and knew all the tricks. That very soon became the rule.

Anyway he goes on here. These worried him. He says, "I knew they were just fairy stories, but there was just a chance. If they weren't true, then couldn't I be free to go out and have some fun?" Why behave in that case? Remember in The Book of Mormon Korihor based his whole doctrine on this one thesis that when the man dies, that is the end thereof. Therefore, they lifted up their heads and rejoiced in their wickedness. There was nothing to restrain them. It was just a moral teaching, anyway. When a man dies that is the end thereof, and all of Korihor's mischief evolves from that.

Well, Clement didn't want to misbehave. "What should I do?" he says. Then he decided that he would go to Egypt. He had money, so he went to Egypt. And then he decided to make friends with the hierants and the prophets in the temples there and go around and inquire.

|p6

They would be perfectly willing for money to do something for him. They were very indigent in the temples at that time. He would pay them to invite some spirit from the other world and then he would know that there is something hereafter. "They can teach me something about the hereafter. I know the Egyptians are always talking about it," he says. "That will at least solve the one question I want to know, whether the spirit is immortal. And I don't mean just in the spirit. I wanted to see if they could let me hear something and see something. Then I would be sure." But merely to talk about it as philosophy wouldn't satisfy him, he said. So he decided to go.

He had a good friend who was in the philosophy school, and he said, "Don't do that, whatever you do. It would be a very dangerous thing." He told him, "If nothing happens, then you will be desperate. If you don't go, then there is always the possibility that there might be something. Just leave it at that and don't do it."

He goes on with the story. He says at that time news and rumor were going around the city. It was being evangelized that the kingdom of God had appeared in Judea somewhere and there was a prophet preaching there, and that he backed up his preachings and claims by most singular prodigies and wonders. These rumors grew, and he didn't know what to make of them. He paid no attention until one day there was a street meeting. Right at the most busy crossroads in the center of Rome, here was this character preaching to all the people standing around. He was proclaiming that the Son of God had appeared in the region of Judea, promising eternal life to those who would listen to him—that he had been sent from God the Father, etc. Clement said that he spoke about matters both temporal and eternal. That was Barnabas who had come on a mission to Rome. There were some students from the university hanging around, and they started making fun of him because he spoke with a Jewish accent. They were wits, so they laughed at him and exercised some syllogisms. For example, why did God make a flea with eight legs when he made a huge elephant with only four legs to hold it up? Wouldn't that be silly of God? Then they would all roar and laugh.

Barnabas said, "Well, I could answer you and I'd like to argue with you, but I have been sent on a mission here. I can only teach what I have come to teach, and I should not be distracted. You can listen to it or you can leave it alone, but that's what I have to do."

Then they started yelling, and somebody threw rocks, and there started to be a mob. So Clement grabbed Barnabas by the hand, he says here, and dragged him into an alley nearby and they ran and got away from the mob. Then he took him home. Barnabas was very much discouraged because he hadn't had any success on his mission in Rome at all. He had to go back to a general conference which was being held in Caesarea. Clement said, "I can't go with you now. I have some business affairs to settle, but as soon as I do, I'll take a ship and follow you. Caesarea, you say; all right I'll go there."

There's a fascinating description of what the conference was like there. It's not like the other literature at all. I mean the typical church literature, miracle literature. Peter is a very real

!p7

character. He takes a swim in the ocean every morning, and he has a very good sense of humor. Clement wants to see him more than through the crowd. He finally gets a conversation with Peter who tells him some wonderful things. Peter answers the questions that he had when he started out. First, he says, "What about my father and mother? They haven't heard this; will they be damned because they never had the chance?" Peter said, "Now, you are asking me to tell you things that you will learn later on, but I'm not going to tell you about now. You will understand what our work for the dead is like when we get to that part." And Peter satisfies Clement's mind on all things.

These are the questions he asks, you see. And so we start out this one with the literalism. I have arranged here, which I have never used before, in chronological order this argument. We only need to touch it at a few points to show what this is. Namely, the things to watch are this. The early church was very literal minded. The doctors hated it and got rid of it. And then they had to restore a lot, but they restored it in a different department. They brought it back again after the manner of the schools. It has always been changing since. But the main thing was to keep it allegorical so that we would be safe, as Gibbon says, behind the broad veil of allegory.

One of the first things Peter says to Clement is this: "We affirm there is absolutely nothing evil in matter." Because this was the doctrine, you see. God had to be immaterial and had no contact with material at all. This was Neoplatonism, not Platonism. Plato was different. But Neoplatonism was that matter is bad and evil, and spirit is everything that isn't matter. So the only definition that they ever gave of God was the **asomaton**, "that which has no body." The bodiless one was God. That was all you could say about him, as Origen says. And you could see they had a legitimate reason for regarding material and the flesh as loathsome because that's the way everybody was behaving in those days. It was a period of decline, and they took it for granted that if people had bodies they would misbehave and do anything that felt good. That's what they were doing, and we have a rich literature on that, of course. The idea was that anything material was absolutely defiling; it was vicious. So you get to the Neoplatonists with the doctrine that even any contact with matter would defile God himself. Well, how could God have made the universe then? He made a physical world, after all. Oh no, that was made by the thirty Eons. So there are thirty steps between God and the final creator. And that was a mistake, you see. That was Sophia. The final Eon was Sophia, and she misbehaved. Being female, she wanted to rule things. She went wild in space, and the Lord gave her no more support. She had a terrible abortion and brought forth a lot of filthy matter, and from that the world was made. So God is not responsible for this world, not at all. He is pure unmatter, according to Neoplatonists. They are rabid on that particular subject. That is why it is so revolutionary when Peter says, "We affirm absolutely that there is nothing evil in matter," thus countering the favorite claim of the Neoplatonists and Gnostics.

The earliest Christian apologist, Aristides, will not waste his time arguing about abstractions, he says. "We Christians simply will not accept any allegorical explanations." That's all they use in the Middle Ages later on. There are the four interpretations of things that Thomas

|p8

Aquinas gives us. There are the seven trophies of Tyconius, the rhetorical devices used in the schools, which Saint Augustine says are the keys to Christian preaching. We adopt those. We adopt the method of rhetoric preaching, using all sorts of tricks. The seven means of saying something when you mean something else. These become the principal tools of Christian teaching, according to St. Augustine, the greatest of all Christian teachers, both for Protestants and Catholics. And he used them certainly. That's in his great work called *De Doctrina Christiana*, "The Teaching of the Christian Faith." But before him Aristides said, "We just will not accept allegorical explanations. They are simply myths and nothing else, because you make them up."

But the next apologist to follow him was the famous Justin Martyr, the first person to join the church who was a real first-class philosopher from the outside. They were very proud to get him. He never laid aside his philosopher's robe that he acquired in the schools. He was the first philosophical martyr. He's called a martyr for that reason. But he had grown up in the schools. And he turns the whole thing around. He insists that the Christians have as much right to allegory as the Greek myths do. "We have as much right to the myths as you do. It's really the Greeks who taint their allegory with a touch of the physical," he says. "The Greeks imply that there might be something physical in their myths where there's nothing physical in any of ours," he said. So he had shifted from the days of Aristides.

Some influential teachers who followed wanted to have it both ways. Early Christians said that God and the heavenly spirit world must be thought of as physical. It's interesting that Bousset, the very stout Catholic defender of this position, says, "Nevertheless, the early Christians thought of God and the spirit world as physical," while he himself does not share the view.

Later on, at the end of the second century, there was Clement of Alexandria, and he became the big name. Quoting Bousset still: "In Clement of Alexandria the old teachings began to shrink to a purely intellectual content until he spiritualizes the sacraments to the point of being incomprehensible, nothing but a mere game of words." Well, Bousset, the most eminent Catholic writer, says that's what it became. Did they ever get out of it? No, this has become the rule ever since.

Tatian, who has given us his four versions of the gospel, informs us that it was the pagan philosophers who laughed at the Christian anthropomorphism. Tatian is another very early one, and he says, "What the pagan philosophers laughed at in Christianity was its anthropomorphism" (the idea that God should look like a body), showing that the Christians did teach that—the anthropomorphic God. The schools of the philosophers laughed at it, so they turned around and joined the schools. Still, Tatian ends up on their side, as does Minucius Felix who comes a little later. Next to anthropomorphism, the first thing the intellectuals and Gnostics denied was the physical resurrection. They could not tolerate that idea. We read in the newly found Bodmer Papyrus, number ten (a Coptic papyrus found in Egypt from the very early days of the church). It's supposed to be Third Corinthians, Paul's third letter to the Corinthians. Some people think it is genuine.

|p9

But it's against these Gnostics. The great sin of the Gnostics was to dematerialize everything, and this is what we find in the Bodmer Papyrus, for example. It gives a number of false doctrines taught by the Gnostics, and the first one is that there is no physical resurrection. The second is that God created a physical world; we can't have that. They just ruled out everything physical. The early apologist Athenagoras objects. He said, "Life would be an utter waste without the resurrection. It's the resurrection which gives everything in human life its meaning."

And the greatest of all theologians was Origen. He was born and grew up on the campus of the University of Alexandria. You notice he has a good Egyptian name (born of Horus). He flourished in 230 A.D. and was a dedicated student and a phenomenal person. When he became a Christian, he took over the doctrines, but he couldn't agree with a lot of them. But he does give us what they are. He tells us, "This is what the Brethren taught. This is what they used to teach in the church." And so he is a valuable source. Back in the year 80, Celsus had written a scathing attack on the church, and Origen years after gave a reply. But in the process of replying to Celsus, he has to tell the things that Celsus accused the Christians of teaching. So this reply to Celsus is the best source we have of what the earliest Christians taught, next to the Bible itself and the **Clementine Recognitions**.

Origen is honest enough to report what the early Christians believed. Because he was always giving away what they believed, he lost his chance to become a saint or a doctor of the church, although he is the most influential. He contributed enormous writings. Augustine is nothing but a paraphrase of Origen who lived earlier. He kept seven stenographers (beautiful girls, incidentally) at work taking dictation all day long. He answered all the questions in the book. He was enormously productive. Keeping the seven beautiful stenographers working is something to be said in his favor. He is the one that says, "All you can think of of God is that he has no body. He can have nothing physical about him at all." Origen himself was so averse to it that he wouldn't eat anything. Somebody gave him an inheritance of some sort, and he would spend a penny or two a day for a few grains of wheat. He would eat them and vomit them up, disgusted with his own physicalness. It was anorexia, you see. People really do get as crazy as that. He had that problem, and he looked it. He was very skinny and cadaverous. But that's not what the early Christians believed.

When he was seventeen years old, they were running down Christians in Alexandria. His father didn't want him to go leave the house, so he hid all his clothes. Origen was very modest, so that was effective. But more than anything else, Origen will not allow holiness to anything corporeal. He says the resurrection can only be spiritual, a non-physical resurrection. There it is again, your **asomaton**, your invisible image, your unphysical resurrection. "When God's voice spoke from the heavens, it was not a real voice," he says, "since only the elect heard it." Already he is allegorizing—the great Origen. "The doctrine that God and the Son go to and from the earth is quite offensive," he says, "but only if one takes it literally." Well, no doctrine is offensive if you don't take it literally.

|p10

There's nothing wrong with saying, "thou shalt not commit adultery," or why not say, "you shall commit adultery?" Don't take it literally though; then you're all right, you're safe. And this is what they are doing, deliteralizing everything. "Now, we know as well as you do," he tells his pagan opponent, Celsus, "that God does not move; so how could he go from place to place? In the **Parousia**, 'the return of the Lord,' God does not descend to the earth in a topical sense but only in a mental sense." You think of Him as being here and He is here. Well, that is the way he talks.

Lactantius is the first of the Latin fathers and the best Latinist. He left the church as so many of the earlier ones did. St. Augustine did too for nine years. He said, "We don't have the old doctrine anymore." Lactantius left the church and joined a pious group that tried to live the original order of Christianity. There were lots of people doing that in his time. This is only the sixth volume of the Greek **Patrologia**, you see. Lactantius wrote, "Whoever desires the highest good, let him desire to live without a body, for matter is evil."

After noting that the Scribes and Pharisees reject the Old Testament references to Christ because they would not accept his being born in a physical body, Hilary can still affirm that the physical resurrection of the righteous is a contradiction. (Now this is St. Hilary who lived up in Gaul and had great influence on the editing of the scriptures.) To rise with sinful bodies would be to be saved into nothing, he would say. A physical resurrection is only for the wicked; they deserve it. This is what the great Hilary was teaching about the resurrection. It was just for the wicked. Isn't that a promise?

Rufinus is very important. He translated all the earliest Greek writers in the fourth century into Latin so the Latin people could read them. Clement of Rome has come to us in writings that Rufinus has given us. The Greek part has been lost in some of them, not all of them. He says that after the resurrection all will be spirit, no bodies. Well, what's the point of having a resurrection? Here's another one of those flat contradictions.

Eusebius goes all the way. "Any appearance of God must necessarily be an intellectual and a spiritual one," he says. Bluntly, "Christ did not die." This is Eusebius, the father of church history. He is the greatest source we have for church history. He was a personal friend of the Emperor Constantine. He tells us about the Council of Nicaea, and he was there. He lived in 325 A.D. (It's awfully warm in here, isn't it? I can't think. Will everybody go to sleep and make it unanimous? I know a few people are doing it. Then it doesn't bother me if I stumble around here because then nobody is bothered, and neither am I.)

But I think these references are interesting. I raise them in chronological order. This is the progress of the church. It starts very early. Can you imagine Eusebius of Caesarea saying bluntly, "Christ did not die; he did not suffer the death of a common criminal." He said, "Prophets, apostles, and high priests are still in the church, but we see them all with the pure

|p12

It's more real to have Jesus in there than out there. "When everything dissolved into abstractions, it left an uncomfortable feeling behind. The generation that rids itself once and for all of the old literalizers of which Jerome speaks. . ." Jerome lived in a monastery in Bethlehem for fifteen years and knew the Christians at Jerusalem. There were old groups that still hung on. He called them the old-fashioned Christians, the literalizers. They would take you up to the top of the Mount of Olives and show you a plot that the church owned where they said the temple was going to be built when Christ came again. This was the sort of thing they taught, and Jerome was shocked. "Whom Jerome speak of crave no other, the presence of physical objects to tie them to the reality of the scriptures." (That's in the fourth century.) In his day everybody started making a pilgrimage because they wanted contact with something that was physical. They went to the temple site, but Jerome says, "Don't go to the site of the temple in Jerusalem. Does not the sepulcher of the Lord appear more venerable to you? In the resurrection you have heard that all things will be without bodies. (This is from the eleventh volume of the **Patrologia**.) There is a passage that says this is what we will do when we are resurrected. Of course, we must be resurrected physically because the scripture says we will. So you will rise up with your body, but as soon as it is completely incorporated and put together, it will start to melt and dissolve and presently go away so you won't be bothered with it anymore. So that accounts for the resurrection and makes it spiritual at the same time. He says, "All things will be without bodies for they will have no need of them, and all matter will return to the **nihilum** [the nothing] from which it was once made. All matter came out of nothing originally and with the resurrection will all be restored, and then it will return to nothing."

Jerome admits though that Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius—the earlier fathers, all believed what the old Christians believed: that the Saints would reign with the Lord after the resurrection in the flesh. Yet he approves of pilgrim ladies who piously lick the place where the Lord lay in the holy sepulcher as they groan and sob. In the fourth century people started making pilgrimages to Palestine, and the church tried to stop them. Do you know there is not a single writing of the Catholic or Protestant churches that encourages pilgrimages to the Holy Land because it is an act of no faith. If you really think that these things have been taken care of and the church is established, you wouldn't have to go back there to look for some tangible contacts. That argues a lack of faith in the institution. The church fought it all the time, but the pilgrims started going and continued to go. They would go up to the top of the Mount of Olives, the place where the Lord would come back again, and look up to heaven and weep. That was where the Lord was last seen, and they wanted a physical contact with what was there. Jerome says, "Go to the holy sepulcher instead. Don't go to the place where the Lord left."

Incidentally, Lady Sylvia, a very rich Gallic woman of the fourth century, went on foot to all these places in a long flowing black robe. She had a terrific personality and scared everybody to death. She visited all the holy places, but at the same time she visited the place where Andromeda was chained to the rock and Perseus rescued her. That was just as real to her.

|p11

eye of our minds." Notice, we don't need literal prophets or apostles; we don't need a high priest; we see them in our minds, and that's adequate. That's better than the other kind. They use that argument a great deal. He mocks one Marcellus for teaching that God has a body like a man and his foolish teaching that Christ made human flesh immortal through the power of the resurrection. These are all quotations from Eusebius. He applauds the nobility and good taste of the Greeks and Romans, the pagans, for interpreting their own deities allegorically. "We Christians should take a lesson from them and interpret our gods the way they do," he says.

Notice, they knew that the Greeks and Romans didn't take their night life of the gods very seriously. Those were inventions of the poets very largely. But this became the main weapon of the church, idolatry, plurality of gods. They never believed in that, but they had to have something to make it appear that they had departed from the old ways and that they were more righteous and more severe, and spiritual, etc. "We don't believe in all those idols and all those immoral gods." Well, as I say, the ancients didn't either. Their gods were something very different in the mysteries, the ordinances and various celebrations. Now we have great literature on them. We didn't have it before. Before now we have been going on the poets.

Eusebius says it is unholy to say that matter is unbegotten or was only organized at the creation. Notice what they were preaching—that matter was not created and was only organized at the creation. It wasn't created out of nothing; it was organized, which is what we teach. He says that's what the early church taught, but it's unholy to say it. "The real human is an intellectual, bodyless, immaterial, rational being, and as such only is he in the image of God," he wrote. And then he reveals himself in the seventh book of the history. He says that it's the simple, old-fashioned Christians who believe in the old literalism. We're much too intellectual for them; we leave that all behind. We don't need that anymore.

What marks the fourth century, as Alfoldi puts it, is "the victory of abstract ways of thinking—the universal triumph of theory, which knows no half measures. The Gnostic idea of the body as a prison is entirely at home with the doctors of the church. They love it because matter is vile."

Now there was a very righteous old guy. He and his followers got quite close to the early church, and they suffered a lot of persecution for it. They were noted for their old-fashioned ways. He left the main church because of the immorality of the clergy and stuck to a literal interpretation of the scriptures. Even to believe, says Epiphanius, that we actually are in God's image. That actually refers to Adam's body. Three exclamation points Epiphanius puts in there. He listed over eighty of these heresies that carried over from the third century. He is writing in the fourth century. Everyone had his own doctrine and was preaching in his own way. But the thing to do was to leave out anything literal, physical, or material—anything that smacks of Mormonism.

St. Augustine goes all the way. "Christ is with us if we believe. His dwelling in you is more real than if he were outside you before your eyes."

|p13

Although it didn't belong to the gospel, she felt she might as well see the place, in her attire of course. And she also visited the cell of Sarah and saw the cradle of Isaac and things like that. "And what goes on at the tomb of the Saints," Jerome said, "such a howling and yelling and lamentation you can't imagine." Just like there were at some festivals in India where people yell their heads off and rant and carry on. What strange pilgrimages. No wonder they shouldn't go.

"Why should we not honor relics in view of the Psalms?" he asks. "Why should dead bones be considered pollution?" It's odd that they turned to bones because they wouldn't accept the physical and the literalness of the gospel. Then they turned and went full blast for relics. They had to be tangible things—a cradle, a house, especially bones. "Why should they be considered pollution?" Jerome says. "Elijah raised a dead body, and it wasn't a dead body anymore after he did that." Well, anyway these go on and on.

St. Basil, annoyed by the physical component of Christ, too physical to be the highest, said, "I believe the resurrection to be the transition from his physical **gnosis** to his incorporeal **theoria**. That's a pure Aristotelian expression. **Theoria** is pure contemplation, just mind and nothing else. St. Basil is one of the three great Cappadocians and one of the four doctors of the church. There are only eight doctors, and he is one of them. They laid the foundations of Christian doctrine. And he says, "I believe the resurrection to be the transition from this physical gnosis to incorporeal theoria." No body, nothing but just mind.

"Angels do not have tongues or bow the knee," said Severus. "Away with the thought. They are figures of speech. Christ ate and drank after the resurrection only to show that he was not a fantasy, that he was physical." (That's a strange thing.) The wine and food really represented his teachings. He didn't really eat, but he had to represent that he wasn't a fantasy, so he ate to show that he was physical; but what he really ate was his teachings. That's the way they argue. But you notice that there is a formidable defect here, and only the Pearl of Great Price can fill this gap for the present time. We'll get on to particular things here. We have never referred to this before, but I think it is important because we don't realize that. In the controversies that are raging today, they talk about the crazy Mormons being Gnostics ("The God Makers," etc.). That's exactly the way they talked about the early Christians. It was the doctors of the church who talked that way, and they are the ones to whom the Christian world is dedicated. John Knox and Luther quote these fathers as the authorities just as often as they quote the Bible. They prove everything by these fathers. None of the first and second century. All after the fourth century.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 3

You notice that I am mentioning sources all over the place. Some of those sources are available here. The main reason I'm giving you all this stuff is that they have not been available. Nobody has ever paid any attention to them, as a matter of fact. They've never been viewed from this point of view, and we have been collecting them because our whole thesis this semester with the Pearl of Great Price is that it represents a great gap, a vast amount of scripture that has been neglected and lost, but has now been found, and we refer to that. Now these fathers refer to the lost scripture and refer to earlier times. We talked about the early Christians; then the later times when they threw it all away; then after that when they tried to get it all back again coming in at a different angle. We were talking about literalism.

Now as to the sources, half the books from last semester are still on reserve. All the sources I mentioned were the fathers before the Nicaean Council in 325 A.D. They are the early fathers. They are not the apostolic fathers which come immediately after the church, the seven of them, but the so-called ante-Nicaean fathers. They are available in one collection. We have three copies of them in the library, actually. I spent a whole hour at the library this morning, and they weren't able to locate any one of them. But we do have three sets of the ante-Nicaean fathers and they should be on reserve on the fourth floor. Then there are other sources that we mention as we go. That includes the apostolic fathers too.

We were talking about the importance of literalism here. This is where we differ from all the other churches in taking it literally. Well, why shouldn't you take it literally? Gregory of Nyssa puts it this way, "If we soar in language and stand above the arch of heaven, we shall find there the supracelestial earth and also those who gape after sensual enjoyment and ask shall we have teeth or other members hereafter? The answer is yes since the scriptures are perfectly clear. We shall have all our members, but we will not make use of them."

You had to have your cake and eat it. They knew the scriptures made it clear that there would be a physical resurrection, so you had to have your eyes, ears, teeth, organs, and dimensions; but you would never have any use of them because you would be resurrected. You had to be a spiritual being then. This is an awkward answer. Now Gregory of Nyssa was one of the greatest. Professor Jaeger spent all the last years of his life editing Gregory of Nyssa who had already been edited by Benedictus Nursia. It's a massive work which you can't find here. You'll find it in the old edition of the **Patrologia**, but it has never been translated. You won't find it anywhere, so we won't bother about that. But he was a very important father. He was especially interested in **teleiotes**, the idea of being initiated. The temple ordinances were an obsession with him. He could never get them out of his system, but he didn't know what they meant.

|p2

The great John Chrysostom is one of the doctors of the church. There are only eight doctors of the church—four Greek doctors and four Latin doctors. They are the ones that really give us the basic theology of the modern Christian world—Catholic, Protestant, and all the rest of them. They are ones who are constantly cited, for example, in the controversies of the Scholastics and also in the controversies of the Reformation. The reformers referred to them every bit as much. In fact, they used the doctors more than the priesthood before them in the Middle Ages who were not nearly so learned. Notice they don't include some of the great ones like Origen, but they include two cousins, Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Basil, and then this John Chrysostom and Athanasius, of course. He was present at Nicaea, and he was the one that gave the Christians the Athanasian Creed. This creed tells you that God is three, and yet he is not three, he is one; the Father and the Son are the same, yet they're not the same; they're different, yet they're not different. And it clarifies things beautifully and led to hundreds of years of controversy, the Nicean Creed.

So those are the four Greeks and the four Latins. Notice that they come very close together. Two of them are cousins. Then the Latin fathers are even closer together. There's the great St. Augustine; and his teacher was Ambrose, the bishop of Milan. Ambrose was a rhetorician, long before he joined the church. His rhetoric was always interesting. Augustine converted him finally. Then there was his friend and contemporary, Jerome. They died just fifteen years apart. Jerome spent fifteen years in Palestine, lived in a monastery at Bethlehem, and translated the Bible—the official Vulgate Catholic Bible. Incidentally, we wouldn't have any Bible at all today without him. The King James translation goes back to the Vulgate because at the time the King James was made, nobody could read Greek very well. They didn't understand it at all. And Hebrew was almost out of the question. Look at how they laughed at Scaliger. They were good scholars, but there were problems. In the Beza manuscript there was one verse missing at the end of Mark, and the great Erasmus supplied it by writing what the Greek words would have been. In that one short verse, he made nine bad grammatical mistakes, which shows you how well they understood the text anyway.

The writers of the King James version, which is the most glorious prose work in the English language, leaned heavily on Luther's Bible, and Luther leaned heavily on the Vulgate, the Latin Bible, because that much they could read. But they had late texts. This isn't a class in the Bible, but this is why these people believed these things and why they lost all the stuff we have in the Pearl of Great Price that is so important. You have those three doctors, and then way off in 600 A.D. you have Gregory the Great whom we mentioned before. He was called **Pater Superstitionum**, "the Father of Superstition," because he introduced all sorts of things into the picture that were necessary to fill in the gaps that the loss of the earlier teachings had left.

John Chrysostom left us lots of writings, and he is a wonderful writer. He says, "How can God have a tangible body? Such a mystery can be viewed only with fear and trembling. We can't understand it." Elsewhere he says he doubts that the angels can understand it; nobody can.

|p3

Well, actually Origen uses that argument. But they never could break away from it because the scriptures wouldn't allow it. John Chrysostom (which means "golden mouth") was the great orator of his time and lived to the beginning of the fifth century. He says, "The old Christians had to have physical miracles and presences, those simple-minded boobs. We don't believe like the early church." They were proud of having advanced from the primitive doctrine. That's why there was another de-eschatologizing of Christianity after World War II because the German Lutheran scholars were very much disillusioned by the terrible things that had happened. So led by Rudolf Bultmann they said, "Well, we must de-eschatologize." In fact, Albert Schweitzer in his **Leben Jesu** started that. He says, "After all, they were primitive people. They didn't know **A** from **B**. We'll have to get rid of the superstitious part of the Bible—the miracles and the idea that Christ is the Son of God." He was a great moral teacher, and that was as far as you could go. And so you had the de-eschatologizing—taking all the supernatural element out of religion, and what do you have left?

But then in the 1950s and '60s they had this reaction, along with the Ecumenical Council. How can we say we are Christians if we don't believe what the early Christians believed? Call yourself anything you want, but don't call yourself a Christian because you say those people were crazy and didn't know what was what. But already you have that in writers like Jerome. He talks about the old-fashioned Christians. So Chrysostom says, "How about these things? We can't go along with the old Christians. They had to have physical miracles and presences." You will not find translations of John Chrysostom either, too bad. We have him in the **Patrologia** here, two different editions. He has seventeen volumes in it. It's a massive work, and you can find out all sorts of things.

Do you realize that the fourth century is far better documented than the fourteenth century, or even the nineteenth century in church history? It's marvelous; we have everything that went on at the time when the church was lost, when Constantine took over. The fourth century libraries are tremendous. We have all their personal letters and reflections. Eusebius' table talk with the Emperor Constantine, and Constantine explaining to him what he has in mind. It's like some intimate, in-depth reporter for a TV documentary. We have all these notes from the early church at this time of transition. What value! And nobody ever reads them. Why not? Well, because the church was set on its way. Its pattern is established. No minister ever looks at these or even knows of their existence. It's very puzzling and rather embarrassing to talk to them. But they feel that has all been settled now. They have their creeds, and the concern of any minister or pastor is with his flock and the duties he has to carry out as far as going into the fine points of doctrine is concerned,

So Joseph Smith came along with all this, claiming that he had literally seen the Father and the Son. Imagine what a tremendous cultural shock that would be. If he wanted to say the worst thing he possibly could, that was it. So John Chrysostom repeatedly invites the members to see angels and martyrs with the eyes of their intellect and not to expect that angels and martyrs were real people. He said that the older Christians had to have that sort of thing. "Those simple

|p4

souls lacked the intellectual capacity for the incorporeal [or non-material] gifts. They had to have miracles because, unlike us, they had not learned to see with the mind and faith alone." Just as if the Christians of the fifth century were an improvement on the days of the apostles. They actually speak patronizingly of the apostles. "We go to school and we understand these things."

And then here is a very frank statement, "If we no longer have revelation, we have something better." And what do you think is better than revelation? "We have something better than revelation," he says. "We've gone away from that old physical stuff to a spiritual realm; we have the bones and relics of the martyrs." Talk about going back to the physical, the tangible. Only this time they're not even alive; there's just a lot of dead rubble here. You can see them by the thousands around the Mediterranean, these dried, withered bones—a rather hideous sort of thing. That's far better than revelation, he says, to have those bones which the demons fear.

He uses one argument for the fact that they still have the Holy Ghost in the church though. He says, "When I go into a big church very late at night, and it is dark, I sort of get scared." That proves there's a Holy Ghost, you see, because there is a spiritual experience—a thrill of spirit. He says, "Any city that contains the bones of the Saints is absolutely impregnable." Of course, they believed that until the cities started falling before the Moslems like moths before the flame. And this was from a man who held physical things in utter loathing. "The church is all because it does not exist physically, but in the spirit. Heavenly things, being incorporeal, are seen only in the intellect. The Lord is near; he is here, but never visibly. That is not what is meant by the coming of the Lord or his appearance," he says. They called that chiliasm which is the belief that the Lord would come and reign for one thousand years. They believed it in the early church, and then it became a heresy. Four hundred thousand Donatists in North Africa were put to death because they believed in it, with the approval and by the recommendation of the great St. Augustine who himself was an African. He was the bishop of Hippo. These Donatists were teaching the wrong thing, so they got rid of them. The emperor's troops went out, urged on by Augustine, and slaughtered four hundred thousand of them for believing that Christ would come again. That's a strange procedure, isn't it. If you want a reference, this is in the sixtieth volume of the **Patrologia**, twenty-sixth column. He goes on, "But that is not what is meant by his coming. After the resurrection, the Apostles no longer asked the Lord what would be the sign of his coming or the end of the world. They knew he had already arrived, and he would not answer save by promising the Holy Ghost. He would never come again." He goes on like this.

Then Nicephorus comes next, and Gregory the Great is the latest of the great doctors of the church. They want it both ways. They say in the seventy-ninth volume of the **Patrologia**, "Since there is no such thing as a bodiless body or an imageless image [we talk about the body of Christ and about man in God's image], what's the solution? Christ must still have a body, but one having nothing in common with what we can possibly imagine as a body." St. Nilus says the same thing. And the Venerable Bede, who died on my birthday (no coincidence at all) in the year 735 in England, was one of the greatest of all the fathers.

|p6

about being here (aside from the fact that he couldn't get coffee in the cafeteria) is that you people seem to take your religion much more seriously than the Anglicans do. My answer was, "Everybody takes religion more seriously than the Anglicans do." It's not considered self-respecting to take it too seriously with them. But he's a great man.

So at the beginning of the century, scholars began devoting themselves to the rediscovery of the Jesus of history who had nothing of the supernatural about him, we are told in this article. This started out especially with Albert Schweitzer. Ten years later, it had been not only abandoned but discarded with contempt, only to return twenty years after that with the doctrine we have today: The materials in the Gospels have survived only as expressions of faith, not as historical data. Jesus has become a mere saving event; he has ceased to be a person. He cites Rudolf Bultmann. "It was a choice between that and the common view that Jesus was a teacher of ethics who represented the highest level then reached by Judaism and that later Christology is mainly the work of Paul." It doesn't go back to Jesus at all. So we get these things that set us apart, back to Bultmann and the rest.

I have so many friends who are devoted to Reinhold Niebuhr. He says, "The biblical eschatology, the miraculous part of the Bible, the supernatural, the hereafter etc. must be taken seriously but not literally," You don't take it literally, you see, but you take it seriously. Well, if you don't take it literally, you don't take it seriously, as Aristides said. It was like Yigael Yadin, who was a commander in the Israeli war in 1948. He was here and we were down at Kent Brown's house. We talked all night with Yigael Yadin, who was the editor of the Dead Sea Scrolls. His father discovered them. He died recently, but he was the commander of the Israeli forces at that time. He said, "In Israel we don't believe in miracles, but we count on them. We never could have got through these wars if it hadn't been for miracles," he said. "So we don't believe in them, but we count on them."

E. M. Dahl was a Danish scholar who collected all this stuff—the biggest single collection of writings on early Christianity. He reaches the conclusion of **anthrosomatism**; it is a real body that rises in the resurrection (that Christ had), but not the same body that we have here. And he says, "This assumes that the mind of modern man is more likely to have the right insight into truth and reality than that of his ancient forebears." That's the basic thesis: modern man with his education surely knows more than those people knew. But about these things?

Soggin is a very active Christian archaeologist, and he says, "Why not call a spade a spade. There are those today who will go right back to the old literalism. The story of salvation only exists when we are dealing with reality, not with later artificial workings-over. As Hesse says, "only that interests us which actually happened. Everything else, not at all or incidentally." It doesn't interest us at all if it didn't actually happen, which is exactly what Aristides says at the beginning. And E. C. Rust says, "We must still hold to historical, bodily, and even physical resurrection without being crudely material." There you are again; we want to believe in

!p5

He wrote in England, and he was finishing his Gospel of John as he expired. He was trying to write quickly and get to the last verse before he died. He said that it was to teach the Apostles that Christ appeared to them in the palpable body and ate with them. To teach them what, if he had no body, but was a spirit? Can you follow that line of argument? He came to them; he asked for food to eat; he brought the fish and cooked it on the fire; and he ate with them. Whenever he appeared after the resurrection, he asked for food and ate with them. He said, "A spirit hath not flesh and bone as you see me have." That was to teach them that he had no body of flesh and bone, but was a spirit. Well, we don't want to be slowed down with this kind of logic too long.

Do they still follow this crazy line of argument in Christianity today? Well, there's an article by Wuttke in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche wissenschaft* which says, "The allegory with the self-congratulating pleasure of thought manipulation; the games which become ideas, which become a mechanical idea of verbal inspiration." You see, by using words and learning phrases, that's the equivalent of inspiration. ". . . a mechanical idea of verbal inspiration. To be rapt away from matter, that is the longing of the Christian Greek; it is St. Ambrose's cup of the spirit, which from heaven is held out to the earth."

Now, there are two brothers Hugo Rahner and Karl Rahner who say that the longing of the Christian is "to be rapt away from matter," to be taken away from matter. They still cling to that. They are the two most eminent Catholic theologians today. They say the main object and desire of being a Christian is that you won't be contaminated or concerned with matter at all, with the physical universe. And Arnold Lunn, who in the 1930s was the stoutest defender of the Roman Catholic theology, says, "Thomas Aquinas, starting from the universally admitted truth that it is certain and obvious to our senses that some things are in motion, proceeds to deduce the existence of God." Something is in motion; is there nothing literal in that? Well, then he says, "If one resorts to the easy, self-contradictory expedient of denying the manifold of finite things has any existence . . ." As Lovejoy writes, all problems disappear at a stroke if you say that. We make it just allegory; we get nowhere. Arnold Lunn cites Jerome's remark that the idea of God sitting on a throne is superstitious nonsense. Thomas Aquinas is the greatest medieval philosopher, and he says that it's superstitious nonsense, yet his own blessed assurance is Aquinas starting out from universally admitted truth that if it is obvious to our senses that things move, then God exists. He proves the existence of God purely logically by the fact that things move. Arnold Lunn entitled his big work *The Revolt from Reason*—that everybody but the scholastic philosophers of the Middle Ages had no theology and no religion at all because they revolted from reason in wanting to talk about a physical God, physical heaven and things like that. That was the revolt from reason. The idea of God in heaven is superstitious nonsense.

But things have changed now. Scholars at the beginning of this century, we read in a recent *Expository Times*, the official document of the Episcopal Church in England . . . Incidentally, I had a conversation with I.E.S. Edwards yesterday. The thing that impresses him so much

|p7

the physical resurrection, but not crudely material. Nothing like that. It reminds us of Bottom in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*. He is going to take the lion's part, but he will frighten the ladies with his terrible roar. He says, "No, I'll be careful not to frighten the ladies. I will roar as gently as any sucking dove." It's the same thing here. We don't want to be too material, but we must be material about it. St. Augustine could never explain infant damnation. These children weren't baptized, so they had to be damned. He says, "They'll be damned, they'll be damned, they'll be damned all the way—but with a light damnation." They have to have it both ways.

If we recognize this literalism, it takes us to this very important basic doctrine of a preexistence, on which there is an awful lot. You see how the preexistence comes out if we accept the literal existence—if we don't believe in creation out of nothing. This emphasis on preexistence and seemingly redundant repetition is driving home the realization that knowing who we really are is the only thing that can put everything into its proper perspective. And, of course, it's a big thing in the Pearl of Great Price. The key to understanding knowledge is that we are eternally spiritual. Now, what did the early church teach about that? The Egyptians were great on it.

As Donner says, The basic teaching which we find in the Proverbs of Solomon—the speaker was in the presence of God before the foundation of the earth—is found among the Egyptians; and you see a lot of it there. The earliest texts are the pyramid texts, aside from the **Shabako Stone**. These are the oldest books in the world, and they are huge. Incidentally, as Professor Edwards tells me (he is the authority on the pyramids, and he is here now), they are working on the pyramids of the fifth and sixth dynasty now, and they are discovering new pyramid texts everyday. We have thousands of them, and this is all back before 2400 B.C. This comes from the Old Kingdom. This is what they believed way back there. These are the oldest documents in the world, and it isn't just a few fragments; it's a library.

In the pyramid texts we read this, for example: "The pharaoh was conceived by his father when there was as yet no heaven, nor earth, nor people, nor birth of the gods, nor were there any dead. And every individual existed when the plan of the ancient Lord of heaven was not yet formulated." It speaks of a primordial mother, how the one became three, and how before all that we were together in his presence. "My name is the son of the Primordial God." These are from the pyramid texts and go right over into the coffin texts without a break here. "I existed before I was born, when the gods did not exist, when as yet there was no bird trap, when the cattle were not yet lassoed. I was formerly; I was of yesterday, a great one among the great and noble ones." The ordinary person puts this on his coffin (well, this is nobility here). One thinks of Abraham 3:23. He saw many that were great and noble. "Thou art one of them," the Lord tells Abraham. Well, you get this all through the Egyptian stuff. Here is a coffin text: "Before I was born by hand or born of woman, he created me in the midst of his perfection, which caused to jubilate those who shared in the secrets." When we were created in the preexistence, remember the sons of God shouted for joy and all the morning stars sang together. That's the creation hymn, and it's often referred to in these writings.

|p8

The thing most often referred to in early writings is this creation hymn—the hymn of joy that was sung at the creation to celebrate the plan which was now accepted and would begin to be operative. And we were there. There's also a great deal of that in the Dead Sea Scrolls. But the fact that this is in the very earliest Egyptian stuff is interesting.

We mentioned the **Clementine Recognitions** before. When Peter is explaining the gospel to Clement for the first time, he tells about the plan "which He of his own good pleasure announced in the presence of all the first angels which were assembled before Him. Last of all He made man whose real nature, however, is older and for whose sake all this was created." That's the preexistent man. Moses 6:51 says..."I made the world and men before they were in the flesh." And so we have many passages of this from the early writings. Going back to the **Clementine Recognitions**, "This world was made so that the number of spirits predestined to come here when their number was full could receive their bodies and again be conducted back to the light." So if they were conducted back after they finished their testing here, they must have been there before.

The **Pastor of Hermas** is the earliest of the seven apostolic fathers we mentioned before. This was discovered at the end of the nineteenth century. It teaches that the Christian should so live to be ready to renounce the prince of this world at any time and betake himself back to the Lord—the Lord having sworn by his glory that after a certain set day of salvation on this earth, salvation would be impossible. So you have to behave yourself now.

I'm going to read from the **Odes of Solomon**, and we will let this do for the early Christian stuff. The **Odes of Solomon** were discovered in 1906 by Rendel Harris way up east of the Tigris, almost in central Asia. They are the earliest Christian hymn. They go right back to the beginning and refer to the Dead Sea Scrolls. You get these people wandering back there from Palestine. They go down and become Mandaeans, down near the mouth of the Tigris and Euphrates. There are the **Hymns of Solomon** and the **Odes of Solomon**. Now they are checked against early Hebrew and Christian writings, and they are the oldest and the best. Not only that, it's a beautifully lyrical hymn. The **Odes of Solomon** deal with the temple ceremony, and they are in Syriac. I included a long translation of them in the back of a book of mine. (The best thing about it is the back. I may be a terrible compiler, but I do supply you with a lot of stuff that you can't get everywhere.) That is the book called *An Egyptian Endowment or the Message of the Joseph Smith Papyrus*. I noticed today there are four copies still on the shelf, and there are some on reserve. Don't pay attention to what I say, but look in the back. There's an appendix with five or six parallels showing that what the Egyptians did in their temples was exactly what the early Christians and Jews did, according to these documents. There you will find the **Odes of Solomon**. This is from it: "Peace was prepared for you before ever your conflict, your testing, was upon this earth, for I know them and before they came into being, I took knowledge of them, and on their faces I set my seal. Who is there that is not subject to them? They are mine and by my own right hand I set my elect ones [He is talking about the Church, about Israel].

|p9

Another passage: "All that have seen me were amazed. And I was regarded by them as a strange person. He who brought me up is the most high in all his perfection. He who brought me down from on high also brought me up from below. Grace of the elect, and who shall receive it save those who trust it from the beginning. The love of the elect, and who shall put it on except those who possessed it in the beginning. Then they tried to slay me. But I did not perish because I was not their brother. Nor was my birth like theirs. For I was older than they could remember. In vain they attacked me. They fought to destroy the memorial of him who was before them. And while I praised among the praising ones, I was great among the mighty ones. For according to the greatness of the most high, so he made me in his own likeness. And in his own newness he renewed me. And he anointed me from his own perfection. Hallelujah! All who see me will be astonished. For from another world, from another race am I."

Then chapter 41 is the creation hymn, hailing the Messiah. You compare it with early Christian liturgy from the eighteenth volume of the **Patrologia**. We have the **Oriental Patrologia** too which is very valuable, in which the congregation identifies itself with preexistent design. And the **Sophia Christi**, "All spirits are ageless and equal as to creation, but differ in degrees of power." The fact that one person is as old as another doesn't mean that one can't be greater than another. That's a very interesting thing that's explained in *The Pearl of Great Price* when we get to that. You think it isn't fair if one person came first? No, nobody came first. Intelligence never was created, neither can be. "Man also was in the beginning with God." Then why is God so much greater? Well, that's a very interesting problem in *The Pearl of Great Price*. I've been quoting here from the **Sophia Christi** and the **Gospel of Truth**. These are all very old and very recent findings. "One's true name is that given to him by the Father in the preexistence." That's the name by which you will be known when you go back. "How can anyone understand whose name was not called out in the beginning? He remains ignorant to the end, is a plasma of forgetting and will pass away with it."

And here is the doctrine of **anamnesis** too. If anybody has the true knowledge, it is certain that he is from above because when he is called, he hears, he understands, he answers and he turns toward the one who calls him. There is this recognition, you see. You recognize the voice of the Father if you are righteous. This is a Platonic doctrine of **anamnesis**. Again we don't want to get sidetracked. There's a wonderful passage from the **Gospel of Thomas** about all the sufferings you have to go through in the church, all the beatings you have to take. And this you also find in the **Hodayot**, the Thanksgiving Scroll of the Dead Sea Scrolls. You have to suffer a lot, but when you get a chance to know what you were before and how much is at stake, you would look upon this with nothing but rejoicing. It's your big chance and you wouldn't miss it. You're so glad to come here. And the **Gospel of Thomas** says, "When you come to know yourselves, then you will be known, and you will know that you are the sons of the living Father. But if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty." Jesus says in this same writing, "Blessed is he who was before he came into being, and blessed are the solitary elect. For you shall find the kingdom because you came from it. You shall go there again."

|p10

Incidentally, this is the **Gospel of Thomas** which contains sayings of Jesus that are not in the Bible, and all churches, Protestant and Catholic, have accepted at least fourteen of these sayings as authentic. These are original, authentic sayings of Jesus that were lost, and now they are found. And in the latest Revised Standard translation of the Bible, they are included. So go to the **Gospel of Thomas** to find out what they used to believe. These things got lost, and the evidence is that they are showing up now. You can get this at the BYU Bookstore. You might be able to get it in paperback. It used to be quite cheap—the **Gospel of Thomas** from **Nag Hammadi**. This is from the congregation of the early church in Egypt before the apostasy hit it. It came out in 1949-50 and caused an immense sensation. I guess most of you can't remember it. But it was nothing but the **Gospel of Thomas** and was as big news as King Tut. It was in the newspapers every day. Go back and look in **Time**, **Life**, and **Fortune**. You see nothing else, but the **Gospel of Thomas**. That was a big thing.

You will find an interesting article by John Allegro who was one of the most insightful students of the Dead Sea Scrolls. He lost his job at Harvard for this article that was in the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1960. The scrolls were discovered at the end of the 1940s. In the 1950s there was a big excitement about them. And then all of a sudden, nothing. They were suppressed. Were they actually suppressed? Yes, they were, and that's what Allegro shows in this article. The Jews don't like him, and the Christians don't like him. Nobody likes him because it isn't what they had been teaching. For the Jews, it is much too Christian. You don't have Jews with the sacrament, and a presidency of three, and twelve apostles before the time of Christ. That's what Professor Cross at Harvard, who has lectured here a good deal, calls the "church of anticipation." It's as if the whole Christian church was there ahead of time. Well, you get that in the Book of Mormon. The Jews were offended to find out that there was so much Christianity in Judaism, and the Christians were offended to find out that the Jews were doing these things before Christ came. The Catholics were especially offended because it robbed them of their originality. They felt that Christ had to be original. He had to bring something that wasn't known before. Well, Christ fulfills the prophets and brings more. In the Book of Mormon is where you find that beautiful blending of the two.

And so in the **Gospel of Thomas** there are all sorts of things that people don't like today. "When you come to know yourselves, then you will be known and you will know that you are the sons of the living Father . . ." And then he says down here, "Blessed are the solitary elect; you shall find the kingdom because you came from it. And Jesus said, 'If they say to you from where do you have your origin, say to them [this is one of the unwritten sayings of Jesus], We have come from the light where the light has originated through itself. It stood and revealed itself in their image.' Lord, do I and man belong to the material world? The answer is you and your children belong to the Father who existed from the beginning. Your spirit came down from above from the imperishable light; for this reason the lower powers cannot approach you. But all who have known this road are immortal amidst mortal men." You have this satisfaction.

|p11

And then there is the **Gospel of Philip** which is equally old and equally important. From the aspect of the temple, it is very important. "The Lord said, 'Blessed is he who was before he came into being for he who is and was shall be.'" It continues, "The exalted nature of man is not revealed but in secret to those who have been initiated and who know." This is an important thing.

When these new writings turn up, so many of them begin with the title "The Secret Teachings of the Lord to the Apostles After the Resurrection." He taught them secretly after the resurrection, and they did not divulge these things. They were not shouted from the housetops, as the Jesuits insist. You see the Christian world can't admit that there had been any secret teachings, let alone any lost teachings—because if there were, where are they now? Whatever happened to them? Now they admit that there was a great deal and now it is possibly turning up.

From the **Gospel of Philip** again, this is the Cabalistic teaching: "At the Council in Heaven every spirit appeared before God in the very same form they were later to take in the human body. God examined them one by one, and many hesitated to come here and to be exposed to contamination." They knew it would be a hard life, and they didn't want to risk the test. They didn't feel good about it. There's a great deal about that, incidentally. I have some good ones here. Two weeks ago I had occasion to go through the old Slavonic text. It was a very good refresher course for me. In the Second Book of Enoch (remember Enoch was the great scribe), "Write all the souls of men, however many of them are born, for all souls are prepared to eternity before the foundation of the world."

In 1912 R. H. Charles got together all the writings that were known before the Dead Sea Scrolls and **Nag Hammadi**. This is a standard collection of Old Testament apocryphal writings. It is on reserve here. If you have any questions about the Old Testament, look up R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, volume 2. He says, "The Platonic doctrine of preexistence of souls is here taught. We find that it had already made its way into Jewish thought in Egypt." So through Egypt, Christians and Jews, he says, both adopted this. But the fact is they had it independently; though, as we saw, it was an Egyptian doctrine.

The doctrine was accepted and further developed by Philo. We mentioned Philo before; he is the one that shows how the Jews lost literalism. He turned everything into the abstractions of the schools. Josephus says it was an Essene doctrine, so it would belong to the Dead Sea Scrolls which were unknown at the time this was written. The idea is that spirits are immortal and endure forever and ever. Man is a spiritual, eternal being without beginning or end. And he gives a number of examples here, "He says it became the prevailing doctrine in later Judaism [the doctrine of preexistence] until modern normative Judaism got rid of it. You will find it in the **Beresheit Rabbah** and the **Tanhuma**, etc. "The doctrine of preexistence as taught by the Essenes, by Philo, the **Talmud** and the **Cabala**," says Meyer, talking about that.

|p12

The **Apocalypse of Baruch** is a very valuable one that goes way back. You'll find that in R. H. Charles. It says, "The multitude of those who should be born was numbered and for that number a place was prepared where the living might dwell." And this is another view: What are we here for then? Was our coming down here a fall or a calamity? Well, the Gnostic doctrine was that we are here in prison. We are being punished. "Man's descent from heaven at the moment of conception with his human form and divine seal (showing that he had existed before). . . ." But unlike Origen and the Gnostic schools, the **Cabala** does not regard life as a fall or exile but as a means of education and a beneficial trial. As Nephi says, "Our time here became a time of probation." That's what the **Cabala** teaches. But Origen, the Gnostics and the Christians went off in this direction—that it is a fall, an imprisonment, and a curse. Well, just like "Adam brought the curse of man's first disobedience and the fruit of that forbidden tree whose bitter taste brought death into the world and all our woes." It was utter calamity that brought us here. In the Jewish teaching that was not so. It's a benefit, a time of education and learning, and a time of testing. So in the third chapter of the Book of Abraham we read, "We will make an earth whereon these may dwell, and we will prove them herewith to see if they will do all the things whatsoever we shall command them. They who keep their first estate shall be added upon. . . ."

Another book we are going to cite is from the **Zohar**. This is a very important writing which has been neglected by the Jews; they come back to it. They used to think it was just an invention of Moses of Leon in 1240 A.D., a work of the Middle Ages, but now they know it is very old. It has come out in a number of editions. I have a beautiful, complete Hebrew edition of the **Zohar** that just came out. It's full of not just biblical teachings, but things that might have been in the Bible. Remember the canon of the Bible is a very arbitrary sort of thing. Many things are in there that shouldn't be, and things are left out that should be there. But the **Zohar** tells us here: "All men before they lived on earth were present in heaven in the identical form they possess in this life, and everything they learn on earth they knew already before they came to this world." That's an interesting thing; how could you be tested if you knew it already. This becomes a very interesting problem in physics. According to the Talmud, this world is only a marshaling area, a sort of freeport, while that world above is the true dwelling. We have just left it temporarily to be tested here. "All spirits which are to enter into the body exit from the day of creation of the world until the earth shall pass away."

Now a powerful passage in the Zadokite Document from the Dead Sea Scrolls tells how God condemned the wicked in the preexistence by not counting them among those chosen. "From of old, from the days of eternity and before they were established, he knew them and abhorred their generations. With exactitude he set out their names, but those whom he hated he caused to stray." Remember in the Pearl of Great Price, Satan was a liar from the beginning.

This expression that is used is another important one: "from eternity to eternity." In the Serek Scroll of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2:1, it uses the expression **me'olam le'olam**. It's more than an ecstatic outbreak "from ever to ever." The Christians use it, and Barnabas uses it in his

|p13

epistle eight. Barnabas—remember he is one of the seven apostolic fathers, one of the earliest fathers after the New Testament. He says, "From eons unto the eons means that you come out of the eons and you go into the eons." You have an eternity behind you, and you have an eternity before you. This is the bottleneck you pass through to determine for a long time to come which way you will take hereafter. He says, "The way of light is the Lord from eons into the eons; the way of life leading from one eternity up to the other one to come. The eschatology is inconceivable without the protology. Typical of this common background to Jews and early Christians is the prayer of Anna in the **Pseudo-Philo**. "Hast thou not, O Lord, examined the heart of all generations before thou formedst the world?" In the Secrets of Enoch in the Slavonic Enoch (this is one very close to the Joseph Smith Enoch), the Lord says to Enoch, "Sit down and write the names of those who are not yet born and the places which are prepared for them forever; for all the spirits were prepared before the foundation of the earth." Enoch speaks here, "I swear unto you, my children, that before man was made in the womb of his mother, he was prepared; and how each has sojourned in this age that a man might be tested in the balance while he was here." There's your probation and preexistence too. "There has indeed been prepared in advance a place for every human soul."

We'll go back to our friend Gregory of Nyssa again. "The soul had a previous existence and a life of its own where, even as in this life, it was given its free agency by the Creator. And such as grew weary at doing good entered this life at a disadvantage, having passed the test less satisfactorily than others." Now this is writing which is accepted by Origen, the earliest Christian theologian, and he says that this is what the brethren taught. "I don't believe it," he said, "but the brethren in the early church taught it." Now the fact is when we are born into this world it's with unequal advantages, isn't it? Some are born blind, lame, crippled; it's terrible. Some are born into poverty; some into riches. He says, "How does that happen? They used to teach that before we came here life was a test too, and when we passed the test, we came into this world. Our life here is a reward for our performance before we came here." He says that would certainly explain the inequality of people being born. Or as Gregory of Nyssa says here, "The soul had a previous existence for even as in this life, it was a free agent." Remember there was a Council in Heaven. They voted and some preferred this and some preferred that. You were perfectly free to take your way there. You had your free agency. And such as grew weary in doing good entered this life at a disadvantage because they passed the test all right, but less satisfactorily than others passed it. Well, there's an interesting thesis that Origen developed. Needless to say, it was slapped down.

Well, Basilides, also a contemporary, says that suffering in this life is punishment for sins in the preexistence, not by way of denying that there was preexistence, by insisting that the opportunity to suffer here, even martyrdom, is rather a reward earned before, an opportunity for greater glory. Persecutions are not to punish the saints but to sanctify them. Then back to Origen again, "The spirit stands for progress and by definition evil is refusal to accept progress. This is the principle of apostasy that you refuse to progress, and when you dug in your heels in the

|p14

other world, you came here at a lower level. "Learn this one thing," wrote Cyril of Jerusalem, "that before coming to this cosmos, the spirit did not sin, but that we came down sinless here and now. And now we sin by choice."

Well, which is it? Is it a matter of sin up there? We had to come down here and take on flesh, I suppose, to be tested in a particular way. No, it's the level of performance that we are judged on in coming down here. And that's another interesting thing—that wonderful passage where the Lord says that one will be more intelligent than another. Don't resent it because you know perfectly well why you are not more intelligent than you are. We only use one thousandth of our potential anyway. So you can't complain that somebody is ahead of you. You might be far far better than you are. So don't worry about him; just improve yourself. And this is the gospel of repentance. Well, the time is up and we are still bogged down in these fundamentals. But they are the fundamentals that are treated with peculiar address and clarity in the Pearl of Great Price, and as far as I know, nowhere else.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 4

Now, to add a little excitement and change of pace, I'm going to wear my other glasses today. That's how exciting this is. I don't know how long they've got to go on wasting footage on the same haggard pan here. It's not going to do any good. "Age cannot wither nor custom stale his infinite monotony." That's from Shakespeare. It's from *Antony and Cleopatra*. She wasn't monotonous. Shall we talk about Cleopatra, "who burns upon the water"?

We were talking about Clement's questions, and this is very relevant to what we are doing. The first question, he does not want "to die and go we know not where; to lie in cold obstruction and to rot." That's a future he does not relish. It bothers him, he says. Since he was a small child, this idea had been after him all the time. So that was the first question he asked, would he live hereafter? He went to all the doctors of the schools in Rome, and there were lots of schools in Rome. The answers he got were well, yes you will live in the flowers, or you will live in memory, or you will be absorbed into the great sea of being. He didn't find that satisfactory at all. He wanted something literal, and we went into literalism. So he went and talked with Peter, and Peter said, "Yes, this is absolutely literal; we absolutely deny that there is anything evil in matter. That's part of the picture." This was a revolutionary teaching. Then we saw that the early teachers of the Church, the early Christians, all taught that; they were literal minded. The doctors of the schools weren't. By the fourth century they had gotten rid of that completely and would have nothing to do with matter. Matter was entirely evil, the Neoplatonic doctrine. You get someone like Plotinus, and any contact with matter would defile even God himself. To this day the Christians believe in a nonliteral conception of things. Well, if he was to exist as an individual (this was important to be himself), then there must have been a preexistence. If he was a spiritual, eternal being, he must have existed before, and the thing that bothered him as much as anything was this idea of preexistence. We saw last time that preexistence was also an important part of the picture. We have all these references here and will just refer to a couple of them.

In the first volume of the *Patrologia* there is an interesting note by Migne. He edited it. He speaks for the fathers of the church on this subject, I Clement 1:28. "Clement asserts that the spirit is older than the body, according to one of the four interpretations of the fathers." He says the fathers interpret this four ways. Did we preexist or not? Remember this is all essential to our handbook of terrible questions which is the Pearl of Great Price. The first thing that Migne says is one school taught that the spirit was before the body (it was preexistent); a second that the body came first and the spirit after that; still others that they came into existence together. That school has a special name. And still others that are not willing to make any

assertion at all. Along with which opinion should be mentioned the errors of Pythagoreans, the Platonists, the Gnostics, and the Origenists (the Hermetic School). Origen for a time firmly believed in the preexistence, and then he changed his mind. Pythagoreans believed in reincarnation, **metempsychosis**, that you did exist before but it was in another shape or being, an animal or something. This is no satisfaction because if you change your identity completely, you are somebody else and you really haven't continued to exist. I may have been a chair in the preexistence, but that doesn't give me any satisfaction now. Or to think that I will be a cockroach hereafter gives me no great comfort either. That is not me continuing. They feel that very strongly. The Egyptians are particularly strong on this. That's why this emphasis on the name. It was the name to help preserve his identity. It was himself and nobody else that continued. You had to have hereafter, but you had to preserve your identity as well.

But Plato really believed that we existed before and that we still have dim memories of it. How do you know it was good, beautiful and true? Because you saw it before. You have a memory of it when you come here. Every recognition of truth is a recognition of something you knew and learned before, and we are moving toward that state. Plato went all the way there. But Origen changed places. He said that this was the teaching of the venerated elders, the earliest Christians, the brethren in the early church. But he has equal respect for the doctors of the schools because he was born and raised actually on the campus of the University of Alexandria. His father was a teacher, and he was born there. He could never get that out of his system, so he was perplexed and didn't know what to do. He began by fervidly preaching the doctrine of preexistence and ended up by denying it. But in the sixth century it flared up again in his name (the Origenists) in Palestine among the monasteries there and in Egypt too. It had a revival at that time as the true teachings of the church.

But when you get to Hilary in the West, in the fourth century, he says that preexistence stumps him completely. "It is an impious and an alien study, you should not even think about it." He says, "How can anything exist before it is born? How is that possible?" They are giving rational answers, you know, not scriptural ones. Or in that case, why bother, but he did bother. He couldn't leave it alone. In many places St. Augustine accepts the doctrine, apparently because of the appeal of Plato (**anamnesis**). He believed it up until the year 410 A.D. Would you say that was a crisis year? We are quoting a study by De Wulf here, "After that he hesitates and does not cease to hesitate between traducianism and creationism." Traducianism is the doctrine that the spirit and the body were created at the same moment. Creationism is that they were created separately and then were joined together. **Traductio** means "carried over together." Incidentally, we have to do something to make this more photogenic. I'm going to bring a visual display next time. Oh, it will stagger you. It will be a most unusual book.

So St. Augustine hesitates between traducianism and creationism, though he preferred the latter because it explained the transmission of the original sin. "He repeats endlessly," says this writer, "that he has not yet made up his mind."

|p3

This is typical; he never made up his mind. This is interesting because St. Augustine is the maker of western theology. The Protestants are as dependent on Augustine as the Catholics. But he never made up his mind. His mother wouldn't let him, for one thing. He was a very pious and moral young man, but his mother wouldn't let him marry the mother of his illegitimate child. He had a child to whom he was very devoted, but his mother said, "No, you will ruin your career chances." This was St. Monica. She would say, "Put it off; don't get married yet because when you've had your pleasure, then will be the time that you can repent and get forgiven and carry on. Meantime, don't let a family interfere with your career." And he tells us quite frankly that the objection to sex was not sex at all. It was the danger of having children. Sex was okay if you didn't have a family. This was the great St. Augustine. He says ". . . think of having squalling children and the smell of cooking cabbage and having to change diapers and shrieking wives in the house, short patience, etc. You have to be free to concentrate every thought on God. Think always on God and nothing else." You must cling to God regardless of what and keep him constantly in mind; nothing but God. In that case you can't bother about marriage because it is a distraction. It's marriage that's bad, not letting off steam once in awhile. He thought that was all right, and he did. When he was seventy years old, he tells us in the *Confessions* that this was his daily prayer. "God give me chastity and continence, but not yet. **Sed non modo**, let me wait awhile." In other words, he wanted to have his cake and eat it. This was the purpose of rhetoric; this was the whole spirit of the times he lived in, the fourth and fifth centuries. He was amazed when he saw the whole civilization collapse before his eyes. He couldn't understand why it was so. But I think he may have contributed to it as much as anyone.

Well, he believes in the preexistence perhaps, following Cicero and Apuleius. But in 394 A.D. he first rejected the idea, popular with the Gnostics, that the soul sinned in the preexistence. He gave that up first, and then he gave up the preexistence entirely. But he didn't condemn the hypothesis of preexistence itself at that time. "In short," says this particular study, "Augustine truly does not know. It is perhaps temerity to want to penetrate a mystery reserved to God himself," he says.

Then there was an official statement by the church. There was a synod held in Africa in 523 A.D. by a number of bishops. They were in exile from Sardinia, actually. They sent a synodal epistle around stating this is the answer to the question: "The question we should either leave in silence or consider without contention since the holy scriptures give no clear statement." There's the idea, you see, many precious things had been removed. The schools turned Plato around. The Neoplatonists got rid of that part of Plato's teaching. They didn't like that at all. The epistle continues, "It should be investigated with caution, especially since it's possible for the faithful to ignore it without disadvantage."

Incidentally, when we quote these councils of the church, and there have been many of them, we have the original records and notes edited by Nursia and the great **Mansi**. We have the complete **Mansi** here. Now **Mansi** is a complete record of all the councils of the church that

|p4

were held (the Greek and Latin), what was said, who presided at the meeting, what was done. For these times we have remarkably full records. We know everything that went on in the church at that time—bishops that were questioned, troubles that came up in wards, etc. And they go into tens of thousands of pages. We have them all here under the collection of **Mansi**. If you want to read the edited version, though it is many volumes, that's the **Hefele**. Professor Jaeger, who is supposed to be the best classical scholar of his time, told me, "I always read my **Mansi** in **Hefele**." It's easier to manage. If you are interested in any council of the church, you can find out about it there. They are chronologically arranged, and they take place at different places. You find some most interesting things going on.

So they said it could be ignored. You don't have to worry about the preexistence necessarily. This was a teaching that had enormous impact. It makes all the difference on how we look at our situation on earth, doesn't it? Brigham Young said that more Latter-day Saints apostatize because of the doctrine of preexistence than for any other reason—more than polygamy, more than the trials and hardships, more than the teaching of the Law of Consecration. This comes as a surprise and shows how completely it had been wiped out of the Christian consciousness. What turned people off was this very rational doctrine of preexistence which is being accepted much more widely. The churches are taking a hard second look at it now because it is very essential to understanding our situation. But it was not in the cards in the nineteenth century.

And back to our old friend Augustine again. We have all the works of Augustine. There are a lot of them, and they are enormously influential. Remember, Luther himself was an Augustinian friar. It was the doctrine of anamnesis, the intimations of immortality, that was supposed to have moved Augustine who first accepted it and finally rejected it, as I said. In his book of *Retractions*, one, eight, and two, he says, "The trouble is it does not agree with science." Notice, it's not the scriptures, but science. Science does not prove the preexistence. That's why St. Augustine rejected it. That's the sort of thing you can only know by revelation and intuition, I suppose. As Father Eggersdorfer says in a very good study, he does not reject it on scriptural or religious grounds, but only because he finds it illogical. He says it's not a scientific doctrine. On the contrary, what bothers him is that the scriptures keep bringing it up. "Revelations 4:6 talks about familiar animals found around the throne of God," he says in his epistle number 124.

Incidentally, we have 195 letters of St. Augustine. He was the most important man in the church. He was the bishop of Hippo, and everybody sent letters to him asking questions. We have the answers he gave to these questions. And the funny thing is when they ask him basic questions of doctrine and marriage, and things like that, he never refers them to any higher authority. He doesn't say go to Rome, go to Milan, or go to the head of the church. He knows no head of the church to go to at that time. There was no uniform church. Of course, the Roman church claims it was their own; everybody else does. But St. Augustine didn't know of that clearing house. He doesn't say, "Take your doctrines to a higher source."

Never once refers them to a higher source. And very often he says, "I can't answer your question, and there is nothing we can do about it. The question stumps me."

And his friend Jerome was living in the East. Remember, Jerome gave us the Vulgate, the Latin Bible, which is the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church and the one that was used more in translating the King James than any other. Luther stayed close to it. He cites the example, along with John Chrysostom, that Paul knew everything that existed before this world. But it cannot be uttered. What is harder than to find out what the beginning or the end of a thing is? Moses knew and so did Solomon who says, "I shall remember the things from the beginning of the world." But they don't tell us what it is. In the end Augustine dismisses it with a one-liner, a very famous one-liner that Luther uses about the preexistence. It's a nervous and unsatisfactory solution. "What was God doing before the creation?" he says. "Making a hell for people who ask that question." Too many questions, he says. Then he adds his own solution in the *Confessions*, eleven and twelve: "I don't know because I don't know." Well, there we have to leave it.

And again here, Bousset, the great Catholic preacher, says Clement of Alexandria (third century) expressly rejected the old doctrine of preexistence (note that he says the old doctrine) because it conflicted not with the scriptures but with Greek philosophy and culture. Everything must be tested by the schools, later on by Aristotle. You do not change the doctrine to agree with the scriptures. You change the scriptures to agree with Plato. This was done all the time. If you had a conflict between Plato and the scriptures, the scriptures were always adapted. There was this constant accommodation. That's why they were able to get along with the schoolmen and the advancement of science as they understood it. They did not accommodate the new philosophy to the scriptures, but the other way around. It shows which was the real authority. It was not the scriptures but the Greek philosophy and culture. Clement mocks the old-fashioned orthodoxers, as he calls them, and their fear of the higher culture and new advanced education. In other words, they were fundamentalists, and he said, "We can't change that."

The final decision was not with Plato and the Stoics though, but with Aristotle. Here we are quoting a new study by Florovsky on this subject. This is Aristotle: "God has given independent being and life neither to the nature of soul itself nor to the nature of body separately but rather to men composed of soul and body. They cannot be separated. The soul and body cannot exist apart." You cannot have had preexistence. Well, what happens after you die then? I guess that's pretty near to Seventh-Day Adventist doctrine. They teach soul sleep. You go to sleep, become completely unconscious until the resurrection. The soul has no awareness or consciousness, or in other words no existence. So what have you gained by that? You start up where you ended and continue right on. Soul sleep is completely pointless doctrine. It's like your odorless perfume. You cease to exist, but you cease to be aware of the fact that you are not existing. Then all of a sudden there you are. It might have been a million years; it might have been ten minutes. Who cares? It makes no difference. You just weren't there.

|p6

This is some doctrine. I don't know how you can build great faith on that.

Severus of Antioch says, "In the fashioning of men the rational soul is not created before the body nor the body before the soul." And so it goes. Lactantius, the first Latin father, mocks the doctrine of preexistence as a Stoic and Pythagorean doctrine. "Oh, wonderful and singular Pythagorean memory of another life. Oh, miserable us in our total oblivion. Why don't we know that we lived before?" he asks. He is being very caustic here.

In a very early writing, Philastrius says, "It is also heresy to say that before the body of man was created there was no spirit." It's heresy to say that the spirit was created before the body, but it is also heresy to say that before the body, there was no spirit (well, now what are you going to do about that?), ". . . and that man is in the image of God's body and not the spirit of man. When the prophet says that God said 'let us make man,' it was future as in making not of flesh but of the spirit which he declared to be rational. And the male and female has nothing to do with the sex of corporeal matter but of the rule of the spirit." And so it goes on and on.

Jerome says, "If we accept that doctrine, it will destroy the whole allegorical value of the scripture," which is that these things happened spiritually not physically. "What Origen said was foolish. The angels have their degrees not by merit but by creation. The angels had no preexistence either. It is a depraved and wicked Gentile error when Origen says the spirit of man partakes of the nature of divinity."

Well, the definition of what is divine is what's eternal. The eternal is divine; the divine is eternal. That covers everything beautifully if you think of it, but he says, "It is a depraved and wicked Gentile error when Origen says the spirit of man partakes of the nature of divinity, as if the maker and the made could be of the same nature. As if they could have anything at all in common. It is utterly vicious to make God in any way like man." So how are you going to discuss God or say anything about him? Then Jerome is going to tell all about what God is like after saying you can't possibly define him. Chrysostom does the same. If Jerome's statement, "it is utterly vicious to make God in any way like man," were so, then upon becoming incorruptable there's only one conclusion to be drawn. They would become as gods who were not so before. That amounts to making created things resemble God. Now such were the absolutes of the fourth century schools. No created thing can resemble God. They deal in absolutes all the way. And when you have an absolute, there's no argument at all. As Copernicus said, "There is no proportion between the infinite and the finite." There is nothing you can say that they have in common. There's nothing you can say about one that will apply to the other, so forget about it.

Well, you would think this would put an end to thought, bring down the curtain, and give us a few years of peace. Don't believe it for a minute. It's just the sort of thing the philosophers love to feed on. You could hold endless committee meetings on a subject like this. hundreds

|p7

They had hundreds of councils and fought like cats and dogs. It kept them from being bored like the academic feuds of the universities, ancient and modern. They start these feuds going and they go for hundreds of years. They are the only things that make life interesting. Someone wrote a very good essay on that subject. He wrote *The Life of Queen Victoria*, etc. It was the famous argument between Dr. Arnold and Dr. Bentley at Oxford which went on for almost a century. The author's main argument is against the idea that Adam and Eve came down and took bodies as punishment, the favorite Gnostic and Origenistic idea. We don't go with that either.

All right, let's get it official now. The Fifth General Council of the church in the year 593 made this statement which Christians stick to, to this day. It's issue number 204. They argued 203 problems for days and days before they got to this one. It was just like a state legislature or any other legislature.

"If anyone says or holds that the psyche (soul) of the Lord existed before and was united with God before his incarnation from the Virgin and his earthly birth, let him be anathema." He will be cursed if he claims that even Christ existed before he came down and was born to the Virgin. Now isn't that a statement? Christ says he was with the Father and left his glory to come down. "The glory I had with thee before the world was." All that counts for nothing here. It's the doctrines of the schools that count. "If anyone holds that the psyche of the Lord existed before and was united with God before his incarnation from the Virgin and his earthly birth, let him be anathema." That statement you will find in Denzinger. Incidentally, he is a very convenient source. This is the official statement as it stands at present of all the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Look it up in Denzinger. This is in Denzinger Versus Origen 593, number 204. They are in that order.

And Father Danielou, the last person to treat this, died recently under very strange circumstances. He was a cardinal and a very able man. He saw very clearly the weakness of the position that the Christian churches take today, how weak they are in ignoring these things and passing them by. He says the weak point in Origen's theory is his idea that there is more than one existence. What, no afterlife? He cites Canon One of the Fifth General Council in 593, a key date: "If anyone teaches the mythical doctrine of the preexistence of the soul and return to the Father's presence ['that they may again return to our presence and have everlasting life'], and the doctrine that follows from it, let him be anathema [wiped out of the books, not considered, cursed]." And they were teaching it.

Methodius, a person who enjoys great prestige among the doctors, says Plato and Origen were all wrong "because it is against nature for a soul to exist without a body or a body without a spirit. You have to have them both." In other words they don't believe in spirits. Well, if you had to figure these things out rationally, we would never have arrived at them. And in this treatise he treats the resurrection from every angle. He treats it from Jonah, Moses, and Elijah on the mountain, but he never once makes reference to the resurrection of the Lord. Isn't that something? That's in Methodius, the eighteenth volume of the **Patrologia**, if any of you are

burning with curiosity. So the early church believed in the preexistence; the later churches and the official churches today do not believe in it. But we do because it was restored by Joseph Smith. Incidentally, the most beautiful and moving description of this is the oldest. I brought the text here, but I haven't been into Syriac for a long time. So I'm going to use translations. Five different people have made translations besides me, so all I can do is pass the buck to them. I compare the various translations carefully. This is a thing called **The Pearl**. It was found in 1906 by Rendel Harris way up east of the Tigris. Its dating is interesting because Alfred Adam, a Catholic scholar and very able Orientalist who lives in Jerusalem, dates it between 50 and 70 A.D. That means it could have been written within 25 years of the Crucifixion. Walter Crum, who is the great authority on Coptic documents, places it right there in the first century. You can't get an older Christian document than this. **The Pearl** is meant to be a romanticized thesis, something like the story *Added Upon*. Now we have rather mediocre (that's a flattering word) musicals about the preexistence. We sentimentalize it. I don't know how much the author of **The Pearl** cleared on this, but it is the oldest Christian hymn we have and it is certainly the most remarkable.

It starts out, "In my first primeval childhood (he's in heaven, you see, before he came here), I was nurtured (quoting Eliza R. Snow, you recognize) in the royal house of my father with loving care in the midst of abundance and glory." This is where he came from. "My parents sent me forth from our home in the East, the source of light, supplied with all necessities." So he comes down to get the pearl and bring it back with him. The pearl is the integrity which he preserves during the trials and tests of this life so he can continue hereafter to be a member of the royal family and assume his throne and crown above. ". . . making a packet for me from our rich storehouse. It was sizable but light enough for me to carry. I came from the house on high as a great treasure, bringing with me precious stones from India and Kushan and gold and silver, and they girt me with a diamond.

There's an interesting footnote on **adamus**, on the diamond, here. You see, the word Adam was associated with diamond. Adamantis means that which cannot be damaged, that which is immortal. There's a long story behind that. Diamond is the urim and thummim, the sacred stone that was given to Adam when he came down. So the name Adamantis was given to him—the prince of stones.

Continuing with **The Pearl**: "They removed from me the garment of light which they made for me above." The idea is that when you lived in heaven you had a heavenly garment; and when you left, it was put aside, carefully folded and put under the Father's throne to be kept there until you came back if you were worthy to receive it again. A good deal is said in this Syriac stuff, for example, about the great tragedy of sinning in this life because you lose all that you invested. What you have up there represents long terms of investment and work to achieve such a state. You left it all there on reserve, on deposit, the crown and the garment carefully folded and deposited (in the throne, some say) in a special chest, for you to resume when you return. And if you can't take it back, you have lost all that you worked for before, which makes this earthly trial a key experience, a terrifying sort of thing if we miss it. You can miss it, and it's

so important not to. Continuing: "They removed from me the garment of light which they had made for me and my purple robe made exactly to fit me." And it would fit no one else. This is interesting. It is your robe, and it has certain marks on it. "They made a covenant with me and wrote it in my heart lest I go astray." So you have covenanted with your parents above in this test. He was instructed to go down to Egypt and bring back the pearl—this integrity. It's in the sea guarded or surrounded by a fire or poisonous, snorting serpent—the dragon. This was the dragon or the serpent of the Garden of Eden guarding this thing. But he has to get it away from him. He has to outwit the dragon and get the pearl. "Returning the pearl, he may resume his garment of light and his outer priestly mantle and become heir to our kingdom along with our Second One." The Second One is the second heir to the throne. He will become an heir along with the Son. Not the second born, it says, but the next or second in line to the throne, second in glory, successor. That is the first born, Christ, the elder brother.

So if you perform properly when you go down there, you can come back and resume your garment and "become heir to our kingdom along with our Second One." So when he comes down, he has two guides or guardians. Remember they always come in threes. They are official couriers who know the way and are sent down with him up to the point where they bid him goodbye and he is on his own. Remember, the two guides say, "We will leave you now, but we will return later." Then the minute Adam finds himself alone, that is the time Satan strikes and tries to win him over. That's what happens here. The two guardians are sent with him. That's standard; in the eighteenth chapter of Genesis, the Lord appears with the three men, always the three.

He arrived at Maishan where the merchants of the East gather. This is the dividing line where the goods are all transshipped, like the upper or second cataract on the Nile where all the goods of central Africa are transshipped to go into Egypt. It was a new world in those days. In fact, at the cataract Senuseret III, 2000 B.C., set up a famous monument which still stands. The people south of it may not go north of this line, and the others may not go south of it. This is the boundary, and when you pass this stela you enter another world (Senuseret's famous inscription). That's what Maishan is, the place of transition between the worlds. On the other side he is in Babylon. Now he is in this world which, of course, is called Babel or Babylon. He enters the walls of Sarbug (Surrupak). It has been suggested that that is one of the Sumerian cities, one of the three oldest cities in the world along with Erech. That's the Sarbug he is talking about. This would certainly apply. This was a very ancient story, wasn't it? Sarbug didn't exist anymore at this time. The Mesopotamian city of Surrupak was early noted by scholars, but the identity was rejected on geographical grounds.

Well, there the guides leave him on his own, and he goes on toward Egypt. As in the **Book of Tobit** here, Egypt means the spiritual Sodom. In Egypt he immediately looks up the serpent who has the pearl (it's quite homey; quite like a novel). The serpent is staying at an inn. So he goes to the inn and checks in to keep an eye on the serpent and catch him while he is still asleep. This could be a spy thriller with the dragon just a name given to the odious person

|p10

who is going to try to get the best of him—who does, as a matter of fact. He shouldn't be doing this dangerous thing the way he does. Don't try to go to the dragon; you'll be in trouble. There he meets a young nobleman from his own country who was born in the covenant and with whom he shares full confidence. He warns him against the temptations and defilements of Egypt. He says, "You're going into dangerous country; I can help you out here."

This is also part of the spy thriller, isn't it? He meets up with Agent X or the fat man, or something like that. Isn't LeCarre writing the best spy thrillers now? To avoid arousing suspicion as a stranger, he adopts the dress of the Egyptians. He can't get away with it because he's not that clever about it. He gives himself away in speech and all sorts of things. He doesn't really belong to this world. You see, this is a member of the Church, one who has accepted the covenant. His behavior is different, and they suspect that he is not really one of them. They notice that he is an alien, and so what do they do? They invite him in, make friends with him, and ask him to enter some of their deals. They invite him to dinner. The wine flows freely and before you know he's one of the boys, which is exactly where they want him. "Whereupon, he forgot that he was the son of the king and served their king." Well, they got him over to their side. And what's more, he enjoyed the life. We've read about a half dozen spies within the last few weeks that have gone over, and they all did it for money. It's the same thing here. He liked the high lifestyle, the rich foods dulled his senses, and he fell into a deep sleep. Well, the poor guy is helpless now.

So what is going to happen now? Meanwhile, the heavenly parents are aware of what has happened. They call a family council up above. "We've got to do something to save the boy. He's making a fool of himself." All the great and noble relatives come together, and they decide it's time to act. They must do something, so they draft a letter and they all sign it. "This letter might stir him up, but if this doesn't do any good, we'll have to do something else." I'm sure we've all slipped at some time or other, and then there is some reminder from home. The letter is addressed "to our son in Egypt from thy Father, the King of Kings, and thy Mother, the Queen of the East, and our Second One, thy Brother."

And this was the letter: "Awake and arise from thy sleep. Heed this letter. Remember that you are the son of the King, and take a good look at your present master. Remember your mission to fetch the pearl. Remember the garment and robe that are awaiting you so you can put them on again when your name is called out from the book of those who were valiant [this is interesting because in Doctrine and Covenants 76 it speaks of those who were valiant] and you will become the heir to our kingdom along with your brother, the successor to our throne." And we read in Doctrine and Covenants 76:76-79 "These are they who receive of his glory, but not of his fullness. These are they who receive of the presence of the Son, but not the fullness of the Father . . . These are they who are not valiant in the testimony of Jesus; wherefore, they obtain not the crown over the kingdom of our God." It uses the same imagery exactly that we are finding here in **The Pearl**. "Then the king with his right hand sealed the letter against the

|p11

evil children of Babylon and the rebellious spirits of Sarbug lest they open and read it or destroy it." Notice that there has to be revelation; there has to be authority in these things. The sealing is very important in the early Christian writings. The seal protects it and keeps it out of contact with the world. That's why we seal people, so they won't revert. If you seal a thing, you put a fix on it. **Khatum** is the regular word in Egyptian and Arabic. **Khatum** is the seal or stamp you put on something, and then it can't be opened by anybody else.

"The letter was brought by an eagle, the king of the birds." This is a very rich theme in the East. King Solomon sent a letter to the Queen of Sheba, and it was carried by the eagle. The **neser**, sea eagle, flew through her window while she was asleep and dropped it upon her bosom. She saw the seal of Solomon on it, opened and read it, and was duly impressed. But it was delivered by the eagle. The eagle stands for revelation—a dream, a spirit, or something like that. It comes to them while they are asleep. So we go on, "It alights by his side and becomes all speech [the letter became all speech] whereupon he awakes and rises from his sleep." He was sleeping like the queen was. This is what stirs him up again. So there is contact with the other world. "He kisses the letter, breaks the seal, and reads. Lo, it is the same letter which he brought with him from on high." They gave him a letter to carry with him, but it was written in his heart. A very common theme in ancient literature is the matching of the two parts of the **tessera**. You break the **tessera**, which is usually a coin of clay or metal. You cut it in two and keep half. Another person keeps half, and when you put the two together, then it is complete. The stick of Joseph and the stick of Judah are joined the very same way. He matches them up, and it's the same letter that was written in his heart and he brought it with him from on high. "Then he remembers that he is a king's son and his royal nature asserts itself."

From this point on, everything is in reverse. He does an about face and everything reverses. He remembers the pearl, and he has to get it, so he sets about lulling the serpent to sleep, invoking over it the name of the Father. He does it by prayer. Having seized the pearl, he does an about face wholly drawn in one direction toward his Father's house, having at this point reached the uttermost depths. First, he sheds his filthy garments for cleaner ones. Then he leaves them behind in the world where they belong. He sets his course undeviatingly toward the light of our home in the East. The letter that woke him also leads the way both as a guiding voice and as a guiding light. And there were the two birds, the **hudhud** and the **neser** were the two guide birds that take you to the presence of Solomon. It was a real document written on paper or silk of high sheen with red ink. I wish I had the tangible document here. ". . . encouraged the traveler by its guiding voice and instructions [which fork of the road to follow, etc.] and drawing him on with love. He successfully passed through Sarbug and left Babylon on his left. And so he reached Maishan, the port of the merchants where you cross the division line on the shore of the sea. There his garment and his outer robe were waiting for him."

Now he is entering the temple or going into the new phase. "They had been sent ahead from home by his parents in the custody of the two faithful guides."

|p12

They had left him at that point. They are waiting for him and have the garment ready for him. Everything is ready to resume now. "He had forgotten how glorious the clothing was, having lost his childhood memories of home. Yet it all came back to him the moment he saw it. He saw himself as he was as if in a mirror. He and the garment completely identified with each other for the garment would fit nobody else. They were a single individual though they were separate. He noticed the same phenomenon with the guides that brought the garment. There were two of them, but each bore the identical token of the King. By this sign he also reclaimed his own inheritance, namely the garment with the gold and the precious stones which adorned it, fastened everywhere with diamond clasps. And the image of the King of Kings covered the whole thing." Then he saw the whole thing begin to stir and set in motion. Before he could go any farther, he gave certain signs and tokens at the veil. "And I clothed myself with it and mounted up to the gate of greeting." He comes to the gate finally, and the whole family is there to greet him. The first person to embrace him was the last person to embrace him as he left. It was his Heavenly Mother.

You notice that we don't have a lot of Heavenly Mother in our teachings because the Heavenly Mother has her particular job, which is to keep the store while the others go forth on missions. You notice that all the angels and all the missionaries are male. The mother is the eternal hearth and home. She has her work to do there. She is the last to greet him as he goes and the first to greet him as he comes back. Those marvelous lines by Sappho: "The evening brings back to the mother all the creatures that the bright sun of morning has scattered [around 10:00 a.m.]. It brings back the little sheep and goats, and brings the little boy back to his mother." Everybody goes out on their bright adventures.

Odysseus goes forth into the world for his thirty years of adventure, but he always wants to get home. In the end it's his Penelope that he has in mind. It's the same thing. He goes back to home. It's interesting that the Heavenly Mother greets him along with the Father. It says here, "At the gate of his princes, I mingled with the great ones." The oldest book in the world ends with this. He gets back to heaven and mingles with the great ones there. As Virgil says in his Fourth Eclogue, "I mingled with the great ones."

The Pearl continues: "At the doors of the palace which was from the beginning, I mingled among them. He who received me joyfully, I was with him in his kingdom." And then the **Kephalia**. There are the five greetings he receives. The first greeting of peace the gods and angels gave to the first man as he departed from the eon of light. This same greeting ceremony took place with Adam we are told right at the beginning. The second greeting is the greeting of the right hand, the clasp of the right hand—that which the mother of life gave to the first man when he went forth to the contest. The first embrace, the **aspasmos**, (the embrace through the veil which is so important in Egypt) is that which the mother of life gave to the first man as he separated himself from her in order to come down to the earth to be tested (for the **agon**, the testing). She wishes him luck and hopes he will be able to carry on, covers him with love, etc.

|p13

as they embrace, as he separates in order to come down to the earth for testing. Also, all the gods and angels embraced him on that occasion, and all who were to be of the Church hereafter embraced him with love. The word is **aspazein**, which means grasp, embrace. The final verse is, "The first honoring [the first good wish] is that which Adam received when he left for the abyss below. He bowed the knee, worshipped the God of truth and of all the eons of light."

These are remarkable documents that come from the early church. As I said, this one was discovered in 1906, and everybody accepts it as the earliest Christian document we have. It's much earlier than the others, going way back there to the middle of the first century. So the preexistence was a very important part of the early church, but now we need to get to cosmology. What you should notice as we go along are the preexistence passages in the Book of Abraham and the Book of Moses. They are very clear in there. Remember, Abraham comes down in the same way. ". . . Abraham, thou art one of them; thou wast chosen before thou wast born."

The East is the source of light (answer to student question).

[The Pearl can be found in Brother Nibley's **Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri: An Egyptian Endowment** (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976), Appendix III.]

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 5

Now, the third question of Clement is cosmology, of all things. The most primitive rock carvings in the world are what you will find in the glyphs if you go out to Lincoln Beach which used to have a marvelous collection. That used to be a sacred place with splendid displays. There's a cave out there, and, of course, it has been mercilessly looted. A big industrialist from New York came out and covered it and walked away with some very valuable things. Of course, there's a law from 1906 that you are not supposed to do that. Well, if you look at these carvings, what will you find? You will find glyphs, spirals, swastikas, sun wheels, quadrates. You'll find these throughout the whole world. They are cosmic signs. They have to do with revolutions of the heavens—the sun, the moon, the cycles of the year, etc. Not all of them, but they are plainly marked and they are found by the thousands.

If you want to go back to primitive societies, what about their rites and their dances? They are very impressive. The Hopi dance cycle will begin around March 15 this year. The snake dance is purely cosmic. The dancing is done by the antelope clan, and they form the cosmic spiral. They spiral around three times, and then when the dance is over, they unspiral. It's the winding up of the universe. The thing is very much aware not only of the elements—the rain, the clouds, and the earth (the snakes go back to the underworld)—but also of the stars in their courses. They are very important. In the kivas at particular rites they observe stars, especially Sirius, but they make special observations of the stars. The kivas are set up to align and to sight along certain stars. This is just one example; there are many. Throughout the world you find the great megalithic sites. A megalith is a big stone, and you find these giant stone monumental establishments.

I notice that even someone as conservative as I.E.S. Edwards, who was here last week, has come around and concurred on that. Remember he said in his lecture on the pyramids, "They didn't build these things for nothing." Well, they used to think they did build them for nothing—that it was just to display the vanity and power of the king and put the slaves to work. That isn't the idea at all anymore. Now Edwards realizes that it was all to take their bearings on the universe. It's a cosmic structure—all the angles and points.

They used to accuse people who went too far in that such as old Mr. Rutherford. We had him visit here a couple of years. They become absolute nuts on the subject of pyramidology, so other people shy off from it. You don't want to become identified with the lunatic fringe. You can carry it a long way. Nevertheless, the oldest monuments we have, everything we do, is based on our awareness of the cosmos, of the setting we are in. Edwards recommends Alexander Thom's work. Thom was a retired Scottish engineer. He started to take

|p2

alignments and sights on megalithic monuments throughout Europe and England. These sites number thousands. He found that they do follow certain rules and have a certain standard measure, a megalithic yard. And they have alignments on stars and the moon, and have to do definitely with the equinoxes. They were aware of the procession of the equinoxes, of all things, which takes considerable scientific sophistication. These are borne out in hundreds of places. Well, even Professor Edwards has come around to that now.

But the point is that we've always been aware of this. This is what our temple is about. Of course, the temple is a place where you take your bearings on the universe. That's what the word **temple** means, a template put on a map. All of our temples are full of that, especially the Salt Lake Temple. We see the sun and the stars represented, and up at the west end you see the dipper pointing to the north star, around which all things revolve. The sun stones, the moon stones, the stars, the three degrees of glory: it is very cosmic in its structure. Of course, what is presented there is a cosmic drama of the creation and how things got going. It takes us in contact with the real cosmos. And a funny thing is that the most conservative Christian year, seen in the Anglican Church, is strictly based on solar and lunar festivals. The big Easter controversy, which was ferocious and raged for years, was should we judge Easter by the moon or by the sun alone, because the two don't cooperate very well, as you know. You have two different standards to go by. But we don't have the canonical year. We don't celebrate at a certain time—say the first new moon after the equinox or something. This is very important for them, and it has to do with the solstice. But we have all of this in the temple, as the ancients used to; it is taken care of there.

But in England and all those other countries, they are just following the very ancient practice that goes back to the earliest times. We have *Archaeologia* here, a big British journal of archaeology, that goes way back to the eighteenth century. We have over two hundred years of it here, showing their tremendous concern in England with these things. The church years (they deal with these) are simply continuations of the old prehistoric, megalithic rites that go back to the oldest time, on judging all your movements and putting everything into the cosmic scene. Everything is not just a setting, but it's a planetarium. It's a situation where things are happening, and you enter into it and cooperate and move along with things. You move with the traffic. They are very much aware of this.

There's a very good book, *Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial*, by Henry John Feasey. He traces them all back to early customs; and, of course, we have the customs and folk tales, and things that have continued since. We have very early records. Classical writers visiting the country thousands of years ago described what they did there. We all know about Stonehenge and the like. We have our Facsimile No. 2 in the Pearl of Great Price which is a hologram. That's one of the best you could find, but we're not going to talk about that now. But then you also have science fiction which is our latest expression of this idea that to enter into the picture, to be part of it, the cosmos has to be in there.

|p3

Now it's a strange thing. They call it cosmism, and it is banned from religion today. You are not even supposed to mention it. This is an interesting thing because it used to be the whole show. And, of course, this is what the Pearl of Great Price restores with a vengeance. Is cosmology an inherent part of religion? This is the question that comes up. When revelation is denied, they talk about deliteralizing and dehistoricizing and de-eschatologizing, and demiracalizing and deapocalypticizing the elements of the Bible. That is you remove all the supernatural elements in the Bible if you want to find the real story—what the real kernel was. As we noted before, we're "above" that primitive nonsense. The early Christians may have believed in that; but, of course, we know better than that. We're scientific. And, as Neery says, if we've done all that, we've got rid of everything, we've de-eschatologized and the like (we don't really believe in a literal heaven) that means that cosmology will also have to go. But without cosmology in religion, an important ingredient is missing, one which the Pearl of Great Price restores actually. At all times the doctors of the Christians and the Jews had driven cosmology out with a fork, to cite Horace, but it always kept coming back. They could never leave it alone.

The issue of how far the real universe is to be involved in our religions has left the learned sitting on the fence. The problem behind much of the vagueness and difficulty of Hermetic and Gnostic literature is that, of course. The terrible questions would disappear at a stroke, as Lovejoy observes. Arthur Lovejoy wrote a book called *The Great Chain of Being*, and it has to do with what they believed about cosmology in the Middle Ages. They always believed in a multitude of worlds, and they always believed in the vastness of the universe. It's the modern world that got rid of it, strangely enough. *The Great Chain of Being* in which all things are related, was the most sensational philosophy book of its time at the beginning of the century. He says just forget the cosmos and then all your questions disappear at a stroke. Then all your answers disappear too—no questions, no answers, nothing to bother about. But this is why we took it up in the first place—to know, are there answers to these questions?

The favorite source of this cosmology in the Christian reason is from Plato's *Timaeus*, the Pseudo-Dionysius, (we won't go into these), and Genesis. After all, it's the physical creation; God created the earth. It was quite physical, whether you like it or not. They won't let us deny the real universe, and consequently (this is Lovejoy speaking) the language of acosmism (that is there is no cosmism in real religion; the negation of a cosmism) is never to be taken too seriously. Nobody really does. This is interesting because they talk about it all the time. One can't simply ignore the universe. As Van der Leeuw writes here, "There's a human inclination—general as well as Christian—to base the trust of one's salvation on the cosmic. Only when the human passion of a divine Savior has a cosmic background does salvation seem sufficiently assured. Without that cosmic background to underpin it, the idea of salvation is not sufficiently confirmed." If you leave that out, it's not strong enough. I knew Werner Jaeger, the great German classicist, very well. He was interested that I was a Mormon. He and his wife used to have me at their apartment, and we would talk a lot about these things.

!p4

In his classical work on the subject he says, as a good Lutheran, that the two do not belong together naturally; in fact, that cosmism and religion are absolute enemies. You can never mix them because one is spiritual and the other is physical. Here we go on that again. In his book *Aristotle*, he says it was Plato who converted astronomy (previously the essence of atheism) into the essence of theology. What a thing Plato did. Before Plato, astronomy was the essence of atheism, according to Jaeger.

Seagram's whiskey sponsored a TV program some years ago in which the leading scientists of the time (I mean the big wheels) such as Shapley, the astronomer; Kistiakowsky, the biologist; and Raymer, the geologist, all got together. The subject was life on other worlds. The whole theme of the series was that if there is life on other worlds, there cannot be a God. Christianity can't possibly be true. There can't be anything about salvation. You see, they were completely brought up on this idea that creation had to be from nothing or it was nothing at all. So if there was life on other worlds, it would discredit all religion. Well, that's a strange conclusion to come to, but Jaeger says that was the very essence of the thing before Plato. Astronomy denied religion. Well, it's just the opposite.

Kant says, "What is it which proves to me that there is a God? The divine law within me and the starry heavens above me." Aristotle looked at the stars moving in their majesty and said, "Now that proves there is a God." Other people look at the same stars moving in their majesty and say, "Now look, that proves there is no God. They get along perfectly well without God." In *The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* we read:

That inverted Bowl we call The Sky,
Whereunder crawling cooped we live and die
Look not to it for help
For it as impotently moves as you and I.

So you can take the very same evidence and prove absolute opposites from it. To one the starry heaven proves there's a God; to another it proves there isn't a God. Well, Jaeger says it was Plato. That's so typical of Professor Jaeger. At that time he was writing his great three-volume work on Greek education called *Paideia*. He brought certain elements in which were very Oriental. I said, "This is treated in the Old Testament, and have you gone into this and this particular source? There's a lot of interesting stuff there on the same subject." He said, no, he wouldn't touch it because if he started bringing that in—although it was perfectly relevant, he admitted—it would destroy the beautiful architectonic structure of the theory of education he had built up. That's a typical German professor. You abolish anything that doesn't fit into your structure and say, "Presto, there it is; that proves it's so." They do that again and again. They remove every passage from the Bible that refers to a physical God, and sure enough, the original Bible didn't say anything about it because they've taken out all those other passages. This is the way it looks. Jaeger says that. You've converted the essence of cosmology as the essence of atheism into the essence of theology.

|p5

This is Karl Kahn speaking, "If when Plato, Xenophon, and Aristotle speak of heaven as a cosmos they do not have in mind the immediate spectacle of the night sky, still the celestial motions are the most conspicuous and most noble manifestation of what they do have in mind." In the Psalm 19 we read, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork."

According to Chaeremon, a very early recorder, astronomy was first and foremost among the studies of the Greek teachers, including Pythagoras. And it was all of Egyptian inspiration, according to the various sources here, Hesiod and the Milesian school of cosmology, etc. The majesty of the cosmos and the clearest evidence of divine order in things was not to be ignored. But if it was accepted, where did it fit into a purely spiritual, abstract, allegorical theology? For example, a Dutchman by the name of C. P. Van Andel recently collected all the Greek writings of Enoch, put them together, and compared them to find the original Enoch. There are many texts; and where they all agree, that's the original source. The thing that bothers him so much is that Enoch is so fond of astronomy. He's bringing it in all the time, and this man considers that corruption. It must be attributed to separate schools or a different cult entirely. But they go together logically enough.

Our friend R.H. Charles is disgusted that Enoch even mentions astronomy. He says there's nothing spiritual about that. He says it's the most crass physical science. It's hardly pure astronomy, incidentally. When the Lord says to Enoch, "I appointed Adam as a name from the four component parts—" the four elements that make up everything, you know. That's the name A D A M. "And I appointed him four special parts and four special stars, and I called his name Adam." The stars, the components, the elements of the body, the colors, the directions; everything goes together. It's all united into a single system.

Now we get this from both the books of Enoch and the books of Abraham (not just ours, but the newly discovered ones also). The special knowledge was passed to Seth and from him to Noah; hence, from Abraham to the Egyptians it was the secret of mathematics and astronomy, according to Jewish tradition, accepted by the doctors of the Middle Ages right down to Thomas Hood in modern times. Now this aspect of Judaism had a peculiar appeal to the early Christians. They liked this cosmos. It's only the moderns that have gotten rid of it. According to some Jewish scholars, that is why the Jewish doctors gave it up—because the Christians adopted it, and they didn't want to become too closely identified. Nicolas Sed wrote a lot in *The Review of Jewish Studies* (1964) and was one of their main scholars. This cosmological mystique of the Middle Ages, the *baraitas*, goes right back to the apocrypha of the first and second centuries. It was shared by the Jews and the Christians up to the fifth century, and then they dropped it like a hot potato and wouldn't have anything to do with it. Strange thing, isn't it? He says this impulse for cosmological speculation of the Palestine rabbis of the first three centuries absolutely dominates them and often traces it to Plato's *Timaeus*. They always trace this to Plato. You don't have to trace it to Plato. People always had cosmology in their religions here mediated by Philo, who was a Jewish Platonist, and the Gnostic writers, which

|p6

produced a special Gnostic "rabbinic gnosis," we are told. Yet Van der Ploeg finds the same cosmological teachings of the Jews already in the Psalms and cites the Nineteenth Psalm, "the heavens declare the glory of God," and he says the Jews always had that in the early days.

Modern scholars shun the question of cosmology. It's poison. It only complicates theology, they say. It was one of the crimes of Joseph Smith to bring it in. They associate it with magic. Carl Schmidt, who at the turn of the century was the foremost authority on early Christian manuscripts, says, "It was cosmological speculative ideas which repelled the fathers of the church more than anything else. They detested them and fought them savagely tooth and nail. The fathers of the church of the fourth and fifth centuries would do anything to suppress that teaching, that the cosmos has anything to do with religion (isn't that strange?), because it's speculative. It is the main issue between them and the Gnostics," he says. "The Gnostics were guilty of turning purely religious objects into cosmic powers which gave the death blow to the eigentumlichkeit of the Christian religion." That is, the genius of Christianity was the abolition of cosmology, he says. There was no cosmos in religion, he claims. When anybody tried to introduce it or go back to the old Jewish teachings or the early Christian teachings, they were guilty of the cosmic heresy; they were guilty of being Gnostics, etc. Apparently, if the Christians taught anything that anybody else had ever taught, they were not original and, therefore, not to be taken seriously.

But I just thought last hour, there is this objection to cosmology; namely, that it could be a dangerous thing. This intimacy with the cosmos is likely to turn people's heads. This has happened, of course; we have stories of this. It can fill people with infinite vanity. People who study the cosmos are willing to accept the divine as long as they are it. Like Longinus: he is the great sublime that he depicts. Carl Sagan would be a good example of that. The symphony orchestra in the background, the heavenly light playing upon him as he gazes off into the vastness. Here is the ultimate achievement of creation, right here, and it has that effect. The great scientists of H.G. Wells, etc.

Faust is the classic instance of that. Faust is a disturbing story. He wanted to know. He had been teaching and had studied all subjects—philosophy, medicine. "I studied all these subjects. I'm an M.A., a Ph.D. and yet after this I don't know anything more than I did before. I'm as stupid as I ever was. What shall I do?" he says. He pulls his students around by the nose, he says, and he's not going to stand this any longer. "I'm trained to magic, but I don't have to tell my students a lot of things that I don't know. This is the object: that I can see all reality together, that I can grasp the whole cosmos and not just fiddle around with the definitions of philosophy, etc." These are the things that bothered Clement. Remember, the school men could only give him the stuff that Faust is utterly sick of. He's sick and disgusted with it. He says, "No dog would live longer like this." It was either suicide or he was going to commit himself to the higher powers to understand these things. And so he becomes the mysterious Dr. Faustus who sells his soul to the devil. He knows too much. You mustn't seek to know these things.

"Seek to know no more," as the witches tell Macbeth.

So this cosmology can turn your head. There's a story in the Apocalypse of Abraham about this. Well, in a number of early ascension stories when the hero, in this case Abraham, goes up and beholds the vastness of the heavens, he becomes dizzy. He has nothing under his feet; he thinks he is going to faint. He starts raving, etc. It's too much for him to behold. And we have several very early Christian stories where the Apostles ask to be shown Satan and his powers and the great gulf. The Lord advises them, "Don't ask to see that. It will do things to you." Is the payoff a wasted life? Faust gets nowhere until he repents and comes back to faith again, lives by faith. The angels say finally, "Don't give up, keep trying, keep striving. Don't let vanity carry you away and you can be saved." Not just on the Rhine, but throughout Europe he was a great myth. He was finally able to master all sorts of things. And the earlier Faust is Marlowe's Faust, the English Faust, a great play. They are both great dramas, as you know. At the end of Marlowe's Faust he says, "See how Christ's blood streams through the universe; one drop of it will save me! Oh, my Christ." He's looking at the Milky Way, and he gets carried off. But earlier he says, "There must be the idea of redemption behind this. It must have to do with the gospel plan somehow or other." Meanwhile, they go into all the various corners of ancient mythology to taste all the forbidden delights, etc., to learn the evils of this world. And they find that they are really not much as a payoff. It's a wasted life.

In 1969 I gave a talk on science fiction and the gospel, and it was just printed without my knowledge. I didn't know anybody had taped the darn thing. Needless to say, it is full of things that shouldn't be there. On page 13 here is the point: "Thus beginning with the great scientist of the early twentieth century of godlike knowledge and uprightness as its central character, science fiction soon discovered chinks in the armor and ended up in very short order with the sinister figure of the mad scientist, either making a Frankenstein monster he cannot control or deliberately perverting his knowledge for power. The mad scientist became the stock figure instead of the great scientist who passed away because he was altogether too fantastic anyway." There are some wonderful examples here of how they actually considered him. But let's go back to some real scientists.

This is by C.P. Snow who wrote novels about life among the scientists at Cambridge in England. And I.E.S. Edwards who was a Cambridge professor knew him very well. C.P. Snow was extremely unpopular and everybody hated his guts. That's why he wrote these novels which are rather vicious digs at life among the great scientists. Everybody is playing dirty tricks and stealing everybody else's data, etc. But this is quite enlightening, these passages about the great ones which we worshipped in my day when I was a teenager here.

Well, here's a quotation from J.M. Brewer, *The Gostec and the Doshes*. This is written in all seriousness. "Falishinski, the great scientist, smiled indulgently. He towered in his chair as though in his infinite kindness of his vast mind there was room to overlook all the foolish little

|p8

foibles of all the weak things that call themselves men." (I think of Carl Sagan there.) "A mathematical physicist lives in vast spaces. To him human beings and their affairs do not loom very important." We have a sort of superman here. The nearest thing to him is the figure of Rutherford who discovered the structure of the atom in the 1920s, and that was sensational. This is what C. P. Snow says about this, "The tone of science at Cambridge in 1932 was the tone of Rutherford. Magniloquently boastful, creatively confident, generous, argumentative and full of hope—science and Rutherford were on top of the world. Worldly success, he loved every minute of it. Flattery, titles, the company of the high official world. He was superbly and magnificently vain as well as wise, and he enjoyed his own personality."

Now here if ever, says the guy here, is the great lovable scientist of science fiction. What more could one ask for than science at such a level? "He enjoyed a life of miraculous success," says Snow. But then something strange follows. "But I am sure that even late in life he felt stabs of sickening insecurity." Now this is strange, sickening insecurity in this of all men. And then Snow goes on to talk about the other great Cambridge scientists. "Does anyone really imagine that Bertrand Russell; G.H. Hardy, the great mathematician; Rutherford; Blackett; and the rest were bemused by cheerfulness as they faced their own individual state? In the crowd they were leaders, they were worshipped; but by themselves they believed with the same certainty that they believed in Rutherford's atom that they were going after this life into annihilation. Against this they had only to offer the nature of scientific activity."

That would keep up the fun for awhile. It's interesting while you are doing it, but it's complete success on its own terms. In itself it was a source of happiness, but it is whistling in the dark when they are alone. Then they know they are going into nothing. Have the fun while you can.

One Moment in Annihilation's Waste,
One moment, of the Well of Life to taste--
The Stars are setting, and the Caravan
Starts for the dawn of Nothing—Oh, make haste!
Oh, make haste.

So cosmology isn't going to answer it. It's not going to take the place of religion, in other words. The Alexandrian-educated Origen, our old friend; we always come back to him. He's our favorite. He knows perfectly well that cosmology has no place in the abstract purity of the religions of the schools of Alexandria. But he says it was the teaching of the early church, and his loyalty is painfully divided in this as in so many other cases. Gregorius Thaumaturgus tells us how Origen first taught him rhetoric. Then Origen taught him holy mathematics, incontrovertible geometry, and astronomy that sets up the ladder to the things of heaven. And this is what Origen taught when he was a teacher at Alexandria. Then he went to Palestine and got into a lot of trouble with the church because he wasn't orthodox. He was teaching the old Christianity and got all mixed up. They didn't like it anymore.

|p9

Notice the name Gregorius Thamaturgus—Gregorius, the wonder worker, because he had this knowledge of all sorts of scientific tricks.

Quoting Cornelius, "For Origen the seductive beauty of the universe existing from aeon to aeon as the genres and species appear and disappear sanctifies matter itself as a means of containing order among the anarchy of the spirits." The order of creatures, species, higher and lower orders, speciation, taxonomy, etc. That to Origen was the structure of the universe, and it was part of God's plan in his early days. He gave it all up. His ambiguous position is clearly in his argument with Celsus who was against the church, and he is trying to answer it. "If the Lord says I am not of this world, there must be other worlds," he says. "Their nature is hard to explain if we would avoid falling into the idea of a universe that is incorporeal (that doesn't have any matter)." He says, "How do you explain it?" This is Origen speaking here. "Is the universe just a fantasy in my mind; is that all religion is?" he says. "This is a highly unsatisfactory conclusion," he says. Then in his great work on the first principles of the gospel, he says, "I just don't see how we are to explain it when the Savior is actually in one place and then another, or the Saints go hither, and some people come down from heaven. Now that calls for physical motion, but the philosophy won't allow it. God is everywhere; he can't move around. What are we going to do?" Well, he tosses up the sponge. He can't imagine what another world would be like. Philosophy has denied him the literalism of the early Saints and he has nowhere to turn. He says, "When finally by grace of God the Saints shall reach the celestial place, then they shall comprehend all the secrets of the stars. God will reveal to them the nature of the universe, but I will leave it there."

So he compromises. You can't get rid of it; God's going to tell us about it later on. Well, he never got to be a doctor of the church. He never got to be a saint, although he was the greatest by far of all their theologians, because he taught these things. He wasn't holy enough. His own training breaks through at the end of the passage when he plugs for perfect knowledge. He says, "Purged of all that is physical and corporeal." That's what he wants. He contradicts himself again. He recommends consulting Philo on the subject. Now Philo, the Jew of Alexandria, neoplatonized the Bible. He said, "You mustn't take these things literally." And Origen recommends going to the Jew Philo if you want a solution.

"As in his speculation on the creation, for Origen the process of history could have for him nothing but a symbolic meaning. As a result, it led Origen into insuperable difficulties in Christology," as Florovsky writes in a recent article. "His aberrations were, in fact, the birth pangs of the Christian mind," Florovsky wrote. They had to make up the values of what we call the Christian mind today. What is taught in all the churches today, except this one, is what emerged at this time. Origen represents the birth pangs. Should he plug for the cosmos, or should he say, as he does in the end here, that we must be purged of all that is physical and corporeal. That would include the resurrection, as you have seen already. "The Christian mind to be respectable has to give up cosmology," says Cornelius. He is in the position of those Stoics and Atomists with their anthropocosmologies—descriptions of the world in terms of man's

|pl0

functions, according to Baillet. And yet how ardently they both protested against being considered anthropocentric. They are, but they don't want to be taken that way. In the *Hortensius* Augustine tells us that his favorite study all his life has been astronomy, of all things. The reason he broke with the Manichaeans after nine years was that they neglected the study of astronomy. Now they couldn't be true Christians, he thought. They were a very old sect in Asia Minor. He joined them and was happy while he was there. But he said they didn't put enough emphasis on astronomy, so he left. In *The City of God* he gives us a typical Stoic, public school picture of the cosmos. But since astronomy could not save a soul, later on he has nothing but contempt for it. "What good is astronomy? It won't save you so forget it," he says. He finally settled for abstraction and rhetoric, as we have seen elsewhere. "The rhetoric he taught was vain, superstitious, and empty of everything," says Father Eggersdorfer.

Well, John Chrysostom tells us (he's the next one) that nothing good in the New Testament has any earthly physical reference (refers to anything physical). "Anytime you read anything in the New Testament that sounds as if it might be physical, interpret it spiritually," he says. "It's just an image, just an allegory, just a figure of speech. Never take anything in the New Testament physically." This doesn't leave you much, does it?

Fred Hoyle at the end of his first book *The Astronomer* says, "I defy anyone to write three meaningful sentences on any subject without some reference to the physical universe." That's quite a test, isn't it? You can't get away from the physical universe. Yet Chrysostom says, "Yes, you can very easily by denying that it is there at all, and if anything says it's there, just call it something else." He says here, "When we read that God is in heaven, we must not give literal interpretation to such a passage. He's no place." And we mentioned that Arnold Lunn cites Jerome as giving the idea of God sitting on a throne as an example of pure absurdity.

Stars do have claim on our respect, if you follow Chrysostom, for God created them for our exclusive use and delight. Their main use is to guide sailors at sea. That's why God made all the stars. Talk about being anthropocentric. That's about as far as you can go, isn't it?

Incidentally, the infantile ideas about the starry heavens—the idea popular in the Middle Ages that the stars were fourteen miles away, etc.—are not the products of infantile minds at all, but the result of the determined effort of the doctors of the church to ban serious cosmology from a place in theology. No wonder they had silly ideas as a result of that. They wanted it to be trivial and silly, even when they turned aside the terrible questions with one-liners. The famous one-liner of Luther, which comes from St. Augustine: "What was God doing before he created the earth? Making a hell for people who ask that question."

According to DeWulf who is the main authority, the big work, on Catholic medieval theology, the unanimous doctrine of the scholastics from the time of Abelard on was the individual alone is the true substance; hence, cosmological doctrines were very vague. Nature as such was

|p11

commonly looked upon as being sui generis with an autonomous life so that theology had nothing to do with the cosmos. Up to the twelfth century there were those caught by the hesitation of St. Augustine between creationism and traducianism. Like Origen, he couldn't make up his mind. Creationism was everything created suddenly out of nothing, referring to preexistence too. Or was it all created at once. St. Aquinas has another way out. He says the spheres of the planets were regarded as being composed of a special sort of matter which was radically different from all terrestrial matter. Now, that's a neat solution. Yes, there is a physical universe there, but it has nothing to do whatsoever with terrestrial matter. They're not the same elements up there as down here. We are living on a unique and peculiar earth. You get that from Aristotle too.

Well, the twilight zone between cosmos and no cosmos was the playground of the Hermetics, and the Hermetic doctrines continued to force themselves, as Sieboldt says here, upon the minds of such thinkers as John Scotus Erigena, teaching the doctrine of the sun as a creative mediator in the developments of the cosmos. Well, with the Renaissance came renewal of astronomy, and religion found it objectionable. Ramus wanted to rid astronomy of the hypothesis of Aristotle and others by which the Middle Ages sought to reconcile the two.

John Calvin, who was the great voice in Protestantism along with Luther, said "No cosmos; get rid of it." This was right at the time of the Renaissance when these things were coming out and discoveries were being made. The prospect was broadening and the universe was being taken in. Very exciting times. For Calvin the answer was it's best not to speak of such things at all. It's unlawful for Paul to speak of them. He says what he's talking about is the cosmos there. That's in the **Institutes** Calvin has written here. "Since Paul, though he was carried to the third heaven, positively declared that it was not lawful for man to speak of the secrets which he had seen."

Hutchinson's *Psychotheology* seems to provide a coherent and meaningful universe in which traditional God was still the center and the circumference. And there is that new book of Alexander Von Koyre on this particular subject—how the theologians and the scientists handled this in medieval and modern times right down to the nineteenth century. There is a work from 1968, a number of people writing together, *Reconciliations of Christology with the Cosmic World*. Today, they are coming around again. We saw that in the case of all the others. The early church taught it; the doctors rejected it. Christianity doesn't teach it now. Joseph Smith comes along with it, and they give him a bad time. Then they start adopting it. That's what Von Humbolt said, always three stages. First they mock it, then they persecute it, and then they say, "Well, we knew it all along." There's the same thing now. Lots of churches have adopted the most objectionable things in the teachings of Joseph Smith. The first thing was revelation. The big three: revelation, restoration, and the dispensations. I mentioned before that I was at a meeting October before last in Washington, D.C. with Jews and Christians talking about the temple. Those were the three words that were kicked around the whole time, the big three.

|p12

And fifteen or twenty years before that, any one of those would have been absolute heresy. The greatest crime of Joseph Smith was speaking of revelation and restoration rather than reformation. And the idea of dispensationism is just as obnoxious as cosmism. They hated that, but they have come around to it now.

The way is opened when Whitehead declares, "Cosmology is philosophy and not science because it is the endeavor to understand in terms of the completely general the metaphorical nature of things." Karl Popper now comes out and says, "Cosmology is religion, and religion is cosmology." If you're studying, you want to know what it's all about and that's cosmology because cosmology is going to include everything—not only other worlds, but what's on them to the slightest detail. So there's your religion. You don't separate them anymore. It's because of its supernatural implications that the theory of Helmholtz, Kelvin, and Arrhenius that life reached the earth through space was rejected by the Positivists. It drew science and religion dangerously close together, they said. The scientists wanted to keep them separated too. So when you get Helmholtz and Kelvin and the new mysterious forces of electricity and mesmerism, and Arrhenius, the idea that life reached the earth through space brings scientific creation and religious creation too close together. They thought that was dangerous. John Lear, who is the science editor for the *Saturday Review*, writes, "Man is a message from a star but it's not yet sure what it means."

So from the religious side also we learn that our heavenly rest is, of course, a state or condition, one that requires a place also. Just what kind of a place? "Does eschatological mean immaterial?" writes a Catholic priest in the *Verbum Domini*. "The idea of cosmic redemption necessarily brings the real cosmos into the picture, again in what sense?" Now this is in the official journal of the Vatican. And it says the cosmic redemption necessarily brings the real cosmos into the picture; again, in what sense? And so we get articles now on Pauline cosmic Christology and ecological crisis today. They mention *Cosmos*, the Lutheran writing; Eliade, *The Prestige of the Cosmogonic Myth*. No one has gone further to reconcile spirit and matter than Teilhard de Chardin, the great Jesuit paleontologist, but even he leaves it up in the air as if the cosmos had to be sanitized or Christianized before we could accept it.

Modern Thomist writers ignore the views of Thomas on cosmology, declaring them to be not essential. That's a shaky excuse at best. This is a particular Jesuit writing. I was in a Latin seminar with H.R.W. Smith in Berkeley and all the other members of the seminar (there were at least a dozen of them) were either priests or nuns. Smith is an active Catholic. With all these Catholic schools around there and the subject being Latin inscriptions, they all flocked to this particular seminar. Someone would whisper, "Did you hear about Sister Eloise? They say she's a Thomist." Thomas Aquinas was the gospel, but it was as if being a Thomist had suddenly come to be a great scandal. Then Sister Eloise would pass around the cigarettes, and everybody would light up and have a good time. But here the idea is that the modern Thomists don't accept Thomas' views.

|p13

"One can embrace the truly wonderful Greco-Roman reverence for the wonders of the starry heavens," Hugo Rahner tells us here. You can do that and be a good Catholic now on the understanding that they are only a sign of what is happening on a higher level of reality between Christ and his church—a cosmos in itself which Origen has called the heaven of our heart. Thus we are back to Origen's solution and perplexities. "Christ gives light to all the spiritual stars, even as in our earthly light luna brings light to the stars. While to our enlightened minds the uniform motion of the stars suggests a machine, to most Greeks it suggests a god. The poor things had never seen a machine," says our friend R. E. Dodds.

Well, how do the Marxists stand on this? This is an interesting thing too. They talk about the cosmist heresy. The cosmists insist on the same separation. They must separate the universe from the cosmos because, of course, you see where they are. Actually it's dialectical materialism. There is only the material. To them religion is just opiate; that doesn't really exist at all, so you can't bring the two together. And yet they react as Darwin reacted speaking of the jungle. When he views the glory of nature, he is filled with the thrill of religious awe and he can't shake it. He just feels that there is something more there. This is a very common experience, and this has bothered the Russians a good deal because they are actually very spiritual people. Notice, religion has been their endurance with all the hells they've had to go through. But the Marxists will not let their cosmos be tarnished with religion any more than the Christian doctors would have their religion corrupted by the cosmos.

Then Rudolf Bultmann: "By his unsubstantiated conclusion that the cosmological texts found in Paul are of Gnostic influence, Bultmann did to Paul what the rabbis did to apocalyptic. He purged it of its world view." M.E. Dahl is writing here, "Jewish eschatology should be taken mythologically." They took it literally. How we take Paul's theology which does give the answer to those questions, he says, depends on whether we like it or we don't like the answer. It's all up to us how we take these things, he says. "We don't need religion to cast light on the nature of cosmos nor on anything else for that matter. A certain type of mentality there is that holds that science is of a limited power, that its ultimate foundation depends on faith." Of course, most scientists go along with that. But according to Reichenbach this finds no support in logic—the rise of scientific philosophy—that science is not founded on faith. Well, this gets into science and religion.

"What you see is not real." Milton was held to be a heretic in his angelology because his angels were too real. They certainly seem abstract and allegorical enough, don't they:

And chiefly thou, O Spirit, that dost prefer
Before all temples th' upright heart and pure,
Instruct me, for thou know'st; thou from the first
Wast present, and, with mighty wings outspread,
Dovelike sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,
And mad'st it pregnant:

|p14

What is he describing—a dove, an angel, or something? Again, he appeals to "what in me is dark; enlighten what is low; raise and sustain." But they say his angels are too literal, so we can't accept Milton as doctrine. People have written many doctor's and master's theses on Milton and Mormonism.

"Even science fiction is forbidden to introduce any religious element," McKenna writes. "The students blush and hate me, but it is for their own good. Science is the only safe game. It is safe only if it is kept pure." You must keep them separate.

Incidentally, we mentioned the **Sefer Yetsirah**, the oldest Hebrew book, written supposedly by Abraham. As Epstein says, it's not concerned either with ethic or religion. Its entire concern is for the natural cosmos. The idea that the natural cosmos might be an object of religious concern doesn't seem to occur to him or to Carl Schmidt or R. H. Charles, or the rest. There is absolutely no place for it.

This has not been a sidetrack. It is right in the mainstream of the Pearl of Great Price, as you know, because cosmology is one of the very strong points. This is what immediately attracted Joseph Smith to the papyri. He said, "They are star charts; they're plans of the heavens." And they are indeed. So we are going to get lots more of that. Someday we will get around to the Pearl of Great Price, but it's all there. It's a small book, and you can read it anytime. Then you'll notice all these things are there. If you go into our theological library over here (and we have a big one), you will see that Joseph was different, and he has really given the world something it did not have. People don't know that. People have short memories, and we count on that. Ministers and priests don't study this stuff. They don't bother about it. They're concerned with their congregations, getting them out to meeting, getting their contributions. So this is a very important lesson on this cosmology business.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 6

I made a bad mistake time before last. I said that Popper said that all religion is cosmology and all cosmology religion. Of course, he didn't say that. He said that all science is cosmology. The other remark that all religion is cosmology could have been made by somebody like Santillana. Goethe would certainly say it. He says, "Who knows or who has science and art, he has religion. And if you don't have them, you'd better get religion." But if you had a complete knowledge of science, then you would have religion. If you have no knowledge of science at all, you'd better get religion.

We've been speaking about Joseph Smith's restoring certain basic religious teachings which the world had lost. Notice, we're not going into scientific things. We are just keeping it scriptural stuff all along here—the old records. And the Pearl of Great Price is the best guide to such lost teachings. So far we have talked about the literalism of it, and the preexistence, and the last time we talked about cosmology.

Now we come to the sorest and touchiest subject of them all. This is a blister. The subject is creation, of course. Even those at BYU are divided on it. There are two totally different schools of creation right in our midst. The problem is that we don't have a dichotomy here; we have a trichotomy—a tricky trichotomy. Dichotomy is used a good deal by philosophers. Sterling McMurrin up at the University of Utah just adores the word; he works it to death. But nobody ever says trichotomy because that's what we have here. Well, philosophers don't believe in trichotomy. Hegelian dialectic calls for dichotomy. Everything has an opposite; every thesis has an antithesis. They get together and form a new synthesis. That's natural that there should be two. Why should you insert a third element? Well, you can't really. It must come from another world. That's why Joseph Smith spoils it with his trichotomy. It's in the dictionary; I looked it up. Dichotomy means to cut into two pieces—cut down the center. Trichotomy is to cut into three pieces. That's what we have to deal with here. In the normal dichotomy of things, everything divides in two—good and bad, the two kingdoms, etc. We're in between them now. We don't belong to either one. We'd have to make up our minds between them. In the natural order of things there is no third. It was this and the opposite in the order of the world, but Joseph Smith brought in something else. Mormonism is another world and it just doesn't apply.

Now, the classic dichotomy from the very beginning has been between science and religion. You think science and religion is a modern issue. It isn't at all; it's ancient. In 585 B.C. Thales of Miletus predicted an eclipse, and it happened. And the School of Miletus decided that there is a god but the things of heaven are imponderable. You can't bring them into the laboratory; you can't weigh and measure them. So for our purposes let's just leave them out of our calculations. Since that's an unknown quantity, we can't use it.

|p2

We'll just leave it out, and that's what they did. Before long, they decided it's extra baggage; we don't need it anyway. Then it became a pernicious nuisance. We should just get rid of it. To have true science, you don't have it at all. With the Egyptians it was the same thing. So you have this big quarrel between science and religion as if they were different things. The reason is that religion deals with things that science can't find available. If you can't measure it, you can't be sure about it. If it's subjective, keep it out of the laboratory. Well, the laboratory gives you all you have. That's all you know, so forget about the other. That's just excess baggage. So that's the course that has been taken. Well, the classic dichotomy is that, then. And which gives the true explanation is the question, of course. This is the point: When we say science versus religion, we are speaking as you would speak ten thousand years ago or three thousand years ago. As Heraclitus of Ephesus was very well aware (he kept rubbing it in here), you're speaking not of science and religion but only of conventional contemporary science versus conventional contemporary religion. And now we can quote Karl Popper. "Where both are concerned, you are dealing with something that is always tentative. You do not have the final answer. The last returns aren't in. You are not going to settle it until you know a lot more than you do about both of them. And you'll never know enough."

Since the answers are always tentative, what do you do? What Joseph Smith has given us in the Pearl of Great Price is something that conventional contemporary religion doesn't have because they lost it and conventional contemporary science doesn't have because they never found it. So Joseph Smith didn't go to either of these for his instruction, and he offended both of them. His followers have always tended to take sides though because they are stuck with the two. Remember, Joseph said, "Whenever I start talking about this creation business, people fly apart like glass. They can't stand the fire. They will stick to their old traditions. I can't even bring it up. They want to string me up to the nearest tree if I start talking about that because their prejudices are so deep and so established." And it was the same way with the scientists, as we will see here. There are some very interesting remarks. They have taken sides and still do. They are unable to disengage themselves from the world and its ways. We live in it and we're stuck with it until we get rid of certain things. In the same way we have taken sides on matters of economics and politics, both being totally alien to the gospel—both extremes. So today, one feels obliged to be either a fundamentalist or a Darwinist, for example. Well, the gospel rejects both. Fundamentalism follows Thomas Aquinas' definition of creation as creation out of nothing. "Instantaneous and simultaneous," as Aquinas says. In one second it was all created, complete all at once. According to the Darwinists it's creation by nothing, without plan and without direction. What created it? Well, chance. Please define chance for me. Well, just what happens, that's all. So we have creation by nothing and creation out of nothing. Of course, we reject both of them. The Pearl of Great Price is the best reply to both of them.

Now, the two journalists who had the greatest impact in the country were Horace Greeley, who was a friend of Brigham Young, and James Gordon Bennett, who founded the *New York Herald* which for many years was the foremost newspaper in the country.

|p3

James Gordon Bennett was a very able man. Both of them had a lot to say about Mormonism. It's an interesting thing. This has to do with the Pearl of Great Price; that's why it's interesting here. This is an editorial in the *New York Herald* for Sunday, April 3, 1842. Why would that be significant? Because in the middle of March 1842 the first publication of the Pearl of Great Price was in the *Times and Seasons*. It included the Facsimile No. 1 and the explanations thereof and up to the eighteenth verse of the second chapter of the Pearl of Great Price. Well, less than a month later it was picked up by the New York papers and the Boston papers and they were quite excited about it. It really electrified the nation. We don't pay any attention to it today, but you would be surprised what an effect it had.

You used to hear a lot about James Gordon Bennett in my day. He was the most influential newspaper editor of the time, and he wrote this on April 3, just a couple of weeks later: "This Joe Smith is, undoubtedly, one of the greatest characters of the age. He indicates as much talent, originality, and moral courage as Mahomet, Odin, or any of the other great spirits that have hitherto produced the revolutions of past ages."

Notice, that he mentioned Odin because at this time it was popular to regard Odin as the great folk hero of the North (a real person) thanks to the writings of Carlyle. In his *On Heroes and Hero-Worship* he makes a big thing of Odin, and so did others such as Max Mueller. Odin is the Woden of German mythology. They thought he was a real person and a founder of civilization. He could very well have been. We won't go into that now. That's another story. You take the saga class for that.

Now, this is what Joseph Smith is correcting, according to Bennett. His editorial continues: "In the present infidel, irreligious, material, ideal, geological, animal-magnetic age of the world..." It was a time when they thought a lot of science was explained by animal magnetism, that was mesmerism, etc. They didn't know what electricity was. Galvani and Volta were just beginning to be aware of this mysterious power of electricity. Of course, today we know all about electricity. We know it runs through wires and you get a bad shock, etc. But today we still don't know what it is. Nobody has the vaguest idea to this day. Unsatisfied electrons, I suppose, that have to be fed. This was the scientific world of the time of Joseph Smith.

Notice that the religious world is up in arms against him, but look what he's doing to the rest of them here now: "... some such singular prophet as Joe Smith is required to preserve the principle of faith, and to plant some new germs of civilization that may come to maturity in a thousand years. While modern philosophy, which believes in nothing but what you can touch . . ." Now this in 1842. We might say that's our scientific age today. They were just as disillusioned in those days, and, as we have seen, their religion was abstract and immaterial. You can see why the two couldn't meet because science would believe only in what you could touch, and religion would not believe in what you could touch. Anything tangible was not spiritual. It was irreligious, physical, and corrupt—Neoplatonism.

!p4

"While modern philosophy, which believes in nothing but what you can touch, is overspreading the Atlantic States, Joe Smith is creating a spiritual system, combined also with morals and industry, that may change the destiny of the race." Then he goes on and raves for quite awhile and says, "Joe is a magnet in a large way, which he calls a power or spirit from heaven. In other respects Joe is a mighty man of God—possessing large stores of human nature—great shrewdness, and as he has taken the management of the Mormon newspaper organ, the *Times and Seasons* into his hand, we look for many revelations, and some curious ones, too, pretty soon."

What brought this on is the Book of Abraham, not the Book of Mormon or the Doctrine and Covenants. The Book of Abraham is what caught people's attention because of its tangible nature. Bennett's editorial began like this: "We give in this day's paper a very curious chapter from the Book of Abraham which we find published in the last number of a weekly journal called the *Times and Seasons*, conducted by Jo. Smith, the great Mormon Prophet, in the city of Nauvoo, Hancock County, Illinois." And the article concludes: "We certainly want some such prophet to start up, take a big hold of the public mind—and stop the torrent of materialism that is hurrying the world into infidelity, immorality, licentiousness, and crime." He is talking in 1842, not 1986. "Professor Lyell, Richard Adams Locke, Dr. Brisbane, Master Emerson, Prophet Brownson, Horace Greeley, and all the materialists of the age, ought to take a leaf of common sense out of Joe's book." Professor Lyell was the founder of modern geology at that time. He was a Scotsman who went down to the beach and looked at the deposits of sandstone and said, "This must have taken millions and millions of years," and then started things going. Brisbane's son was the chief editor of the Hearst newspapers for years. Arthur Brisbane was the oracle of the nation when I was a kid. Not this Brisbane. I was not a kid in 1842. Notice that he even spoofs Emerson here. Wasn't Emerson quite spiritual? No, the whole New England school was enlightened in this way. The Prophet Brownson was really stirring up things. And Horace Greeley was the rival editor.

You notice in this editorial there is not a word about the ministry. Why don't they cheer for him? And Joseph Smith is not attacking anything. You'll find nothing in the Articles of Faith saying we denounce this or that. It doesn't even mention the Apostasy in the Articles of Faith. It's what we do believe, not what we don't. We're not interested in other people being wrong. Joseph never attacked the ministry, but they certainly attacked him. And he didn't attack the scientists here, but he preached something that would take the place—the Pearl of Great Price filling in the gap. The religionists keep silence, and the scientists here keep silence too. As Bennett says, Joseph Smith moves into the gap and tells them what will do some good here. But why don't the ministry cheer for him then? What do they teach that so sets them against the Prophet? They didn't like him at all, especially because he was a rival. They rivaled each other and didn't like each other.

This editorial can be found in a book by Jay M. Todd titled *The Saga of the Book of Abraham*, published by Deseret Book in 1969. We have several copies here. It has this and a lot of other

|p5

relevant material about this. There's a lot about the mummies and things like that which really aren't important as far as I'm concerned. But the author has brought together all sorts of odds and ends in the book, which is quite a useful one.

Todd cites another editorial which appeared the same week. The *Boston Daily Ledger* which was the big New England paper, the intellectual paper, devoted the whole front page to the Book of Abraham, with a big picture of the Facsimile No. 1. Which does the Book of Abraham most contradict, science or religion? Must we take sides? We must take sides as long as we ignore the Pearl of Great Price. But if we pay more attention to it (which we should begin to do), then we won't be so disturbed and torn apart by this issue. Three days later the *Boston Daily Ledger* devoted almost the whole front page to the Book of Abraham. The editor, William Bartlett, was from a very eminent family (you've heard of *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations*). One William Bartlett was a scientific writer, and another one wrote about art. This is his editorial: "We shall publish tomorrow Joe Smith's translation of the Book of Abraham, the original of which Joe says he obtained from papyrus found in the catacombs of Egypt. . . Smith is decidedly the greatest original of the present day. He carries all before him when he undertakes an enterprise— knows no impediment—and never halts in his course till he has accomplished his object. . . He is a genius—and a rare one—and all the armies of Satan, should they confront him in a solid phalanx, would be sure to meet with sore discomfiture, if not complete annihilation. . . . [I don't know how this went over with the ministry in Boston.] We have so high a opinion of Joe Smith, that we intend to open a correspondence with him, in order to acquaint ourselves with all his secret springs of action, and thus, get all the secrets of his success, public and private, worldly and ecclesiastical. The chapter from the recently rediscovered Book of Abraham, and the unique cut which illustrates it, on our outside, [they printed it in that issue, you see] has occasioned us some expense; but we care not for that, so long as we please our patrons, which we mean to do at all hazards. . ."

Note that it is specifically the Book of Abraham that impresses these men here. So our attitude when we talk about the conflict between science and religion is not a plague on both your houses, but rather we say, here comes somebody who has been there, or says he has, and produces a lot of interesting credentials. Let's ask him and see what he says about it. So this semester I intend to avoid the scientific aspects of the question which have sidetracked me again and again (calamitously, since I don't know anything about the subject). There are some very good popular works bringing us to date on science such as the one by Gary Zukav, *The Dancing Wu Li Masters: An Overview of the New Physics*, which is required reading in the Honors Program. Anyway, I intend to avoid the scientific aspects of the question. They're always tentative anyway. It's the historical and literary aspects we are going to consider now. There's an awful lot of it, and we are just going to consider it superficially. It should not be ignored in spite of the great problems and difficulties that it too raises. The reason I turn to it is that it is ignored. This year, the thesis has been that we find in the Pearl of Great Price the authentic teachings of the earliest records; not what science would be if science knew all the answers, but what the earliest records actually were. The earliest records of the Jews and Christians

|p6

denounced and deleted by the doctors of the schools in late antiquity and resulting in a very incomplete record—faulted, complex, misleading, etc. Well, the Pearl of Great Price will put us back on the track. So the subject today is that touchiest of all subjects, the creation.

And the Council in Heaven is what takes priority here. It looms magnificent. You find it everywhere, and it's one of the things that is overlooked all the time. But it is the first consideration when you talk about the creation. There's something else which was reprinted in *BYU Studies*, volume seven (Autumn 1965). It was the second faculty research lecture that was given here, and it was by me on this subject. I remember when Eliade read it in Chicago. He was enormously impressed and excited about it. We will have occasion to refer to Eliade here. He is the great authority on comparative religion. Everybody quotes him. I'm going to quote a little from the lecture to show what the early Jews and Christians thought about this, and it played a very dominant role here. It has to do with the Council in Heaven more than anything else. The faculty lecture was given March 17, 1965, twenty years ago. We talk about the newly discovered documents here because they were the oldest and the best we had. Why must they be newly discovered; why didn't we know them all along? They hadn't been destroyed. They were absolutely taboo. Remember, the doctors of the church and the rabbis wouldn't touch them with a forty-foot pole and condemned anyone who did. It says in the Talmud, any student who asks the big questions of Clement: Where did we come from? Where are we going? When was the earth created and what happened? Was there a preexistence? Are there other worlds? If any student asked such questions, it was better he had never been born. That's the way the doctors of the Jews and Christians view it. And so its the newly discovered documents that have been out of the way all this time. How they survived is interesting. Like the Book of Mormon, they were all buried. The Dead Sea Scrolls were buried deliberately to come forth at a later age—buried with great care and blocked up and sanded up. It's the same thing with the Nag Hammadi library—put in jars and hidden away to come forth later. Remember, the Book of Mormon says, "To come forth in their purity (1 Nephi 14:26)."

Whenever people handle documents, they spoil them. Nobody can copy notes without making mistakes, then making corrections. And before you know it you can hardly recognize what started. You can start a simple English sentence going around the class. He copies it down and folds it over. The next person copies down just what he wrote, not what he copied, and folds it over. The next person copies the last one, etc. Before it has gone through ten people, you won't recognize that sentence. This is what happens when you copy things. So the newly discovered ones have come back because they have been preserved in their purity. That's the only way they can be preserved.

They have much to say about the Council in Heaven and the plan laid down at the foundation of the world. According to the wise Ben Sirach, talking about the Old Testament assemblies in Deuteronomy and Leviticus when Israel was required to assemble once a year for great festivals, etc., "these were the ritual repetition, not merely of the gathering at the foot of Sinai when Moses brought them together to counsel them, but specifically of the great assembly that met

|p7

above at the creation of the world. When God set before them, the human race to be, the covenant of the law of life and showed them his judgments, their eyes beheld his glorious majesty and their ears heard his voice." Now Ben Sirach is the greatest work of Hebrew wisdom literature. That is chapter 17, verses 11-13.

Second Baruch was a contemporary of Jeremiah and Lehi. In fact, he was the secretary of Jeremiah, and he and Ezra both wrote books at the same time. The big question that worried him was why should Israel fall? Why would they become captives? They were bad but not nearly as bad as the people who took them captive. The Lord says that's the very point. Like he said to the Nephites, "The Lamanites have been cursed with a sore cursing; nevertheless, they shall smite you to destruction." Let that be a lesson to us. According to II Baruch, the whole plan of the history of the world is set forth in detail when the Mighty One took counsel to create the world. He presented this plan to them. You will find II Baruch in that big book of R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*.

According to the Book of Enoch, a very important recent discovery, "In the beginning the Head of Days, with head like white wool, sat with the Son of Man beside him upon the throne of his glory and the books of the living were open before him." These books were the register of the names of those who were to live upon earth. They had a big roll call to make sure that everybody would be there for the presentation of the plan. Then the calling of the mission of the Son and the plan, both of which were kept secret until then, were revealed to the elect before they came here. It was revealed again in the Book of Mormon.

It's not too much to say that the dominant theme of the **Thanksgiving Hymn**, the Hodayot, is the ecstatic contemplation of the wonder of man's participation in the heavenly affairs back to the beginning. The most wonderful of the Dead Sea Scrolls is a collection of thanksgiving hymns. Now here is hymn six or hymn F from the Hodayot scrolls published in the early 1950s: "Thou hast caused me to mount up to an eternal height and to walk in an inconceivable exaltation, and I know that there is a hope for everyone whom thou didst form of the dust in the presence of the eternal assembly, and that the sinful spirit whom thou hast purified of great sin may be counted with the hosts of the saints and enter the society of the congregation of the sons of heaven. Thou didst appoint unto man an eternal share with the spirits that know, to praise thy name in joyful unison with them and to recount thy wondrous works in the presence thereof." This is the great creation hymn it's referring to when the sons of God shouted and the morning stars sang together.

Well, the whole point of this is that man actually belongs by prior appointment to that community of the elect who share in the knowledge of the plan and who shouted for joy at the foundation of the world. In the hymn preceding this, God is hailed as the Prince of the Gods and King of the venerable ones. And we remind ourselves that this is neither a Gnostic nor a pagan production. This was orthodox Judaism back in those early days.

|p8

In the first chapter and twenty-fourth verse of the **Clementine Recognitions** when he meets Peter, Peter tells him of the plan of God which he announced as his own will and desire in the presence of the first angels and which he established as an eternal law for all. He gave it to them as the law in the beginning. In one of the Coptic texts they give it the characteristic Gnostic twist. "My father, the joyful glorious light," says the **Psalm of Thomas**, "summoned all the eons of peace [the first angels have now become mere abstractions; they are simply the eons of peace] all his sons and all his angels and established them that they might rejoice in his greatness and share it. All bowed the knee before him in saying his praises together, hailing him as the illuminator of worlds." It's the same picture, but this is a very early group in Egypt. Were they interpreting this mystically? Whatever it was, they knew about the council. This is the very same picture we get from the Clementines where it says that he summoned all the angels of peace, all his sons and all the angels and established them that they might rejoice in his greatness. Remember verse 39 in the first chapter of Moses, "For behold, this is my work and my glory—to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man."

Then there's the newly discovered **Creation Apocryphon**. Incidentally, we have all these Coptic texts here. And, fortunately, Coptic is not the most difficult language in the world. It was never required of ministers until 1950 at least. I recommend Coptic because it's fun. It hangs together beautifully, and it's not hard. But anyway the Coptic text tells us "on that day began the discussion in which gods, angels, and men participated [when they were to discuss the creation] and the decisions of the discussion were then carried out by gods, angels and men ['we will go down'] and they saw that their plan was being followed." This is all told in the Book of Abraham, as you know, third and fourth chapters. "But Prince Jabub did not understand the power of faith."

Again, what do we read in the Book of Moses where it says Satan sought to destroy the plan of the world for he knew not the mind of God. That's the most encouraging thing in the scriptures to me. Satan has a terrific game going and he wins hands down all the time, but he knows not the mind of God, so he's not going to win. "But Price Jabub did not understand the power of faith and so was denied authority over matter which the others shared." That's a very interesting quotation. The power of faith, it will be recalled, was the power, we are told, by which the worlds were created. So we get the same picture from the Coptic source and from the Dead Sea Scrolls source. They were written about the same time.

And then the earliest writings after the New Testament were the seven apostolic fathers. The last of them to be discovered was the Pastor of Hermas. The unimpeachable Pastor of Hermas is quite as specific. This is in 120 A.D. Hermas was the brother of the bishop of Rome supposedly. This is a lamentation on the speed with which the apostasy has overtaken the church. Everything is going down the drain, and it's a cry of distress with the others, Barnabas and Ignatius. In 2 Clement, he's standing on a headland watching a friend swimming out at sea. The friend is getting farther and farther away from shore. He's calling to the church, "Come back before it is too late. You're going in the wrong direction." At last his voice is carried

|p9

away by the wind. It's very much like the last prophets in the Book of Mormon and the Jaredites.

So the Pastor of Hermas says, "Behold God constructing the world in accordance with the great council [some manuscripts have 'the most honored council'], creating the beautiful world and turning it over to his chosen ones that he might carry out his promise to them which he gave them in the midst of great glory and rejoicing; that is if they kept his laws which they accept in great faith." Well, there's the situation exactly: "we will prove them herewith." It will become a time of probation. The plan is placed before them. They vote on it, etc. They would return to his presence and partake of eternal life if they keep his laws. It was to be a test and probation. This life became a time of probation, as Nephi said, which they accepted in great faith. They all voted to come down.

The Mandaean version (very old work from Mesopotamia) is very interesting because it calls the creator **Ptah-il**, gives him an Egyptian name, combining the archaic Egyptian and the Semitic names. While giving the familiar account of the great council, it adds the important detail that three messengers were sent down to supervise the work and to instruct Adam; these three being glorious angels who were later to live upon the earth as ordinary mortals and prophets. They were to be apostles later on. You find that text in Leipoldt.

I'm going to skip to something very old now. Here's this Eliade. I mentioned him before. He has written many books on this. Just a number of writings to generalize here. Mircea Eliade is Romanian, I think. He was at Swift at the Theological School in Chicago when I was over in the Oriental Institute, but we never met. He had a student who was LDS, and he asked where I was teaching, where this Nibley character was. He said, "He's over at the Oriental Institute just across the quad." But the people at the Oriental Institute never talk to the people in the Theology School. That was Swift Hall, the library. I was doing some very interesting stuff in Swift Library there. It's supposed to be the theological seminary for Chicago, and they had no Catholic books or journals. We have a great collection of them here, one of the best in the country. It's better than you will find at Notre Dame. Somebody gave Notre Dame eight million dollars for books, and they spent every penny of it on books about Dante. I remember it made my friend Frank Barry so furious because they spent eight million on one writer alone. So the people in the two never met. But in this article on cosmogonic myths, he compares them. His business is prehistoric shamanism and world religions.

You can get a very good comparison of world religions, throughout the world, beginning with so-called primitives and right down to the big religions today. It's the collection of Joseph Campbell called *Masks of the Gods*. He was here three years ago and gave some very fine talks, and we had some nice talks with him. If you want to review the general situation of world religions from the beginning, you can't do better. The book is very readable, and there are at least three volumes out.

|p10

Moses 1:34. And, of course, it means "many" here. I notice that even Siegfried Lawrence, a very prejudiced character, says what it means is a **gesammtheit**—a gathering, a compound, or a complex. It includes everything in itself, and you will see why. The word is very productive in Egypt. It's a word that means almost anything. You just draw a sled, and this is **tm**. It's a regular verb meaning "to be," but it also means "not to be." It means "to complete, to complete a circle." Immediately, you think of the Hebrew word for perfect. Job was an upright man, **yashar watamim**, upright and perfect. **Tamim** means a perfect circle. It comes right back to the beginning where it started. Of course, **tamam** is the standard Arabic word for perfect or complete. Well, Atum is the one who is perfect and complete. Oh, there are all sorts of things. When we get to the Atum literature, we may talk about them. But in Egyptian it means "to be complete, to be everything, to be nothing, and not to be." The basic meaning they give is **mes-tm**, "one who begot all." Well, that's what it's written as here. The father of all. **Mes** is like Moses, etc. It means "to beget, to have a child." And **Mes-tm** is the one who begot all. And Anthes says the name of Adam represents all that has gone before himself and all that comes after himself. He is the great bottleneck. As to his own origin, we are told it is deliberately left unrevealed or unreported. There are various theories, of course. But in the Pyramid Texts, the oldest writings we have after this, he is the primal god who comes down to earth—the first one to set foot on the primal hill when the waters divide. When the land becomes habitable, Atum is the first one to occupy it. We are told in one text he needed no magic because he came first. He was a real fact. He doesn't need to create something. He has a companion, Amun's **pallakida**, his mate. That's a very interesting way of putting it, as Bonnet does. This was his companion, his helpmeet. This was Hathor, the woman who settled the land. The priestesses of the Atum temple were always called Hathors. That goes back, he thinks, to a tree cult because they have this tree of life business here.

In spite of any magic background, the creation was an act of mind. But at Heliopolis there was a real marriage we are told. Right where the rivers meet, this is Heliopolis. I said that's where the airport is today. It is right here. It's the **On** of the Bible, and **Unell** meaning the stone pillars. It's the old megalithic foundation. It's very important in the New Testament. That's where Moses lived, where Joseph married the daughter of the high priest, where Abraham taught and was taught. Everybody went to Heliopolis, and the earliest Christian accounts say that's where Jesus' parents took him when they went there. There were two temples, the temple at Jerusalem and the temple at Heliopolis. In the Bible they are in frequent contact with each other. We'll get to more of that.

So he brought forth the first pair, which bringing together became the source of all life on earth. They were the first flesh. But it is an interesting thing. He does not create, he begets. He is a father. He does not create; others do that. And then there's this idea "who begot himself." What is it talking about there? Diodorus tells us "the seed not the womb contains the life of the child. Therefore, Adam contained within himself the life as in the womb, and so he is both father and mother." Bonnet insists that there is nothing offensive about this.

|p11

Sing Heavenly Muse, that on the secret top
of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
That shepherd who first taught the chosen seed
In the beginning how the Heavens and Earth
Rose out of Chaos: or, if Sion hill
Delight thee more, and Siloa's brook that flowed
Fast by the oracle of God, I thence
Invoke thy aid to my adventurous song,
That with no middle flight intend to soar
Above th' Aonian mount, while it pursues
Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme.

See, he calls the muse to instruct him how things began in the beginning, and this is the way the epic story and the creation stories begin. Almost the identical words are used in Hesiod. We mentioned last time that Milton was condemned because in his work his angels were too literal or too physical. But the oldest Greek account we have starts out "quoting Milton" word for word. What do you know about that?

We don't have much time, but I'm going to talk about the oldest book in the world. We mentioned it before. I suppose we should have a closeup of this. Can you all see it from here? It's reproduced here; it's rather tiny. This is the **Memphite Theology** or the **Shabako Stone**. I think it was Breasted's greatest achievement to discover the importance of this. If you want to know about it, read Breasted's book called *The Origins of Religion* (of course, it's long out of date now; 1912). I say this is the oldest book in the world, and what a religious document it is. Do you expect this to be primitive mumbo jumbo, a lot of hocus pocus, wonders, and miracles, etc.? Ah, just wait. Shabako was the third king of the twenty-fifth dynasty. Interesting relationships to the Book of Mormon here. His name means "wild cat," and he came to the throne about 716 B.C. You say is this the oldest in the world. Ah, just wait. The twenty-fifth dynasty was founded by Kashta, and then his son was Piankhi. It's very funny. The twenty-first dynasty was founded by a person called Korihor whose son was Piankhi. That's a very funny name; you don't invent a thing like that. It wasn't discovered until the 1870s that Piankhi is a name that we have in the Book of Mormon. Korihor was a priest of Amon who usurped the power of the state. His son Piankhi became king. In the Book of Mormon when they set up the old-fashioned courts, they bring in a man called Korihor. Alma says, "This is the first time this has happened since the old world." They restored these things. You start comparing these names and some amazing names turn up. They certainly impressed Professor Albright.

Well, they were Ethiopian kings. The one that followed after him was Shebitka. Then comes the famous Taharqa. He practically delivered Jerusalem from the Assyrians. So this dynasty was held in great esteem. Their names would have been adopted in Jerusalem by the Jews. This interloping dynasty had championed Israel. We're not going to get into the Book of

|p12

Mormon here. The thing is that to celebrate the founding of this dynasty and to justify and sanctify it, he decided to restore the oldest temple in Egypt—the original temple, the one that was built to celebrate the founding of the first dynasty by Menes. It was the white temple at Memphis. He was to restore it and perform the same rites and ordinances (they didn't know about this at the time) that were performed when the kingdom of Egypt was originally found. The kingdom was "founded" by Menes in about 3100 B.C. But at that time it was very old. See, he was founding the order of God on earth, the celestial order on earth. He built the temple, and there they rehearsed in dramatic form the Council in Heaven, the creation of the earth, and the fall and redemption, and all these things in this document. Well, when Shabako wanted to renew the order of things and reestablish the ancient practices (which were very ancient at the time of Menes, Dynasty I), he decided to renovate the temple, and in the process in the cornerstone they discovered a document. It was a rolled-up scroll of leather. And he tells us about it here. It was the script of a play performed at the installation of the first king of Egypt. The dedication of the first temple that united Egypt to celebrate the beginning of the new rule, a new dynasty, a new nation, a new age of the world. And it was held, of course, at the new year.

Their play begins with the Council in Heaven and the controversy over the right to dominion with Horus winning over Seth—being recognized as the first born, the sole heir and the opener of the ways. More than a third of the text is missing. That's the middle part. That's where a column stood. It was found at Memphis, and this is the copy that was made at that time. But it was brought to the British Museum way back in 1805 or 1807. See, the French went into Egypt, and then the English came and took over, and they took this to the British Museum. It was very worn so they had difficulty reading it, and various attempts were made. Then new sophisticated methods of lighting and a much better knowledge of old Egyptian grammar (because it turns out that it was in the archaic form of the language), enabled Sethe to produce in 1929 the definitive text. So we have the text of it here, and we know what it says. It is a marvelous document which we will read the next time.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 7

It would seem that a lot more has survived than we supposed in Egypt from the Pearl of Great Price. (I have an honest cold now, not just that everlasting allergy. I've been kissing the baby too much.) We were talking about the **Shabako Stone** which is usually called the **Memphite Theology**. I try to avoid it, but I can't; it's such a very important writing. The latest study of it is by Zabkar who has said in the **J.N.E.S.**, thirteenth volume, "One of the most important documents of the entire Egyptian literature, which originated at the very beginning of Egyptian history, is the document of **Memphite Theology**." We mentioned that the **Shabako Stone** was found by the French and brought to the British Museum way back in 1805. It has just been interpreted since the 1920s. But it is the most important document we have from all of English literature, as far as we can conceivably go back. "A supreme god and creator, in this case Ptah, created the whole universe and all it contains by conception of his mind and the commanding efferece of his will. The impact of the **Memphite Theology** was so fundamental that its effect on the Egyptian religious thought remained constant until the end of Egyptian religion." This was the dominant text. If there was a Bible, this would be it. This was their Genesis, their Torah.

"Unparalleled in the history of the ancient Orient as far as its cosmogenic significance is concerned, it deals not only with the creation, but it deals with the cosmogony." And, of course, this is our Pearl of Great Price, especially the Book of Abraham and the Book of Moses. They are both very strong on cosmogony, as you know—Moses being a re-editing of Abraham, as we will see later. It's not cosmological explanation of the cosmos, but cosmogonic—how the cosmos came to be. "It traveled from century to century from one theological system to another. Its theme sounds from the first line of Genesis." We have it in our Genesis: **Bereshit bara Adonai**, etc.

Joseph had it right too because he said it was the council that met at the beginning. That's what we are talking about, the council here. ". . . from the first line of Genesis, from there on through the Old Testament and the latest period of Hebrew literature. It reaches the pages of the New Testament witnessing to what extent this conception of creative power of the Word of God persisted in the ancient Orient, becoming a universal theological theme." It goes right on down into the New Testament. "While the **Memphite Theology** through the Old Testament prepared the consciousness of the religious world for John's logos doctrine about the manifestation and creative power of the Word of God, so the **Amarna Theology** sounded some themes which in the New Testament, especially in John's gospel, represent fundamental features of the relationship between the Father and the Son."

Now all of this is in the Shabako text. Remember we said that Shabako was the third king of the twenty-fifth dynasty. After Kashta comes Piankhi, and then Shabako is his younger brother.

|p2

His name means "wild cat." It's funny, in this dynasty the names very often refer to cats of various sorts. Shabako began to reign about 716 B.C. That comes very late, but remember when he wanted to legitimize the dynasty, he decided to go through all the ordinances and renew the Temple of the White Wall (the oldest temple where the Egyptian kingdom was founded). Here was Memphis right at the base of the Delta near Cairo, and the Red Sea comes down here. This is the Sinai Peninsula—carries right on up into the Negev. And here's the Dead Sea up here. But this is where it all centered here—where the two lands reunited, the north land and the south land. There's a very interesting account of how the serpents were driven from the land. And great heaps of them were piled up and set afire. That was the only way they could get rid of them. They were a health hazard and there was the foul stench. Remember, it was swamp country. To occupy it, they had to overcome these serpents all the time. Now Elise Baumgartel, who made the main study on this particular subject, says that in the earliest time they preserved all the land northward as a refuge for game and for cattle grazing. It was not farmed; it was practically not populated. She's wrong there, but she gives us a picture with various documents as to how they spared one part of the land for farming (the very rich Nile valley) and the other part was for game and hunting. They loved to hunt. Their hunting was in the marshes; they didn't hunt in the back country. The kings of the eighteenth dynasty went into Asia and hunted lions and elephants. They loved that sort of thing. But all the great hunting through the early dynasties was done in the marsh lands.

And remember in the Book of Ether, King Lib did the same sort of thing. After he had driven out the serpents (it rained and the serpents went away) then he divided the land into two parts. He kept the land south as a refuge for game, and he kept all the land northward as a land under cultivation. That was the populated country. They used the same system that was used in pre-dynastic times in Egypt. So this is what Shabako wants to revive now. He is going to have the center here which is called the **mekhat tawy**, "the balance of the two lands." It's written with a balance because the two are going to be equal. This is a very important theme in this document here.

I notice Klaus Koch, writing recently, says the only priestly mythological texts in Egypt (there are only four of them) that are important are this one and the other version called "The Victory over Seth," which I have a complete copy of and which is very good too. This was an ordinance that had to be performed in all the temples every day. And it's just this same story. This lasts right down through to the end of Egyptian religion and was taken up by the Hermetics and taken to Italy with the mysteries; also in the Old Testament and the New Testament.

I was going to have a couple of slides ready to present this today. It might help to see the characters, etc., and explain what is what here. They were supposed to have them last Friday, but they were lost. That's the second time they have been lost. They should be ready this week, so next time I may be able to expose you to these. As I showed you what it looks like, this one is too faint, and this one they reduced in size in order to get it onto one piece. But this was recopied, and he tells us how it was done.

|p3

In the top there's an inscription telling us what king this is, how it was found, and under what circumstances it comes down to us. Whenever the name Shabako is mentioned, somebody has scrubbed it out—every time. Another dynasty—because remember this was a Nubian dynasty; they came up there—and they were succeeded by the twenty-sixth dynasty which was a brilliant rival. That was Semitic with Necho. The next dynasty is the time of the Book of Mormon. But it's interesting that the Book of Mormon proper names all come from this dynasty which was much more favorable to Israel. There are some "dillies" in the Book of Mormon. They couldn't possibly have been invented. They came out of this dynasty. So it begins.

"His majesty had this copied in stone." You see, he found it. If we had the sign here, we would show you why it meant that. Companies come back and repeat and write over again. It's really quite graphic. This is written phonetically, but never without a determinant to show what we are talking about, the general idea, which makes it possible to guess. Without that you would really be at a loss. "His majesty commanded this writing to be copied anew in the house of his father Ptah."

Now Ptah is the god of Memphis. That's where this is. Memphis is here; Cairo is here, and right across the river you can see the pyramid of Zoser there at Saqqarah. Everything gathers together there. But he found it in the house of his father Ptah. (We will see that Ptah is very important here. We are going to see a lot of him.) ". . . who is the lord south of the wall." That expression "south of the wall." It is divided into two parts. Around the circuit of the wall, the southern part belonged to his temple and belonged to him. The white kingdom, the older kingdom, was the southern one. The northern kingdom, the red kingdom, was the other kingdom. And this dividing is a very important thing. You get it very interestingly in the patriarchal romances of the Old Testament. It comes out all over the place. We are going to find mention of that here; namely, the reference to these megalithic centers. This was an old megalithic center way back here. See, Heliopolis is right near here. That's just the airport right up here. They're all together here, just north of Cairo. In fact, it's a suburb of Cairo. And there Mariette found it long ago. It has been destroyed. They took all the rocks to use for ballast for railroad tracks. The British came in, so all that went. But it was a tremendous megalithic foundation. I mean a circle of 365 stones. It was one of those centers which you find all over the world, we mentioned the last time. Professor Thom has correlated these things; even Professor Edwards has come around to realizing the significance of that.

". . . whose house is the one south of the wall. When his majesty found it as it had been produced by the ancestors in the earliest period." By the people who came at the very beginning of everything. So it was ancient when it was written originally, and it was written to celebrate the founding of Egypt, the first dynasty by Menes. You remember Menes, the first king. He founded the dynasty, and to celebrate it he built this temple. And the whole purpose of this is to justify the legitimacy of the king's rule on earth. Does he have God's approval and the right to rule? How does it come that God set up his rule on earth? This is dramatized—the Council in Heaven, the creation, Satan's rebellion, the fall, and the plan of salvation.

|p4

It's all set forth there quite clearly. As I said, it has remained the basic document. Is Menes the same as Narmer of the pre-dynastic palette? Some people think it was. Some people, even H. R. Hall, thought he was the same as Minos of Crete because it was a sea empire as well. The Minotaur was his pet, and the Ipi bull was Menes' pet. It goes on here: "When he found it, he found that it was the record of the ancestors." You think of Lehi looking at the Brass Plates and discovering they went back to the beginning. He was quite thrilled by it. "Unfortunately, it had been eaten by worms so that it could not be read in the beginning parts and in the ending parts." And then we have a blank here because, as I said, a column stood on here for thousands of years, so that blotted out the middle part. But we do have the beginning and the conclusion here, which I guess are the most important anyway. If a play has a good beginning and a good ending, you can forget about the middle. No, the middle is very interesting. It's the Garden of Eden story very obviously, but we start out with the others. "Then his majesty had it copied anew, more beautiful than it was in the first place for the purpose that it should not pass away again." He had it done on hard stone. But the main purpose is that his name should endure. It's very important to have your name endure—not only the king's but everybody's. See the Egyptians are very different from the Orientals here. You don't go into a great sea of being after this. You don't wish to be non-identified. You don't wish to be absorbed into the nothing. The Egyptian is always dead set on preserving his individuality.

Say, I have some statements by Brigham Young on that that are rather interesting (they might be in here). He gives the Egyptian point of view very well here. No, he's talking about another creation story. It talks about Adam in very much the same way. Well, this would be relevant when we get to it. This is Brigham talking about other worlds, which was a favorite subject of his.

Well, he goes on here "that his name might endure." But you wanted that for your name, not just the king's name. Very early the king had these rights. It was the king's secret—the secret of immortality, the ordinances of the temple. He received all the ordinances and the endowment, and that would make him a king and priest forever. That was the idea. But very early, members of the royal family got let in onto this secret and they too have the same rights and ordinances, even the same insignia as the king has. And before very long, already in the Middle Kingdom, everybody has it. Any man can claim all the rights of royalty and be a king and a priest forever in his tomb if he pays attention to the proper ordinances. So he says, "that his name might endure and that his monument might be firmly established in the house of his father at the south side of the wall for all the length of time and eternity, that he might remember his father [and here's good old Ptah again]. This is his name to whom life is given forever." They rubbed it out here, so you can't read it very well to say the least.

It's arranged like a play, and it is arranged quite graphically. It's set forth in this inscription in the rock. It starts out with the two lines giving the setting, the time and the place, the *dramatis personae*, etc. "This is Ptah whom you see sitting here who is acclaimed in his name of Ptah-Tenen."

Now first as to the beginning in general. Since we went to the trouble to look up in Bonnet, we might as well tell you what he has to say about it. Hans Bonnet collected all the information on the subject in a big lexicon, if you want to know where to go for it. Of course, now there's a bigger one—the new lexicon on Egyptology which is many volumes. It's still coming out. "At the beginning of the universe, the Egyptians do not attempt to explain the first ultimate beginning. They begin with a given quantity." The material of the universe is a given quantity to begin with. They don't argue about what must come before that because it is a waste of time, among other things. It's imponderable. Should we be here? This idea of ontology: Should we exist at all? Is it right? Well, we could argue about that until the cows come home. But why bother? We are here, you see. As we used to say to the little kids when we went somewhere, "You should have thought of that before you left home." It's too late now; we're here already.

Let's begin with that as a given quantity. That's the thing that Professor Wormuth up at the University of Utah was very much impressed by. He was one of their most eminent professors up there. He died recently, unfortunately, but they considered themselves very lucky to have Professor Wormuth. He said that Mormonism is the only non-speculative religion. Every other religion just speculates on the beginning of things, should we be here, etc. But we take certain things as given—that we are here and the world is here. We go on from there. Well, they go on from there too, he says here. Now the process of creation is, therefore, one (since they accept material as there already) of organization, beginning with matter unorganized. So it isn't a matter of existence or creation out of nothing which, as we say, the Christian world believes. The scientists say that's what you must believe if you are a Christian or a Jew. The Egyptians didn't believe that for a minute, and neither did anyone else there. There was a very good statement here from somebody on that subject. I can't see it now, but the creation was one of organization.

One system begins with light, with the spark, which heaven and earth bring forth—the sun and the darkness. It's the light in the darkness. It begins with that, but the darkness still presses. The fact is that the light shouldn't be there. There's something wrong because darkness prevails. That's the law of entropy. That's your second law. Everything runs down. The lights go out. Everything becomes dark, and that's the end of everything. They talk about the heat death. We've read dramatic descriptions of how the sun will die, finally fizzle out and have a final explosion after going through all the necessary phases. Everything will cool out and become nothing but a klunker, nothing but a cinder, lifeless and dead forever. The thing that puzzles people today is that should have happened long ago. Why hasn't it happened? They still argue that. Do we have a fluctuating universe or just a one-way one? But anyway, as far as they're concerned, the darkness was there and had to be dealt with in the first place because everything would run down otherwise. So it's a state of inertia. It's a state of entropy that can't move itself. It's this inert matter that Abraham talks about. There was nothing but earth. And we're told about the children of the helpless one, who can't help themselves—the exhausted. Matter, a person, everything in time becomes exhausted, and when it is exhausted where can it go from there? It must be revived from some force outside itself. The Egyptians are very

| p6

fond of using that term "exhausted." The tired, the weary one, has nothing left. What can be done to stir it to life again? Of course, their concern with resurrection, burial, etc. shows interest in that. They always put it in. How are you going to bring life to something that hasn't got life in it? It has to come from outside. In the state of inertia, of entropy, it cannot move itself. And they are called the children of the helpless ones. They are represented on earth by snakes. Entropy is a real force, and it is represented by the great serpent Apophis which in the end consumes everything. It reminds you of the Fenris wolf in Norse mythology, and they have a great serpent too. But in the end the Fenris wolf will eat everything up, the gods themselves. The powers of darkness are going to win. It's the "Götterdämmerung." It's the turning off of the lights. The gods themselves don't have a chance because nothing can resist this power of destruction. Of course, the answer to that is always why are we here at all then? It's a mistake. Something went wrong; something moved against it. The Egyptians go on and tell us that.

So what happens? Well, entropy is a real force, and Apophis has to be overcome so very often. You will find the struggle with Apophis, represented sometimes by a hippo, and he is overcome but not forever and ever. He always comes back for more trouble. He represents Seth here.

After a long period of tension between the two, which would it be, the light or the dark, that prevailed? Then Apophis was overcome and the time of Re could be entered in. Re is the sun god, the god of light. This was the Golden Age, paradise on earth. That was Eden. Too bad we couldn't have stayed that way. There's another tradition which some think to be older. Remember, the priests in the temples of Egypt (and there were hundreds of them) had their different schools and interpretations. You're not going to leave them alone with this stuff without them arguing about it any more than you can expect an elders quorum not to touch the mysteries. They just can't leave them alone. And the Egyptians couldn't either, so you have a number of schools and explanations. They all come back to this basic one.

The other one is that the earth was covered with water in the beginning and darkness. This is in the Old Testament—darkness covered the deep and brooded upon the face of the water. It was dark and inert. It was, as Bonnet says, a form of chaos or disorganization. Chaos is matter, but matter unorganized. You're not going to have chaos in emptiness. You have to have substance. But it's disorganized; and when it's organized, it's not chaos anymore. But "chaos" means the same thing as our word "yawn." It's emptiness. We get the idea of gaseous confusion. But nothing is running there. Then the water was divided and the primal mound came. There was a division of the waters, and the earth appeared on which man could dwell. This was the beginning. This was the primal mound, the foundation of this cosmogony. These were all part of the same picture, and you remember Professor Edwards talking about the pyramid. It represents nothing else but that primal mound. But it's built over a grave mound too, so he shows us. You get a pyramid like this. He notices, though he is very conservative and doesn't want to go in for any crackpot stuff, this road to heaven. You have to have definite angles here. The thing is definitely naturally boxed to the compass. It is a cosmogonic structure, and the height is five to eight here. Anyway, under the pyramid, including the great pyramid, there is a natural mound.

|p7

That's what the pyramid is for. It's for going up to heaven. I noticed yesterday the common word for grave, **ahat**, is "to raise up a thing" and **ma** is "a place where something happens." **Ma'ahat** means "the place where you ascend." It doesn't mean a place where you go down and rest forever. It's not the tomb where "you lie in cold obstruction and rot." It is the blessed place of arising.

And it's interesting that Professor Edwards who spent sixty years studying pyramids has finally reached that conclusion that this is what it is. When Osiris is buried there, the whole purpose is to get him out of there, to rise up. And, of course, the pyramid texts tell you that all over the place. Well, it became a paradise and the primal mound. Well, at Hermopolis they elaborated that an egg came out of the mound, and out of the egg came the sun god, or else the lotus which you find universally because the lotus rises. Remember, Egypt was under water when it was discovered. As the Pearl of Great Price tells us, when the woman Egyptus discovered it, it was under water. And what appears in the shallow, muddy, swirling waters? Whether it's in India, China, or anywhere else, it's the lotus. It's miraculous how out of the foulest waters overnight this beautiful white flower bursts open. Professor Edwards showed a picture, and there's an object over at the museum here of the young Tutankhamen's head emerging from a lotus. The king is the sun, and he is rising from the lotus. But the lotus comes out of the darkness and the waters of the beginning. They go together. The waters of the flood or the waters of Nun.

Interestingly, as Bonnet says, the creation of man doesn't enter into the story. "We have no problem about the creation of man," he says, "because that is going on every day. If you want to know how people are produced, you ask your old man." But we know how that happens, so he says we don't have to have mysteries. They don't have mysteries and stories about that at all. Mary Carr, the great sage, said, "All persons are images of the creator, who have come out of his own members. Man is in his express' image." So that didn't bother them. That wasn't part of the creation. In other words, it's not part of cosmogony. Man is there too, like the other stuff.

And then he becomes Ptah-Tenen, as I said. Here it's a very strong demonstrative Ptah pen pel. A person by the name of Stolk quite a few years ago wrote a book on Ptah. Among the other theories that have been very popular is that the name Ptah is the same as **PTH**. You will recognize what that is, you Hebrew students, **patah**, **pateah**. The Arabic is **fataha**. The opening line of the Koran is called the **Fatihun**, "the opener." **Fataha** means "to open," you see. A thing that opens is a **mifte'ah**, "a key." The Arabic word is **miftah**. It's cognate with Latin. We have **patio**, which means "open to expand." It's related to **pando**, "to expand, to open up," and **Pandora**. It has also been related to **father** too. But **Patah**, our "father," is probably related to the word feeder, food provider, something like that. But anyway, it has been suggested that it means "the beginning, the opener, the one who started everything going." That's why this name **Ptah** is given to him. It's a universal, international name. You're going to find it in lots of things like that.

|p8

He is always represented in human form. In all this creation story, you will find no idols, no animal gods, or anything like that at all. This is all strictly human.

And here Sander-Hansen says that Nun, the primal material, the **urstoff** from which things were made, existed before the creation was universally believed in the ancient world. Nobody believed in creation out of nothing. There was a primal substance that existed before the creation, and the creation was the organizing of that substance. That, he says, was the universal view of the Egyptians, especially of the early times.

We will see a lot about Ptah-Tenen. Notice, he is being acclaimed on the throne. He is the father. Ptah-Tenen is a rare form (oh, you run into that a lot), but Ptah-Tenen means Ptah's office translated down to earth. It means the exalted one. It refers to the hill, among other things, the exalted hill. It refers both to the first land that emerged after the flood and the first land that emerged in the beginning when waters and darkness covered the earth. There was the later flood, and these are the waters the Egyptians are referring to as you learn from the Pearl of Great Price. Remember, when she discovered the land, it was under water. She went there after the flood. But emerging from the flood is a very important thing. And Ptah-Tenen is the land that first emerged. But it is also the person who first occupied it and first lived in it. It means the exalted one, the exalted or uplifted land. This Ptah-Tenen always belongs to the earth. He is the earthly representative of the heavenly order. Everything about him is earthy, and so he is chthonian. Chthon is the Greek word for "like earth." The solar is the light, and the dark is the chthonian. A perfect example of that is in our Facsimile No 2. Notice all these deities are solar deities. They all have suns, and they are moving forth in glory. All these are chthonian, the cow, the female, and including the inscription which tells us this is the dark place where everything comes to a halt. But you have to have both if you are going to create. This is the womb; that's why the cow. That's Hathor, the mother cow—the womb from whom all life comes. And the four figures in front of her are, as Joseph Smith says, the four elements—the four regions of the earth from which physical bodies must be compounded.

So it tells us here this is Ptah on the throne of Ptah-Tenen. Wolf has written a good study on Ptah-Tenen. "He stirs the earth out of her lethargy, which is called **Nen**, a state of inertia, a heat death. That is to say out of her condition of chaos. It is Ptah-Tenen who visits the earth and organizes the earth here below." Out of its condition of chaos, he puts things into order. But he does not give it life or force. He depends on another for that. And he's not a vegetation god. Now, you would think the earth god would be the vegetation god and all that sort of thing, but he isn't. When the waters were divided, he joined the lands together and made the earth habitable; and he sets the pattern for the king, for Horus Ptah-Tenen. He is Ptah's earthly counterpart. He is almost a byword for Ptah. His name is almost a synonym for Ptah's name—Ptah above, Ptah-Tenen below. But he carries things out. He never loses his identity as the exalted one, and his form is purely human. He never takes any form but human. He wears the same crown as the two sun figures wear. It's being worn by Abraham in Facsimile 3.

|p9

It's the Atef-crown. He wears that crown which is the same as Amon wears. So we get Ptah-Tenen and Ptah. That's the people that begin the play, and Act One ends here.

Then the place, the setting, is the division between the north and the south. This is the northland; this is the southland. They are united here at this particular place where the two thrones are joined in one and the king of the North **deseret** and the king of the South **sut** (of the sedge) are united in a single glory. Deseret and the bee are the symbol of the North king. His name is **bit nu**, meaning "belonging to the bee" which is feminine. They knew that the queen-bee was a queen already. They say in a single glory, **Kha**, which is a picture of the sun rising over a mound which represents the king mounting the throne. The two thrones are placed side by side. The throne of the king of the South with the sedge; the other with the king of the North with the bee. The king is shown underneath wearing the white crown; the other king wearing the red crown. Everything is divided between the two, and this division is preserved throughout all of Egyptian life. This is a very important thing. In fact it is the main theme of this document, namely the importance of coexistence here. The two thrones are together, and they are as one. Now, you're never going to get rid of evil in the world. The Egyptians knew that because that was part of the plan. This is why Egypt has been the most stable of all civilizations. They didn't try to wipe out all opposition. They could put up with things. Later, they are less tolerant, however. Notice, they wiped out the name of Shabako here. The theme is eternal life by eternal generation. The **Gospel of Philip** tells us nothing is eternal except progeny. All worlds pass away, as we are told in the Pearl of Great Price. They come into existence and pass away. What doesn't come into existence and pass away? Well, it is the individual. I wish I could find that statement of Brigham Young. It's really a nice one.

We'll go on to the next line. So here they are on the single throne. Now, we come to the theme here. There is much discussion about these lines and what they mean. Who begot Atum in the beginning? It was Ptah. Atum is the big thing. At Heliopolis he is everything. It's very interesting. In the very old Coffin Texts, he is called **Adamu**, using the Canaanite ending **u** and also the soft **d** instead of **t**. In fact, Lefebure, the famous French Egyptologist went to quite a great length to show that this is the same as Adam, and he obviously is Adam here. So it says here, Atum who was begotten and who then became the father of the **pesedj** or the Great Council. The **pesedj** is always translated **Ennead**, but is it the **Ennead**? I notice how Sethe sums it up here. **Ennead** doesn't have to be nine or eight, or any particular number. It means the vast number. The numberless Council of the Gods is what it means. I wish I could see how he put **ennead** here. (Well, who cares?) But it's important though. There are the nine gods, but there are dozens of lists of them. Sometimes they will add one or take some off, or add five or six. Originally, half should be female and half male, with Ptah making the odd number, you see. It breaks down into couples such as Shu and Tefnut and Geb and Neith.

But first Atum. His name is a very important one. Rudolf Anthes has written several long articles and monographs about the name of Atum. It means "many," as we are told in

|p10

But Eliade says this, "Wherever you look, you will always find this central myth of the creation which describes the beginning of the world, including the origin of plants, animals and man; and marriage, family and death. Taken all together, these myths in origin constitute a fairly coherent history." So wherever you go throughout the world you will find about the same story. We are not talking at this time about the process of creation. We are just talking about the council.

W. G. Lambert is perhaps the foremost surviving Babylonian scholar. He is the biggest editor of Babylonian texts today. He says, "The first major conclusion is that the epic of creation is a norm of Babylonian or Sumerian cosmology (you'll find it there), and it's a sectarian aberration." We find these things spread around everywhere.

Hermann Grapow is the editor of five big volumes of the Egyptian dictionary. It took him years. There are three million entries in it. He worked with Erman. It was financed by the Kaiser in Berlin and it went for years and years. It is still the standard Egyptian dictionary. He has written in this on the world before the creation. If you turn to the Egyptian text on the subject, you will find exact parallels from the Old Testament; from the **Enuma Elish**, the old Babylonian epic of creation; from the **Rig-Veda**, which is the Indo-European work. In 1700 B.C. it entered into India, but before then it was up in central Asia. Sanskrit is the related language to it. So you will find this both in the religions of Buddhism and Hinduism. And also the **Wessobrunner** prayer in Old High German. You will find it in the sagas, and you will find it in the **Voluspa**. **Gylfaginning** is a marvelous one if you go into the sagas. Their account of the creation is something. And always it's with the council here and their discussion. In the **Lokasenna** is one of the best descriptions of the council. Loki, you see, is Satan who will not accept the plan. He comes in and denounces it. He starts exposing the private lives of all the gods, and they don't like that. They keep saying to him, "Shut up. Don't tell us any more. We don't want to hear that." So he is cast out. But notice the point is that these are international. You will find it in the Pyramid Texts in the Book of the Dead, in the Greek and Roman temple inscriptions, etc.

These lines from Hesiod's **Theogony** are good. This is the oldest Greek story of the creation—the beginning of the gods. It's very much in line with the rest of them; some Enoch literature. Some would place him before Homer, but his date is easy to remember. It's 777. He's supposed to have reached his prime in the year 777 B.C. But I think Milton must have lifted this line here: He hails the muse and asks the muse to teach him. "Tell me how first in the beginning the gods and the earth came into existence, or how first these things were planted down on earth and the gods set up court on Olympus." But that's almost exactly the way Milton puts it.

Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
brought death into the world, and all our woe,

|p11

No lust is involved. It was really a compromise with matriarchy. Whatever form the child may have in the seed, without the mother it cannot enter into this stage of existence. And that's what we're after. This may seem like a mystery, but remember in the Book of Mormon Christ says, "I am the Father and the Son." Well, I think President Joseph Fielding Smith explained that very well when he said, "Who made it possible for us to be resurrected and live in bodies hereafter? Jesus Christ. Without him it wouldn't have been possible. He is the father of our everlasting, eternal bodies—not the bodies we have here. That's something else. But when we are resurrected, he has made that possible. So he is the Father and the Son. Of course, anybody can be a father and a son at the same time; I've achieved that difficult feat.

Now, the conflict between the patriarchy and matriarchy about which a lot has been written. This is dissolved in the very simple question, namely with this. Which one is it, the father or mother, who makes birth possible? You leave one of them out, and birth is impossible. Well, it's a silly question. When Atum's son Shu separated the earth and heaven, male and female, it was really Atum himself who was doing it all. So Atum comes down here, and he is the father of the human race in every sense. He comes down and transfers it. But you say, "Oh, this is getting sort of complicated. What have we got here?" So Ptah begot Atum who was the father of the Council of the Gods.

And now the play begins. **Iyatenef** means to call a family or a gathering together. It's quite often in those verses in the Coffin Texts, 131-146. Marvelous passages about sealing one's family to one's self in the other world so that you can be united in the hereafter, exactly as we understand it, and as Egyptologist T. G. Allen at Chicago pointed out long ago. But Ptah called together the family of the gods to settle an affair between Horus and Seth. Now there are these two plans. Seth had his plan. Horus favored the gods' plan. Seth had a perfect right to object if he wanted to, but they were going to discuss it. You can never get rid of Seth; he is always there. He was cast out of heaven not because he disagreed but because he resorted to violence in heaven. As we are told in Moses 7:31, there is naught before thy throne but peace, justice and wisdom. To settle this affair between Horus and Seth, he began by forbidding all contention. "There shall be no contention among you." What was the first thing the Lord said to the Nephites when he came to them? There shall be no contention among you as there has been in the past. All contention is not of me but of the devil, for it is contention that stirs up the hearts of the children of men to bloodshed. You shall not contend. So he absolutely forbade that there should be any wrangling, any controversy between Horus and Seth. And by establishing Seth in the kingdom of the South in the place where he was initiated. Yes, that's a funny word it uses there. Later on it says in the place where he was born. It's funny, nobody accepts this initiation, but that's what is written. It says in the place where he was introduced into the mysteries and ordinances; in a place called **saa**.

It's now Geb who takes over. He's the earth god but never a vegetation god. He's very much like Ptah-Tenen, but Geb is much more intimate. He is in the family. He is the principle of patriarchal succession on earth.

|p12

He doesn't represent the powers of the earth which must be stimulated from above. Things grow out of him but never because of him. Geb and Nut are the two who begat Re. Remember Geb is the earth god and Nut is the female heaven stretched above. We see pictures of that out in the museum right now. So they begat Re, making him the father of the gods, and he represents the patriarchal, monarchical power on earth. He's a reflection of the heavenly order here below. He is the **Rp't** meaning the mouth of the race, **Rp't on the Throne of Geb**. Any king, if he wanted to send somebody out on a mission to represent him, could let him sit on his own throne by courtesy and then he was a **Rp't**, authorized to speak for the king. Of course, that's exactly what we have in Facsimile No.3: Abraham, by politeness of Pharaoh, being allowed to sit on his throne. People used to laugh at that and say it was absurd. Pharaoh wouldn't allow anyone else to sit on his throne. Any **Rp't** could sit on his throne. And recently there has been a long study on that called **Rp't on the Throne of Geb**.

Well, he established his son Osiris as well as Horus. They both sit on the throne of Geb. He makes the lords of earthly dynasties as heirs of Geb attested by the **mekes** which they hold. And, like all cosmic gods, he is always represented in human form. The goose associated with him is a phonetic way of writing his name. It's purely phonetic, but he is always a human being. All of these people so far have been people engaged in this particular drama. And he wears the Atef-crown. He wears the same crown that the kings wear there. He is the **wetu**, which means the next in the patriarchal line, the most immediate to the throne, the true successor. The archaic title is **Wepwawet**.

I see this is taking too much time, but this is amazing. We are still going on this. They say why did Joseph Smith get us into this? Well, there's lots more here than we realize. It isn't just ancient mumbo jumbo and superstition. Professor John Wilson called it "mumbo jumbo," but I didn't call it that. Well, we should get things stirring up. This is really quite an exciting story when it gets going.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 8

This **Shabako Stone** is now viewed by many as the most important single document in religious history. It's in the dramatic texts of Sethe, etc. We will refer to the person who discovered it later. But it has been in the British Museum since 1805. George Spencer gave it to the museum, and many attempts were made for one hundred years to interpret it. Some people did some pretty good guessing, but for one thing they didn't realize that it was written backwards; the characters were facing in the opposite direction from what they should have been facing. This is very archaic Egyptian; it's not in the later period. When it reached James Henry Breasted at the University of Chicago, he was able to make a very good study and translation of it. That started things going. He was the one that discovered what it was all about—discovered the clue or key, which was reading it in the right direction. In 1901 he first came across it, and he raved about it. He calls it "The First Philosopher." I've had four or five copies made, and it's on reserve now for this class. It has the translation of this document as given by him. But there have been many changes since.

People return to the attack again and again, and every time they not only confirm but realize that what Breasted said about it was an understatement. Every time its great value, great importance and age is mentioned; it gets older every time. Of course, every time they are able to understand it better. Usually, as you know, when someone gushes and gets all excited at some great discovery, they go wild about it; and then there's an anti-climax. Well, there's been no anti-climax here. The more it's studied (and everybody's on to it now) the more important it is considered. He thought it was in the Middle Kingdom, but it's much older than that. After he was able to present his version of it, everybody could do it. It became easier then.

Is there anyone here who doesn't know the story of Columbus and the egg? You don't know it. Good, I'll tell you the story of Columbus and the egg. The rest of you can ignore it. Columbus was at dinner with some dignitaries. It was after his first voyage to America, and somebody said, "It wasn't such a great thing after all. The ship did it easily enough; anybody could have done it." Columbus didn't say anything, but later on he said, "Can any of you here make an egg stand on end?" Well, everybody tried it and couldn't do it at all. Columbus took the egg, gave it a light tap, and stood it on its end. They said, "Well, of course, anybody can do it that way." He said, "Yes, and anybody can do it when somebody shows them how it is done." There was nothing said about the egg couldn't be cooked or the shell had to be unbroken, or anything like that. Just, could you make the egg stand up. But the point with Columbus was that after somebody has done it, it's the easiest thing in the world and no great show at all. This was the same way. They were absolutely helpless and floundered around until Professor Breasted did it.

|p2

Incidentally, he was very much interested in the Book of Mormon. I knew his wife very well. We used to bicycle together in Claremont. She lived next door, and in those days people didn't ride bikes much, and so we used to wheel around the place. That was after Breasted had died; he retired there. But it used to bug him. She said that he intended to get rid of the problem once and for all. He liked a lot of Mormons, and he said the best thing to do is just show in a half hour or twenty minutes where this is wrong and that's wrong. There would necessarily be some glaring contradictions in it. So he set to work, and never a peep. Nothing came of it.

Well, anyway he did the great work, and after that everybody could set the egg on end. He gave it this rave notice, as I say, which you will read in **The Monist**, "The First Philosopher." And then Erman came along in 1909 and gave it the name Shabako. **Shabako Stone** comes from Erman at Berlin. He called it the Shabako text because it was by King Shabako. The great study of it is by Sethe in 1929, and others have come out since.

But this is basic; this is the one that first brought it out, and it's good. But he says that Shabako was just the man. He believed that Shabako was the founder of the dynasty. Shabako was an extremely religious man. He had come up from the South, and he wanted to establish his dynasty there. He was just the man to do this, a great archaizer. He goes right back to the beginning of things digging up all the records he can. Lots of pharaohs practiced that—were interested in the archaic documents and tried to restore things, especially in the twenty-second, twenty-fifth, and twenty-sixth dynasties. And this was the twenty-fifth dynasty when it really happened. Under Piankhi, under the Sheshonqides (the twenty-sixth dynasty) they went back to the earliest days and renewed everything. And they thought, well, this is a copy from that. No, it is a faithful copy, not a reproduction—not an attempt to imitate anything.

But Sethe believes that Shabako was just the man to give us this text. Every time they founded a new dynasty, they would do the same thing; renew the theology, give a new version of the creation story. It was done at Heliopolis; then Menes did it at Memphis—that's this text here. Then Ammenemes did it in the Middle Kingdom at Dahshur. Then Amenophis IV did it at El Amarna. Then the Moslems did it at Cairo. Always with a new center and a new theology, but they always follow along the same line. But I said he was going to renew it, so he went back to the old temple that was built to celebrate the founding of the first dynasty in Egypt at the beginning of civilization 3100-3200 B.C. It was very old then, we find out. Epigraphically, orthographically, vocabulary and syntax all put it before the Pyramid Texts which are the oldest books in the world. They are all before 2000 B.C. They are found under the pyramids written on the walls, beautifully carved. But they are very old; they go back to 2700 - 2900 B.C. And this is older than that—the grammar.

As I say, this is proved epigraphically. What do we mean by epigraphically? By the way it's carved on the rock—the order, the columns, the way they are divided, etc. This is the quaint, the old-fashioned way. They never did it later on. It was never used after say the eleventh dynasty, so it puts it very old.

!p3

And then orthographically, the way they spelled things. They used the old, archaic spellings, very quaint spellings. Well, those of you who are in English know the difference between Middle English, and West Saxon, and Northumbrian, and modern. But you recognize immediately what particular period it came from although they are using the same words. It was the same thing here. And the syntax (the order in which the words occur) is peculiar to the times. And everything puts it before the Pyramid Texts, so it is very, very old.

What we are showing here is the left side first. The left side is the drama, and the right side is the theological discourse—the temple drama. Incidentally, as we read that piece from Zabkar the last time, this carries right on, he says, into the Old Testament and the New Testament. You will find that everything is very familiar here, and this caused everybody to pause because, after all, what are these people doing with the Bible? Shaba, the first person to look at this, was stunned (well, in other texts especially) by close resemblances to the Bible. In the 1920s the Petosiris text is a classical example of that. It has long passages from the Psalms and the Proverbs in it. And you will find Old Testament and New Testament passages—in a work from 300-400 B.C. Well, this shouldn't be, you see. So they would always soft pedal it. And they always skipped around it. It's only within the last ten years that they have said, "All right, if it looks like an elephant, call it an elephant." This has been staring us in the face all these years; everyone was blushing and no one would dare mention it. Now all of a sudden within the last three or four years half a dozen articles (big studies) have come forth showing that the wisdom literature of the Egyptians, the Ammenemes, as Erman showed once . . . He was ashamed of it. He kept it covered up and never mentioned the fact that it was his greatest discovery. The Wisdom of Ammenemes is the wisdom of Psalms; it's the same thing (word-for-word passages). Well, this really stunned him, so Erman tried to cover it up. That would never do. That's not the evolutionary development of things, but today it is being recognized.

The story that the rabbis tell is that when the animals came to Adam, he was naming them. And the Lord said, "What are you going to call this one?" He said, "I'm going to call it an elephant." "Well, why an elephant." "Because it looks like an elephant," he said. So Professor Popper used to say, "If it looks like an elephant, call it an elephant." Sometimes you hesitate and say, "No, it can't possibly be that." Well, if that's what it looks like, try that first. Take a chance here.

Well, we have the theology, and the left side is the myths of Horus and Seth and the learned discourse in the drama. The oldest parts are the dialogues of the gods here. They are preserved in archaic form like a Greek chorus. Now, most of the Greek plays come from Athens. They are in the Ionic dialect; that's Athenian. But the choruses are in Doric. They are in the old Doric or Aeolic. But Doric is the older language, and the chorus will come on with this archaic Doric with the long "ahs," etc. because they are preserving the original text. It's the same way here. There are obviously two texts. There's a rather free commentary, which is much newer, though it's far older than anything else.

|p4

But then what they are commenting on is the urtext, the text that goes right back to the beginning. The rest was more up-to-date, but very late. The speeches of the godhead are the remains, Sethe says, of a prehistoric book. They were kept in a book, but the book, of course, was long lost. It was copied from this. Remember, he tells us here that he had it copied from a roll that was found in the cornerstone, like the cornerstone of the Nauvoo House. When they were renovating the White Temple, the first temple in United Egypt (the one that began the kingdom), they found this document. And he had it copied on stone. That's why we have it today. But one of the reasons we've been so long getting it out is that it was so hard to read. And the reason it was so hard to read was that it was in a dark corner of the British Museum, and they would never take it out so people could look at it. That's so absolutely typical. The great Richard Laurence who discovered the Enoch texts had to do all his work in the Bodleian Library. They wouldn't even let him take the text over to the window so he could read it better. He couldn't take it out of that damp, dark cell in the Bodleian Library, and that's why he had to work all of his life. Since then it has rotted away from age. They haven't taken any care of it at all.

Anyway, the speeches of the godhead show that we had a very old book here. They treat the sagas in it, the stories of Osiris, Horus, and Seth in dramatic form. It was to be presented on a very special occasion, of course, at the new year—at the founding of not only the empire, but the beginning of the world, the revival of things. In fact, Sethe says, it very closely parallels the mystery plays of Easter and Christmas that were put on in the Middle Ages. But much earlier than the Middle Ages, you will find them all over the Middle East, the same plays. The complex on the top of the temple at Denderah, which is preserved, is what Daumas (who did more work than anyone else on it) says is an Easter complex. It was to celebrate the rebirth of the god at the spring equinox which is Easter. And then they did the other one which was the new year when the sun comes back, the birth of the sun. But it is to celebrate the cyclical death and rebirth of all nature and all the rest. We get our friend Geb in here. So it is for presentation on festive occasions. But it was secret; it was given to only elect people, only those who were qualified and had recommends could see it.

It's in verse, incidentally. It has been quite recently discovered that the Book of Dead (that's one thing people have been reading for a hundred years now) is in verse. That's how little we know about the vowels and the values here. And Sethe, who is the one who made the definitive edition of this, also edited the Ramesseum texts, from the Ramesseum on the other side of the Nile, over on the west side in Thebes. This is another prehistoric dramatic text, and you can match the two. This was a text which was dramatized with the king. He took the role of Atum, the lead. They went through the whole thing, and it toured the whole length of the Nile. The king and the court would dramatize this and were chosen for various parts. On different occasions they could shift the actors around. So the idea of traveling troupes of actors is very old. It goes right back to the beginning of time. You still find them traveling with a donkey and a shadow theater. I have an Arabic book on the subject which is very good—the traveling shadow theaters in the Middle East.

|p5

It's from way back pre-war times when things were fairly stable. But a troupe would travel around, and what they would put on was a shadow theater. The theme was Adam and Eve, the Garden of Eden, and the Fall. They would go through all that sort of thing. People would all gather for it, and it would be a big affair. They'd get some good pictures of it, as a matter of fact.

In this text the **actio** is the drama. The word **drao** means "to do, to carry out visibly." There is the action of the play, and then there is the spoken word which is the dialogue. The action is clearly marked by stage directions. They are very short and very specific, as with the Ramesseum drama. Erman thought the stage directions were commentary, but it turns out they are not. They're directions on what is supposed to be going on here. And these are directed by the **keri-hep**, who is the lectern priest. He directs the ordinances and takes charge. He's the man who is in charge of the operations. There are others there. Of course, people participate in it, but he directs the whole thing. And he or somebody else would read off the lines describing the events that could not be presented visually. There are some things, you know. Should we recite the introduction to **Henry V** at this point? We'd waste a lot of time. But why is the play the oldest thing? It's because it is the most amusing, entertaining, engrossing. It involves you more than anything else. And it make things clearer than anything else. It's the best way of abbreviating. You don't have to go into long words. A play can be kept short and tell you a great deal.

O for a Muse of fire, that would ascend
The brightest heaven of invention!
A kingdom for a stage, princes to act,
And monarchs to behold the swelling scene!
Then should the warlike Harry, like himself,
Assume the port of Mars; and at his heels
Leash'd in like hounds, should famine, sword, and fire
Crouch for employment. But pardon, gentles all,
The flat unraised spirit that hath dar'd
On this unworthy scaffold to bring forth
So great an object: can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?
O, pardon! since a crooked figure may
Attest in little place a million;

[With just a one you can make a million by adding ciphers.]

And let us, ciphers to this great acompt,

[We'll go on adding ciphers and make it a big thing though it's a small thing.]

On your imaginary forces work.

Suppose within the girdle of these walls

[Now, you have to make the play, you see]

|p6

Are now confin'd two mighty monarchies,
Whose high upreared and butting fronts
The perious narrow ocean parts asunder:
Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts:
Into a thousand parts divide one man,
And make imaginary puissance;

[This many represents the army. You divide him into a thousand parts, and you make an imaginary military force.]

Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them
Printing their proud hoofs i' the receiving earth;
For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings,
Carry them here and there; jumping o'er times,

[See, you have to take care of time and space.]

Turning the accomplishment of many years
Into an hour-glass: for which supply

[You have to do all that—imagine the time being concentrated, and also the guise of the kings and their splendor. You have to contribute to that too.]

Admit me Chorus to this history;

Well, that's the idea. You have to do it. You are involved, and you're committed to the play. And Shakespeare is great at getting us that far, isn't he? There's a play for *Hamlet*. Well, we won't get into that. This is getting off the track, isn't it. We need to finish this whole thing today. Here it is now. Well over five thousand years ago they are putting on a play, and it's a terrific play.

The first time I went to the Hopis, it was with Brother Virgil Bushman who was the great missionary to the Hopis. He was born down there. Just after the war, he insisted on taking me down there. There was just a dirt trail, terrible road at that time. They still were using ladders to get up to the mesas. We went up there, and it was the fifteenth of March when they have their first dance. It was bleak and windy, and you go up on the high mesa. It was at Hotevilla. There in the plaza of houses at dawn was this play going on. This tremendous drama was being played. Magnificent costumes they had. It was a cloud dance. The rule is that you can never use anything bought. You can never use anything old or dirty. It had to be neat, beautiful and made of native substance by yourself—really something. And here they were doing this. I started counting them, and there were 52 dancers that came in. There had to be 52 dancers in the oldest Greek chorus (52 weeks of the year). And then the protagonist and the antagonist came in, and they started their dialogue. First the priest went around with the sack of meal and laid out the course that the chorus was to follow. Then a Greek play took place there. After that was a comedy with the mudheads clowning around, etc. But it was the same motif. There was the altar in the center as they have to be in the Greek play. Nobody answers in that because that is the conistra, the dust place, where nothing lives. This is the moat between us and the other world because in the center is an altar. And in every Greek tragedy, the ghost appears out of the ground from there. Then they have the two little evergreen trees, like Christmas

|p7

trees, on either side of the altar in every place where the Hopis have their festival, the twelve villages. And the spirit feathers tied on them in their prayers. This takes you to the spirit world, and the ghost appears (as the ghost of Darius appears in the Persians) out of the ground.

So this stuff is very old, but who told these people to do this? They're as poor as dirt. They were chased to the ends of the world and brutally exploited by the coal people who were strip mining the sacred places in an awful way. But the thing is here they were by themselves going to all this trouble. There were only a few old people and a couple of little kids on the houses because who wants to get up on a cold March morning at dawn and go through that? But they went through it with the greatest solemnity, everything accurate, and the priests reciting their lines to each other, etc. They are very particular about any taking notes or writing anything. I just jotted down one little thing, and they had it out of my hand in a second. I learned from then on, but I went to many of the dances after that. I went later down to Moenkopi. It was the time I took Brother Merlin Myers, the anthropologist. He had never been before. So I said, "Well, I go down all the time." We went down, and I took down that very nice reproduction (1912) of the Book of the Dead—all colors and everything. It's a beautiful reproduction that Budge got out. I took it out, and there was a meeting of the Hopi kids. They met across the road from Tuba City in the Hopi village, Moenkopi. They recognized everything. For example, the dancers had to have the two feathers; they had to have the copper bracelets; they had to have the tortoise shell; they had to have the coyote or fox skin with the tail, as every Egyptian priest had to. They looked just like them. I mean there was no difference at all, an amazing thing that goes on.

Well, how old this stuff is. What is going on here? What have we been missing, you see? The thing is that it's still carried on. They still persist against tremendous opposition. Peabody Corporation tried to get them all to move out to Los Angeles. They offered them mobile homes if they would do that—give up this thousands of years old culture. They resisted the Spaniards; they resisted the Catholics. They resist everybody. They all joined the church at once when the gospel was first introduced to them. Then in 1906 there was a big fuss in Congress, and the Mormons were forced to leave. And, moreover, the Mormons had their farms down there. At Danabata Wash and Moenkopi Wash is where the Mormon farms were. Up along the benches you can still see the poplar trees which mark the farms. But they were all forced to leave in 1906 because of the influence they had on the Indians. Well, that's another story, but it is very close to this one. What are these people up to? How do they know so much about these things?

Now, the oldest parts are these dialogues, and the **actio** has these directions. The things that can't be staged are described by this lecturn priest who conducts the play. He says this is practically identical with the ancient mysteries of the Easter and Christmas celebrations. It's always with the seasons. There is no dancing now. It won't be until March 15, the first full moon in March. It's Easter when they start out, and always that one. That will give you goose flesh. No artificial lights; it has to be by moonlight. There the Havawuhti comes out. That's really scary. The only sound (no drums or anything) is the flute. Like the Greeks. In the earliest Greek play, there was just the flute. The lyre and the string instruments are for the

|p8

solos and the melodramatic stuff; but for the old archaic stuff it was just the flute. And it's eerie by full moonlight. And then the Havawuhti starts walking down the street with these giants with their long rawhide whips, whipping on either side and telling the people to get their distance. Well, that's the Egyptian Nut. She emerges out of the kiva all in black, and she is holding a bow and two arrows. That's her sign, the two arrows. It's in here. You will see the Lady Neith with the same thing, the two arrows. She walks in a stately manner, and everybody really keeps their distance. It's the Havawuhti who is Neith, the woman who brought things first from the underworld.

The speeches are brief and few. Here's another thing. There is no effort to follow chronological order. If a past event must be brought up, they don't hesitate to use a flashback and show what happened in an earlier time. So don't try to construct it according to the rules of Aristotle here. The speeches are brief and few, but they are the main thing. They are the prehistoric parts. Quoting Sethe here, "It is an ancient, holy, piously guarded heritage, a secret ordinance like the Easter mysteries." I mentioned the last time Henry John Feasey's very interesting work on the English holy week ceremonies (very ancient of course). I recommend that you read Augustine, not St. Augustine, but Augustine who in 590 came as the first missionary to England. He was sent by Pope Gregory the Great. You know the famous story about angles and angels. He saw these little English children for sale in the market place in Rome, and he said, "Who are these?" They said, "Well, these are Angles." He said, "They are not angles; they are angels."

So he decided to send a mission up there, so he sent Augustine up there. We have Augustine's correspondence with Gregory. He said, "Look, do you know what these people do? At Easter time they meet at these holy places and they have their races and their festivals. They build booths with green boughs, and they feast and hold celebrations along with the races. They elect their king and queen and all the rest of it." And Gregory said, "Well, that's exactly what we do in Rome at the same time of year. We set long tables in the streets and have a feast for everybody at Easter." It's the time of rebirth; Christ has risen from the dead. Everybody celebrates, so let them go. Let them do anything they want. Let them build their green booths." Remember in Israel for the festival they had the **sukkot**. For the festival you had to have a booth. For the Passover they had to go to Jerusalem, and nobody was allowed to celebrate the Passover within his gates. He had to make it as a pilgrim. So when they were there, they had to have some shelter. So we have the ordinances of the green booths, and we have them all over the world. Well Gregory said, "Let them do it; just sprinkle it with a little holy water and there's no difference. I don't see any difference at all." And there wasn't. They were ancient long before that, and that was at the end of the sixth century.

So they were doing their Easter business long before Christianity ever got there. And it's the same thing here, he says. We're dealing with the same type of thing. As we mentioned the last time, it goes right over into the Old Testament and the New Testament. And this is the way Breasted begins his article: "During his sojourn in the British Museum, it was the writer's

good fortune to subject to close scrutiny an ancient stone, the importance of which has hitherto been entirely unsuspected." Well, everybody suspected it might be important, but they couldn't make heads or tails of it. That was the trouble. "It contains the oldest known philological explanation of the world written a thousand years before the first Greek philosopher was born." He was wrong there; it was written a thousand years before that at least. It was written three thousand years before the first philosopher was born. There were other people philosophizing too. See, the archaic world has disappeared completely, and the marvelous thing is that this has been able to survive. He tells how it happened to survive; remember making a copy, etc. So for the first time there is tangible support to the Greek tradition of the origin of their philosophy in the East. The Greeks said, "We get everything we know from the Egyptians." But nobody would ever credit the Greeks when they said that. Theodor Hopfner was the man who spent his whole life searching as a classical scholar the Egyptian religion as it is recorded by the Greek and Roman classical writers. But he always insisted there was no connection between them whatever. The Greeks insisted over and over again that, yes, they got that there. Plato studied in Heliopolis. Parmenides did, and Thales did. German scholars always said "no" to everything like that. They had no proof that it wasn't so, but it just didn't fit. It was too picturesque, too fantastic. We don't allow things like that; they're not dignified.

Well, now the stone itself is three feet by four, seven. It is black granite, and it's very heavy. But alas, alas, it has that square hole in the center of it because it was used as a nether millstone. Of course, being that shape it couldn't turn as an upper millstone. But it was used as a lower millstone. You can imagine how that would preserve an inscription to grind it and grind it for a few hundred years. It was very hard stone. Naturally, the part that was ground out you can't read. Just very faint forms there. It is sadly damaged and so faint, says Breasted, that either a squeeze or a photo was out of the question. They couldn't make an impression of it, a photo. The best thing to do would be maybe make a rubbing of that, but they wouldn't let them do that. And paleographically it's an exceedingly beautiful inscription. The signs are very much like those produced in modern hieroglyphic type. It just looks like a modern printed book, like Gardiner's book. They never changed the style. It is beautiful writing, way back there in the beginning, just as clear as ever. "But it would be a lot easier to read outside of the dark hall. In years to come they might be able to bring some light in here," he says. And they did, of course. They put light from various directions to bring out the contours, and then they could read it.

Well, let's get to the text now. Turn it on and see what we've got here on the beginning. Here are the stage directions. **Ptah-Pen-Pel.** This one you see here, Pel, refers to whatever we happen to be talking about. It always answers the question: who is this? Or especially, what are you talking about? So we introduce ourselves by saying Ptah, the opener, the beginner. This Ptah is the one we are talking about, Ptah-Pen-Pel. Much he is acclaimed; he is heralded in glory, in the great name of Ptah-Tenen.

|p10

And the abbreviation here shows how archaic this usage is. Ptah is in heaven now. It begins with Ptah in his glory, and he wishes to transmit the powers of heaven (the powers he possesses) to the earth, the same celestial order.

Incidentally, I'm going to suggest that we are following the Terpanderinomos. At the twenty-sixth Olympic games in 676 B.C., they introduced musical games, and Terpander won the prize. He won the prize then four times in succession at Delphi at the Pythian contest. Notice, these were at the holy centers. Delphi was the holiest of all. They were oracular centers, and Terpander introduced the musical element and what is called the Terpanderinomos or the rule of Terpander. You know who **Terpsichore** is, goddess of the dance. The Terpanderian rule divides the whole according to the ritual pattern. Namely into the **arche**, the rule, the beginning. This is the foundation. You start up with Ptah on his throne in the world above in timeless ages. And that's the **arche** or the beginning. The middle part is called the **omphalos** (same word as Latin **umbilicus**). That is the navel or the center of the thing—the main center around which everything is going to revolve. At Delphi, for example, you can still see out in front of the temple there's the **omphalos** shaped just like an umbilicus. This was the center of the world. This was the hierocentric point from which everything came. Every holy shrine had its umbilicus. A great deal has been written about the umbilicus. Then finally comes the **sphragus**, the seal that seals everything up.

The umbilicus here is where the upper millstone turned. It turned around here. And here was the square to pull this in place. So this is pretty well wiped out, but you notice the millstone only went to here, so this part was spared which gives us a little Garden of Eden romance in here. Then on the final one (this is the other half) it ends as it began. But now his glory has been established on earth, naturally in Memphis. The whole purpose of this is to show that the king at Memphis (Shabako in this case) holds the same authority that was held by God and was handed down to man through Atum and through the heavenly council to the spirits and brought down to earth. That's what he is going to tell us about here. So we now proceed here, and Ptah is the main thing. But it's now Ptah-Tenen which means the uprising, the lifting up, the exalted. The rising of the land, the rising of the earth, the first pyramid, the first burial mound, the rising of resurrection—all that is together along with the name Ptah-Tenen. His name is Ptah-Tenen, the first person to put life upon the earth. So this is Ptah coming down to earth (Ptah means earth, you see). But it's earthy. The problem is how are we going to transmit the powers and forces of the universe to this one little planet? This is the way we do it. Well, this is the land; this is the setting. This is the land of the **Mekhy** of the North and of the **Resy** of the South. And it is the joining place of the two glorious ones. These are thrones of glory. That was originally a sunburst coming out here. It's very finely, very beautifully carved, but they were already conventionalized. It was the hill with the sunrise over it. So you had this form like this and then like this. That's what this is, called the **Kha**, which means to arise in glory. It's a regular word used for coronation or crowning of the king. Enthronement was his rising in glory, of course, being compared with the sun.

|p12

To eliminate, to explain by elimination. We'll say, he forbad their quarreling. Remember, he forbad that there should be any contention among them and he placed Seth on the southern throne in the land in which he was initiated. Later on it says in which he was born. But initiated will do because that's what it says. "In the land in which he was born therein at the place of Saa, a prehistoric place."

And then the other one. We mentioned who Geb was. He is the principle of legitimate succession. It's an interesting thing here that it is Geb who puts Horus on the throne of the North—on the bee throne, the deseret throne. Deseret means red land, (it was red rock country) and it is the word for holy land. All these things are mixed up. But it is Geb who appoints Horus because Geb is the principle of legitimate partriarchal succession. I was puzzled the last time because then he should have put Seth in there too. But he doesn't, which is may be significant—the fact that Horus is the only one that is legitimate. Then in the northland (this is **Mekhy**). Paul Karge said that the word **Mekhy**, like the word Mexico, means northland. This **Mekhy** always means "northland," and Mexico in the Central American language meant north country too. Another parallel with Egypt; you get lots of them. "At the place where his father was drowned." Now his father goes into the water there, and he emerges from the water to come into a new life and to mount the throne. Well, obviously baptism. In fact, that's what Gardiner calls it. He wrote a long article in the **JEA** on "The Baptism of Pharaoh." The place where he was initiated; the place where his father was baptized.

At the division of the lands **en pesh taw** (same word as part, split, etc.). There's a very interesting conjunction here that you only find in very old Egyptian. Then Horus and Seth mounted. See, here is an **aha** which is a mast on a ship which you mount. It means mounted up, of course. They both mounted upon the two thrones of Horus and Seth. This is a very interesting word. I talked with Professor Edwards when he was here about this. This is what an **iyat** is. If you go through the Pyramid Texts, you will find every once in a while a person makes a pilgrimage to the most holy place, and he circumambulates the **iyats**. There are usually three of them—always written like this. It is a mound surrounded by standing stones. This is the **iyat**, and that's what it says here. Each one has his **iyat** or his ceremonial symbol, which means it goes back to megalithic times (Stone Age). It's very old stuff. Each one has his **iyat** because we know that's what Heliopolis was. Mariette discovered that it was such a founding. Each had his **iyat** here, and it's very interesting that Edwards himself has come to accept that idea as the origin of the pyramid now. Somebody has just written a monograph on the subject which justifies it. They never would hear of it before. At the division of the lands, the two lands were pacified and reconciled. This is our old friend **Hetep**. You always see **hetep** all over the place in everybody's name. They pacified and settled the two lands at Eon, which means the beautiful place (like Nauvoo). At the Eon which is the place where the lands are divided. Remember King Lib dividing the Land North and the Land South.

Now we come to this next one. And Geb now speaks to Seth. You can always tell Seth because his name has been blacked out.

|pl 1

Notice he is wearing the white crown of the South; and North, the red crown of the North. There were always two crowns, always two thrones, even two graves for the king. Everything was double. Every ordinance was carried out four times really, but there was the white and the red and they were always mixed. We see they are mixed here. "And he was who begot Atum."

Now here is our friend Atum again who in turn is the father or the begetter of the **pesedj**. The writing on this **pesedj** here, that means the nine. You can count the nine, and everybody translates that as **ennead**, but it isn't **ennead**. Sethe says about this, "Perhaps we are dealing here with the **ennead** as no more consisting of nine members than at Karnak, the writing of which has no connection whatever anymore with the number nine." Anytime you want a large council, it's **ennead**. With the Egyptians whenever you want a thing to be taken literally (they use it much more later on, but we should have some examples of it here), you put a little stroke by it signifying one—one item, one thing. It's interesting how that's used later on. You have to use it with every word later on if it's taken literally. If you want it to be dual, you put two strokes by it. But three means any number after two. You're not going to go on adding four, five, six and seven after that. So you have a singular, a plural, a dual and a plural. Incidentally, the dual is the same as it is in all indo-european languages. It sounds the same way. And the plural is the same. You'd be surprised. You'd think it was Latin or Greek or something like that here; how much like it they are. Well, anyway he begot the **ennead**, the nine of them. But he says here it has no connection with the number nine whatever anymore. That would only be something left over from the old Heliopolitan **ennead**.

And then this means to gather your family. There's a very interesting **Iyat** there. We mentioned in the Coffin Texts (which are very old, 2000 B.C.) of the nobility, numbers 131 on, and 146 especially, have to do with the sealing of one's family to one's self in the other world—the gathering of the family. That's the word they use for gather the family and for the family too—a family gathering. This means to call together, to assemble. "He assembled the Council of the Gods for discussion." Another interesting word here is **wep**. You see that all over the place "between Horus and Seth." Notice every time the name Seth occurs, somebody has piously rubbed it out because Seth is the opposition. Seth is Satan, you see; we don't want him in the picture. So for superstitious reasons we wipe him out.

But **wep** is so interesting. Notice it is always written with the horns. It means "open" and "brow." What is the Latin word for brow? It's **ops**, optic—the eye etc. And it's the opening out. Open, **wep**, **ops**, optic and webben (same thing). It means to rise and shine and all the rest of it. But it is to divide and make distinction. The horns divide and go in opposite directions. It's a division. When you open, what do you do? You unfold thy portals everlasting. You unfold the portals; you open them up. That's why this **wep** means to make a distinction, to set them apart. Then you go up to the top here. Breasted thinks that means, "he explained, he laid out in particular." But Sethe says it means "to forbid, to put an end to." The three balls you see together there always have the meaning of exception, to rule out; either to explain in detail or to rule out—to say we are not discussing that.

|p13

Now this formula; there's no doubt what that means. These words must be spoken out loud. They must be recited exactly as they are written, and these are to be spoken by the person who is taking the part of Geb, the earth god. Now the goose is purely phonetic because all of these characters are human. Nowhere do you find them in any animal or bird form or anything like that. This is the oldest times; it was all human. And he speaks to him and says, "Go to the place where thou wert born." So it's born here. And here are stage instructions. Seth takes his place on the south side of the hall. So this is dramatized that way. Then he says to Horus, "You go to the place where your father was buried in the waters—where he was drowned in that place. Horus goes to the north side of the hall. Then he addresses the two of them together, Horus and Seth. He says, "I have divided you; I have set you apart" (notice there are the dividing horns). So they take their places north and south, and that's it.

It continues this way now. Geb then speaks to the entire assembly of the gods (there are the three signs of divinity), and he says these words, "I have commanded Horus saying you are the **yinnep**, which means successor to the throne. It can also be the **wetu**, which means the same thing. It's related to the word for **wepwawet** here. "You are the successor," he says to him. Geb speaks to the gods again, "Only Horus; he is the only heir." You notice the word for heir or inherit is a leg of beef, called suet or **iyat** here. You notice why it is a piece of meat. It goes back to early times. Who gets the biggest piece at the table? You know in Homer the quivering chine of beef and you compete about the meat of honor. Well, at the table who gets the biggest chunk? This is a quivering chine of beef, you see, and it means a payment, or often a reward. You put a t on the end and it means he is the heir. He alone receives the inheritance. Then he says to them again very emphatically, "This one is given the heir." (And it's the old old form) "He is the heir; he is the only heir." He is making this known to everybody, you see. "I have chosen him. I have chosen for the son of my son Horus to be the (notice here is **Wepwawet**).

You will notice on the Facsimile No. 2 that the top figure carries the staff with the dog on top (that's **Wepwawet**) who opens the way, begins the years. It is the hound of the Pharaoh, or whoever it is, that goes ahead of you in the hunt and smells out the way in front of you, scares out the game, and leads the way. So **Wepwawet** is the one who comes first, of course. It goes back to hunting culture. And he is the one who shall be the opener of the way. Here it is written out, the **Wepwawet**. He is the one who will open the way. But here he is the **wetu**. This means the principle of patriarchal succession. He repeats the same thing again here, "He is the opener of the womb." There's **wep** again, you see. The firstborn, in other words. It is the belly and udders of a cow. And **wep-en-khat** is the one who opens the womb, the first born. "He is my son; he is my first born," he says here. "Horus, who is **Wepwawet**, who opens the way. He will establish things on the earth and take over."

Then in the final one here, he speaks again to the Council of the Gods and says, "This is my son who is born, who is Horus, and who is born at the new year." So it celebrates the new

|p14

year. It's the beginning of a new age. Everything starts out at once—a new life, a new age, a new kingdom and everything else. We are founding a new kingdom, a new dynasty. What better than to go back to the beginning of all times; the oldest, most stable kingdom in the world when it was founded, and that's this. So this is founded at the new year. This was noticed long ago, this 18 here. Everybody noticed that. This is the end of Act One. They have been given their appointments. Things are settled, etc. Now what's going to happen? The play has to move now. So we get to Act Two, and the trouble begins. But we won't have time for any more trouble than we have already had here. We should be able to finish it the next time, ha ha.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 9

Now, let's review what we said before. Remember this is the oldest document in the world, oldest writing in the world, and there are many to back it up. They have found a Demotic copy of this quite recently, so it is confirmed by other sources. We were just able to get started with it. We have to go fast because you are going to find this on many other very old documents. We will refer to them perhaps a little later. This is all very close to our Pearl of Great Price. This is the situation: Ptah-Tenen is going to establish the heavenly order on a new world. The setting is this, and they are going to be united in the United Kingdom of Egypt. And so he begets Atum; Atum begets the Council of the Gods. They are all identical. Now there are two things that are mentioned. Remember that Zabkar said, and many others have said (everybody has noted this), including Breasted. (You may have read that article in *The Monist* by now.) They have noted that this is very close to the Gospel of John and Genesis for two reasons. It emphasizes two things that you will find all over in John and Genesis; namely, the work of identification. John chapters 14 through 17, "I am in the Father, and they are in me, and I am in them. Those that listen to us, they are in us." What does it mean by "in us"? And "I am out of the Father **ek Theou**." These are the expressions that are used here in the same sense. And the other, the theme of conflict of Genesis, is the theme of creation. Well, this is John 2. The logos, the mystery of the word, the doctrine of creation by the word, the Word of God. And in Genesis God spake, and it's the word. And it uses the very same word; the Old Testament uses **sepet** which means "lips." Here it is **ushepet** which is the very same thing, by his lips.

First the situation; now we can begin. The most high god who is acclaimed decides to establish Ptah-Tenen here, and this is the situation in Egypt. He is the father of Atum, and through Atum, and through himself also, the father of all the Council of the Gods. He calls the Council of the Gods and they discuss a division between Seth and Horus. Seth is mentioned first here. But when he settles the land, he settles Seth first. Seth is the plaintiff here. He has always been making trouble, and that's going to be a very important element here. Seth is our Satan, of course. But the land is divided between them, the kings of the North and the South, and they are equal. This ends here. He sends each one to his part of the hall and says, "Let there be no more argument between you." And each one takes his place. But then he does a strange thing. He decides to give the whole inheritance to Horus. Why is that? Why did he change his mind? For two reasons made very clear here. First of all, he was very much disturbed. Geb's heart was troubled at the fact that he had given. . . Now Ptah doesn't change his mind here. It's his plan, but Geb's business (remember Geb represents the earth and everything on the earth) is to implement the divine plan down here. And he saw that it would never work with this equal division here. Therefore, he is troubled that the division was equal between Horus and Seth.

|p2

So Geb gave his own entire portion to Horus, the son of his son who was his firstborn. Well, what the theme is here is priesthood and kingship as well as land. Now, the division of the land is no trouble. You notice in the Bible the land is divided among the sons of Noah—Shem, Ham, and Japheth. No controversy there. In the fourteenth chapter of Genesis it's divided among the nations, etc. And the children of Israel divide it again. Israel (Jacob) divides it among his twelve sons; and they get their shares and that's all right. But they are jealous of one who is Joseph. They were jealous of him because he got the garment of the priesthood. We won't go into the story of the garment now, but the garment of many colors; incidentally, the word "many" is added in the King James; it's not in the Bible at all. It says the garment that had marks in it. It's a long story about the garment. When it was brought to Jacob by the brothers to show him that the lion had killed Joseph, Jacob both wept and laughed (this is a story told in the Book of Mormon). He was both pleased and oppressed by the fact that the garment was soiled and bloody. But also it showed that Joseph was alive. When he felt the garment (this is a very old source), he says he knew it. Remember, he had gone blind from weeping we are told. When he felt the garment, he knew it was the true garment of Joseph because we are told there was no other garment in the world like that. It was the garment that he had received from his father, Abraham, and Abraham had received it from Adam, and Adam had received it in the garden. This was the garment of the priesthood of which there was only one. When he gave this to Joseph, of course his brethren were jealous. And remember in the dreams he had, he was the king and they all bowed down to him. You can only have one king. And where did they bow down to him? In Egypt. This is an Egyptian story too as far as he goes, remember? Joseph becomes the second in power. He becomes the king's right hand. With all this authority he becomes a **Rp't** in fact which allows him to sit on the throne. So the brethren were very jealous of him because he became king.

But the division of the land is not the question of who is to be priest and king, and there can only be one. And that's the trouble here. So Geb gives his whole inheritance to Horus because you're not going to have a divided inheritance for one thing. Notice, the son of his son. It's the law of patriarchal succession and primogeniture. It all has to go to one, because if you start dividing up the kingship there is going to be lots of trouble. And Seth is the one to make trouble. Remember, the reason they held this thing in the first place is that there was trouble between Horus and Seth. So this had been going on before. And he finally decides to give it to Horus. Well, what happens to Seth? Is he mentioned anymore here? We soon discover down here why Seth is in discredit—because he had made trouble before. He's the one who introduces all sorts of mischief into the picture, as we see here. We read this right down to here. He divided it equally, and they all had parts of the land. Well, let's go on then.

Then it starts out with another theme. All of a sudden the Osiris theme is introduced here. Isis and Nephthys are worrying; without delay they draw him from the water. Notice in the top figure here is a picture of **mi**, and here are the waves of water. You notice Osiris lying on his back, and the sign on it is **mer**, which is "pool."

|p3

Notice that in old Celtic and old English **mere** is a pool, as in **windamere**, etc. The Latin word for sea is **mare** or **la mer**. The Egyptians used exactly the same word that we use for a sea, a pool, or a lake. So he is baptized. Notice he is lying on his back, an unusual thing here. "He comes of the place of Osiris at the water that belonged to him where it was established anew" (well, it's all missing here). But then here it is again. This is the story where Osiris is overcome and either thrown into the water or drowned (Sethe says you have your choice there) by the wicked Seth. So Seth has been making trouble all along. The two main problems here, you might say, are kingship and priesthood (dominion upon earth) and will the show go on? I mean if it's only temporary, who cares? It's eternal life and resurrection. So the two themes: eternity, life, resurrection and power and authority are the whole theme of the **Shabako Stone**. Well, now let's see, do we have anything here that we haven't mentioned? The lands were divided, etc. Well, the king in Egypt is the high priest, and by definition, of course, there can be only one. And the purpose of the text is to explain that—how it's possible to have one. So this is important to know, how it becomes one. We didn't read this did we?

Then Horus rose up as lord of the land of the South, and he bound together **Dep and Peh**; and he was acclaimed then in his great name as Uniter of the Palace of the North and the South at the place of the Lord of eternity. And it grew upon his head the **weret-hekau** which means the one who had ultimate power. It's translated as the greatest magic or something. **Hekau** usually refers to a goddess—she who is most great and powerful in authority. But it refers to the two crowns. It says they grew together on his head and became one crown so that Horus arose and mounted the throne as the king of both the South and the North—the sedge and the bee—and the uniter of the two lands at the temple in the place where the two lands are united. Two columns were placed in front of the temple (it is always so). We have this in the Bible, the two columns which were borrowed from Egypt, incidentally. Solomon borrowed those two columns. Hiram of Tyre had them cast in bronze, and they were in the manner of Egyptian temples. These two trees were set at the door to represent the North and the South. There's a very famous Egyptian story from the Middle Kingdom, the story of the two brothers, about the two trees that stand before the temple here. They were placed at the gates of the temple (the house of Ptah). Horus and Seth they represented. So the two of them were reconciled (notice the dual there) and they joined together; and the good old Sensen papyrus (same as the word for brother). Sensen means to embrace or kiss. And they united together and became one, and there was no more quarreling between them. Well, that seems like a happy ending after he decided to give it all to Horus. But then we find the trouble here. We come to the drama of Osiris where he has to go through the waters of death, etc. This goes back to the Osiris story. Isis and Nephthys are speaking to Horus, and he is telling them, "Go and rescue him out of the water." They are supposed to raise him out of the water, and he is restored then because he doesn't die completely. It follows right down to the bottom line. And they caused him to come up onto the shore here (it goes back to here, but it is missing). Then here at the top. Now they build the temple here. This part has to do with the building of the temple (the lines are hard to read here; yes, here we go).

|p4

Isis and Nephthys speak to Horus, "Go thou and do so and so." And this is the house of the old man. It means the very old man, the Ancient of Days. Notice it's the old man leaning on a staff. And it's the house of the temple in something. And **seged** means "build or construct." See there's a man building a wall, and the word **seged** means "to build up." Build the house of the king. Sethe says it's the king's castle or house. But it is in so many other things, as in our Joseph Smith papyrus, the **Hypocephalus**. It's there always—the house of the ancient of days. So they build the temple and things are connected here. This isn't the creation story here.

Now this middle part is this drama. We'll shift over to the other now, but most of it is on this side anyway. This, remember, is where the millstone ground and ground and wiped everything out completely. This was the thing that kept this part from slipping around to the other part. They had to hold it down fast. But this part, of course, was hollow, so some of it was spared. But this drama is going on, and three people are speaking: Isis, Horus and Seth. There's an argument, and Isis says something here, and then he says, "You will have joy and happiness hereafter." Then one of them says, (well, that's strange; there's something missing here) "Your life shall be sweet to you" is what he says here. That's interesting because on the others (I have a number of reproductions) there's a sign like this there which is **nedjem** or **bener**. It means sweet, agreeable. The Johannisbaum fruit. What do we call that? It looks like a castor bean. We have them around here. That's the one they use. It means sweet and agreeable. "Your life will be sweet and agreeable," somebody tells them. "And he will wipe away your tears." There are the tears coming down from the eye. So there is some sort of drama here. The three people are arguing—the man, the woman and Seth (Satan). And he says, "There will be peace to you, and your life will be sweet to you. Then he will wipe away your tears." But all the rest of it is missing.

So now we go to the important part of it which is the creation episode, the second half. Yes, that's the way it should be. Notice, here you see the house of the old man, the house of the Ancient of Days. Now we come to this, and this is the theology of the creation. These three are met together (this is why they couldn't read it because it is written backwards). It should read this way by the direction the figures are facing, but actually it's read this way, which Breasted discovered. These are the forms that Ptah bestowed upon all life—how Ptah extended himself and was able to put his life, his nature, and his stamp upon all that was created. The gods who came into existence in or through Ptah. And first of all there is Ptah upon the great throne. He's the first Ptah. These are different Ptahs, you see. Then there is Ptah-Nun, the heavenly Ptah (incidentally, he is standing in the shrine of the temple of the South here), who is the father of Atum. Then there is Ptah-Naunet who is the mother who bore Atum. And then there is the great Ptah who is the mind, the lips, and the tongue of the **Pesedjet** of all the gods—whose mind and heart are in all the gods. You notice you have a matter of degrees here. You have a transmission of power, and what is it? Identity? That's what you have in John. The nineteenth chapter of 3 Nephi is the same thing. He goes aside and prays that I may be in you and you, Father, in me; and those that follow me may be in me as you are in me, Father; and that those who follow them (their converts) may also be one as we are one.

|p5

This idea of being in others and being identified. That's what we have here, and it's one of the keys of Egyptian, this doctrine of identity. In what sense are they identical? Down here we see "the lord who begot the gods" and this was obviously Nefertem that is at the nose of Re everyday. That's resurrection. He smells the flower Nefertem which is the opening lotus and that revives life everyday—the nose of Re, the sun.

Now we go to the top here. Notice it starts dividing into the two, and this is very important because everything happens between these two. You will see in the Book of Moses we are going to get the very same thing. Great emphasis is laid on this in Moses 1:4 and 38-39 which we all know by heart. So it happened in the mind and heart (that's the word **hat**; same word as our word head, front, etc; and there's a picture of a heart), and upon the tongue that the image and likeness of Ptah was in **Tem**. See, through the mind and the heart of Ptah, he established his image in Atum. Great and mighty is Ptah. When he creates something, then everybody breaks out into the creation hymn, which is a very important hymn. Our word poetry comes from that. As Walter Otto showed, the Greek word **poiema** is "to make." It means creation. It's the creation hymn. It was first sung by the Muses to celebrate the creation. Remember, when the plan of creation was decided on and everything was passed, then the "the morning stars sang together and the sons of God shouted for joy." That's the creation hymn. We often find reference to it—to hail God for his greatness, and rejoicing, overwhelmed with joy and exaltation at the thought of the creation of a new world coming into existence. That's what happened. "His mind was imparted; his image is in **Tem**. Great and mighty is Ptah." They acclaim him because through Atum, it says, it came to all the spirits as well. Not only to Atum but to all other spirits as well did Ptah bestow being; in the heart and in the tongue. We say heart and mind because they are the same.

And then again it divides. Notice this is **Kheper en**. "And it came to pass that Horus and **Djehuty-Thoth** cooperated with him." There are three that are going to operate then. There is Ptah. You notice Geb waits down below to take things over. Atum is the one who transmits the seed. But at the creation these three made the main council: Ptah, Horus and **Djehuty-Thoth**. As you know, he is Hermes, the secretary of the gods, the spirit, the revealer, the one who keeps all the records, the one who has all knowledge. He is the god of knowledge, the god of wisdom, the god of counsel. He is always rendered in the Greek by Hermes, so that's where you get hermetism, the source of all wisdom, etc. So these three. And, of course, Horus is the son; he is always the son. Horus, the son, and Djehuty who is represented in the abstract (well, so is Horus for that matter) by the ibis. They came into existence; they were in Ptah, with Ptah. They cooperated with Ptah in all this. **Sekhem** is a very common word. You get it in the names of kings such as **Sekhemwy** out here in the museum. It means might, power, authority—usually rendered as "authority."

"And authority, might, and power of the heart and of the tongue were in what he did." This again is something that has been restored. This is way back; it was made in 1901. This is in

|p6

the thirty-ninth volume of the *Aegyptische Zeitschrift*, and it is Breasted's. Since then they have made a couple of corrections, and this is one of them. "It is the doctrine, the teaching that Ptah enters into" Well, **henet** is to stand in front, to confront, to be joined with, to be as close as you possibly can. ". . . that he is in every body (that's the physical body) and in every mouth of all gods, of all human beings (male and female), of all cattle (there's a cattle hook), of all creeping things (notice there's a serpent), and all other forms of life, according to the plan and according to the order." It was planned and it was ordained. It uses this throughout the Book of Abraham, you notice. It says they planned and then they saw that their commands would be obeyed. They would plan and then they would give their orders, and the orders would be followed. That's what this talks about. "According to what was planned, ordained and commanded, according to his good pleasure." It was all according to his pleasure.

So we have the heart and the tongue acting here, and this is very important because, remember, in Moses he talks about the creation. This is very important because this is the famous logos theology that baffles everybody, and there's no need to be baffled because it is wonderfully clear in Moses 1:4. The logos is the word. Remember, the Book of John starts out, "**en arche en ho logos**, In the beginning was the logos (discussion, council, word, reason). It could mean all those things. And the Book of Genesis begins the same way. Genesis begins in the beginning, but that begins **beresheit**, which Joseph Smith says is in the Council of the Gods. In the beginning they call out the council, **beresheit barau**. He separated them. There was this council and the discussion.

Well, what is the mystery of the logos? He tells us here what it is. Notice, he says in Moses 1:4 here: "I will show thee the workmanship of mine hands; but not all, for my works are without end, and also my words, for they never cease." They are the works and the words; they always go together. And then he says here in Moses 1:38: "And as one earth shall pass away, and the heavens thereof even so shall another come; and there is no end to my works, neither to my words." The works are never without the words. It's very interesting. And the next verse, the thirty-ninth, tells us why they must go together. "For behold, this is my work and my glory—to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man." It's to pass it on. The glory of God is intelligence, and it is shared intelligence. There's no glory in a vacuum. What is the purpose of the word? It's not mystical; it's to communicate. The word is to communicate. It's to pass on, to share it with others. That's what he is doing here. It was in his heart and he brings it up in the Council of the Gods, and they are able to share it. It's through the word that this happens, and it's literally true. This is going to tell us how that happens. Incidentally, the psychology of the word is going to be explained very clearly and vividly here in a passage quite close to the one in the **Sefer Yetsirah**.

Well, let's see what he says here now. Let's see if there is a continuation here. "Everything was done as it pleased him." Then we go down here. The **Pesedjet**, "His council was in his presence in as." Notice, the full council, the **pesedj**, is always drawn this way as a circle divided in two because this is important. It represents the two sides of the argument (it

!p7

represents "yin" and "yang"), and it's always represented this way. That's what this has here. It's on stone, but very faintly it has a line through the middle here (the **pesedj**). "And this council was in his presence as his heart and as his lips, as his teeth in his mouth [see, to make enunciation possible] and as his hands." There were two aspects, the begetting and the formation. Remember, as what's-his-name says of Atum: "**er shafft nicht, er zeucht**, he doesn't create but he begets." But both belong here. This is both creating and begetting. The word for teeth and the word for lips (same as in Hebrew), and here are the two hands. And Atum was the agent through which this was done. And through him came all the gods, and by his begetting (phallic symbol there) and by his fingers, by his shaping (there's a literal laboratory procedure going on here). It's written **djaba** and a picture of three fingers. It has to be plural because there are more than two fingers; **en djaba** is the same word that is used in Arabic or Hebrew, so that's convenient. "And the Council of the Gods (this becomes rather important here) they are as his own teeth and his own lips in his utterance. And as things were brought forth, he pronounced the name of everything as it came forth from Shu and Tefnut," They are the Egyptian Adam and Eve. They are the gods who come down to beget the human race. But you notice in Genesis a very important thing is that the animals are brought to Adam and he names them. Remember, he names everything. It tells us in Genesis 2, as in the Pearl of Great Price, that God brought these creatures before Adam so he could give them a name, so he could classify them. You may have read the psychologist Levi-Strauss who has revolutionized the study of primitive man in our time. He shows that what the primitives do better than anybody else is classify. They are marvelous classifiers. They know hundreds of types of plants and animals that the people who go to study them have no idea about. They know far more than the people who come to study them. And they are all named as they come forth for Adam and Eve. I should say Shu and Tefnut. They're our parents here. And then the council brought forth the seeing of the eyes (see the two eyes), the hearing of the two ears, the **senef** (notice our word snuff, sniffle, snort, snout, snot—all those nose words) Well, they are international and universal. They are similar in Hebrew and Arabic. "And the breathing of the **fenet**, which is the word for nose (there's a sail with air in it which signifies breath). This is the Opening of the Mouth ordinance which is always performed when one receives an Egyptian endowment—whether it's coronation, initiation, or going through the temple. The first thing you have to be washed and annointed. Then you go through the Opening of the Mouth, first with water and then with oil. They touch your eyes that you may see. It starts with the mouth because you must breathe and act first of all—the most primitive of all organs. Many primitive creatures are nothing but mouth. You don't need eyes and nose so much, but you must have the mouth to live.

Your eyes that you may see, your arms that you may smite evil and all this sort of thing, and they go through that. Eighty-eight cases of that were collected recently by Eberhard Otto—a great collection of texts to show what this Opening of the Mouth was. It was a very important part of the temple. And it's the same thing that is performed in the old Jewish funeral (big words like funeral). The rabbi strikes the corpse on the mouth because it can no

|p8

longer speak, the eyes because they no longer see. We are told when Adam was cast out of the garden and was dying, he sent Seth and Eve back to the garden to get the oil of anointing to anoint his eyes, ears, nose, etc. so that he would not lose their function—so that he would not die. They were met on the way by an angel (this is very well established; you will find this in your R. H. Charles book) who told them they couldn't have it yet. Until the Son of Man came with redemption, they couldn't have this ordinance. And so they had to go back without the oil of anointing. But it was to reverse the order of death. But at the funeral the rabbi angrily strikes the ears because they won't hear anymore, the eyes because they won't see anymore. Well, these were the blows of death inflicted by Satan. Cain learned them from Satan. That's a long story, but these things are all related. You'd be surprised how they tie in together.

Now we come to this interesting psychology. You notice these are the sensory organs. These are the perceptors. We get our knowledge of the world from them supposedly. No, we don't. They just come in as electrical impulses. That's all they are—just a form of energy. We have to form them inside when we get them. They come through these senses, but you notice the eyes, the ears, the mouth, the nose do not give out. They do not project; they only receive. It comes in and it's locked in you. You have your private universe. What do you do? It's only the word by which you can communicate this with others. That's why the word is so very important. You do not radiate from your eyes (you do some, but not notably); you do not project sound from your ears; smell, taste and the other things. You cannot communicate them with others. The only way of communicating is through the word. "There is no end to my works or to my words." Words mean communication with everybody else. The Lord says his purpose is to share his glory: "My work and my glory is to bring about the immortality and eternal life of man." He wants to share it with everyone. If the glory of God is intelligence, it has to be shared. Glory is shared intelligence. And it is done through the word. So there is no mystery about the logos. They make such a big secret of it. Remember, in the second part of *Faust* he is reading the Gospel of John in the **heiligen Original** (the holy original), and he says, "That won't do. With the deed; that sounds much better." Well, this brings them both. Here is the deed (the fingers) and the word. They go together here. This is the tongue. So the word is very important to come out here (and what are we doing here now?).

Notice, they cause to mount up. Here is a pyramid like the oldest stone building in the world—the pyramid at Saqqarah, that magnificent pyramid. It's marvelous, one of the first stone buildings ever built. And the others around it were built at the same time. They are some of the most beautiful and perfectly preserved buildings in the world. They're the oldest stone buildings we have, nothing primitive about them. Well, anyway this is a double stairway leading up "so that they might cause to mount up." '**Alah** is the universal Semitic word meaning "to mount up." You know El Al, the airline. "Caused them to mount up to the heart." Now these impressions that you get from the eyes, ears, nose, etc. are conveyed to the heart. And the heart in turn passes them on. They go forth to the **ariq**. This is a wonderful word. The original word is "bind." Notice the determinative here is a piece of rope or cloth because it

!p9

means to bind. Therefore, it means a "covenant"; it means "sacred word"; it means "comprehension"; it means the "last day of the month"; it means anything "binding"; it means the "ultimate declaration." Here it would be the final structuring of things. **Arik** is putting everything together. It's very interesting, the **arik**. In Arabic it's the end of the world. If you have been to the Dome of the Rock, you know the big mosque with the silver dome on it was the holy one. It's called the **arqa**. It's the end of the world. That's where you take off for the other world. They use the same word as the **arik**.

"And this will formulate everything for the tongue to repeat and set forth." Now the tongue can convey it, you see. First, you have to receive the impressions (this is good psychology); then it enters into the heart and mind of the thing and it receives a particular form. It has to be handed on, and then it has to be put into comprehensible structure, and then it conveyed by being repeated by the tongue. "What has been thought by the heart is repeated by the tongue."

So the gods were all begotten, and Atum was begotten, and he begot them too. This applies to both Atum and his creatures and all the gods. "And all this happened through the divine command of God which he conceived in his heart and which he commanded by his tongue. And thus it was he made the spirits (this is the name of the ruler). This means those who are preordained. **Qenet** means to preordain, to set apart, to have a purpose for. And this is the female of the same thing, the **hes-mett** spirits—those who were to beget children. These were special spirits. He set forth the spirits of these two classifications: the **hemswet** (Sethe has a long essay on what they were). These are the feminine. Of course that's the symbol of the Lady Nut, the first mother who came to Egypt with her two arrows. And this other one here **metenu** means those designated for life and all those designated to beget children.

Then this is the last step. He gets the spirits ready to come to earth. "Then he created abundance of supply on the earth for them." **Djifa** means all manner of food, all manner of substance and anything you need for life. The earth was richly provided. "Adam, we have made for you this earth and provided it with everything." This is food offerings; everything provided in general. This is more specific: **hetep**, food spread out, every type of it by this counsel (**en medet tjen**). Then an interesting thing happened. Notice, he has provided the spirits to come last of all. Then he has equipped the world to give them all they need to live on. Then he proceeds to give them a law. Now this is why the whole thing is being done. It must have a purpose here. "He gave this law; namely, whoever does **merret** (that which is lovable, that which is desirable, that which is of good report—a good definition of what is good: remember it is anything that is lovable) to him shall be given life with eternal happiness and salvation." **Hetep** means so many things. It means peace, it means salvation; they just used it for food up here. This will be granted to whoever does good. And then right along with it, you notice, this is the law that is given to everything showing that the purpose of the earth is probation. "To everyone that does **mesedjet** . . ." It means that which is hateful, that which is evil. The word **mesedjet** is a very interesting one.

|pl0

It's the word that is used in Coptic and the Greeks picked it up, meaning the devil who is the great hater. Well, it the same word as "master" in Master Mahan. That's a funny thing. We don't want to get involved in that now. I don't think that first word "master" has to do with the name master necessarily; it can. But **mesedjet** is the same one here. **Mesedj M-aha** means the great hater, the great destroyer—Apollyon, which is what Satan is, of course. But it's anyone who ever does that which is hateful.

That is very interesting; it leaves a subjective definition to good and evil. You can argue until the cows come home, make laws about it, and legislate, but you know what is good (what is lovable and desirable) and you feel in your bones what is evil and what is wrong. "Whoever does that, to him shall be given death in a condition of **hebet**" (to be held back in prison, to be punished). **Hebet** is the regular word for crime, criminal punishment. So this is the rule, and it divides it down the middle. A law has been given that whoever does good will receive eternal salvation and whoever does bad will receive the death and combined punishment here. So then he says, according to this law everything which is done—any kind of work at all, any kind of workmanship, art, science, or any more sophisticated operation, the doings of the two arms, the walking of the legs, the motion of the limbs. So all the acts of man, all their achievements, all their activities, everything they make, their arts, and everything they do is governed by this law which shall apply to all things. And this was according to what he commanded, what he had thought in his mind and uttered by his tongue from the middle." Here it is again; this is a very important saying. It's as if it were right out of Protagoras, isn't it? "This law shall be the measure of all things." Some say this shouldn't be on here. This is **iyat** in that case—the extent by which all things shall be measured. Or if it only has one side, then it means the **imakh**, the measure of excellence, the measure of judgment. Sethe says it is simply the well-known saying, "This is the measure of all things." So everything that comes to earth is to be measured by this law that who does good will be rewarded and who does evil will be punished. And that's why he set it up. Therefore, as Nephi said, "This life became a time of probation." And that's what he is making it here, a time of probation, and it applies to everything.

And then it happened that when these things had been said and done by Atum, and had been caused to come into existence by all the gods, it was all in the name of Ptah himself, who is Ptah-Tenen now. These things will be transferred to the earth where Geb will take over then, I suppose. He is now Ptah-Tenen, and there's our picture of Ptah-Tenen here. "Whom the gods caused to come forth all things from him [remember, the syntax isn't ours] by the way of food and nourishment, clothing, anything else you need [all life's necessities]." They like to repeat all the time here. "Everything which is beautiful and good. Then it was understood that all this was by the great might and power of Ptah through the council. But it was Ptah who did it all. And after he had completed this and looked upon it all, he saw that it was good." As Sethe points out, this is exactly what it says in Genesis: He looked upon it and saw that it was good. "When he saw all things produced by his word [notice, produced by his word but brought forth by the gods] then the gods proceeded to establish cities on earth."

|p11

As I said, this is to be translated down to earth. They've got to get civilization going here.

There's a picture of three cities. It seems that it's always plural, and it's the city symbol. Rome was **Roma quadrata**, divided into four parts. That was a part of the mystery. It all goes back to an early sacral ceremonial center when you had to be boxed to the compass. We still do in Utah—North Temple, South Temple—everything is gauged according to the temple. Brigham Young was very careful about this. Everything must be very carefully boxed to the temple because it is a scale model of the universe. Everything counts itself from the temple; it's an hierocentric society—the last on earth probably now. But that's what they have here. "And he created the city, and he caused to be constructed [notice the constructing is a picture of an adze chopping a board] the fields and farms." These were fields **sepet** or nomes. The Latin word **septum** is a division of things. These are districts on earth where people would settle, of course. "And then the time had come; he placed the gods in their shrines (temples, houses) so he could cause to flourish there the sacred offerings, the sacred food. And he built their shrines [there are three of them] and their statues of their bodies in forms which would please them. Then the gods entered into their images in all manner of wood and precious stone and metal, and all manner of stuff that flourishes upon the face of the earth." So they have established the temples now. "And then this all being done, he gathers them all together." Here again he summons the gods all together in the grand Council of the Spirits and the Gods all together. This is a mysterious name which means he was pleased the way things were gathering. That's the name in which they met at this time—the lord of the two worlds. "And he is the provider of corn for the land." This is a corn barn here. Ptah-Tenen supplies all the grain for the land. "And here is the great throne where all the gods are united within the temple of Ptah [there's Ptah's name written in the temple] and they are all there to hail life. And there he gave life to the two lands at that place. From this place life goes forth to the two lands."

These last three have to do with Osiris—the baptism and the resurrection theme and the final glorious consummation. We'll put that to the next time because that's rather important too. This is strange stuff, but oddly familiar. We are not the only ones that recognize it. Everybody, every Egyptologist recognizes the relationship to the Bible. There's something really going on here. It's very old, and the Pearl of Great Price is what ties it all together. We saw that, "No end to my works or my words."

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 10

Those last three lines of the **Shabako Stone** are rather important, so I've just got to get rid of them. It's a nuisance, but it's worth it because they are very important. They are what the whole thing is getting at—how after baptism he gets eternal salvation and exaltation, etc.

Here are some things I'm going to put on reserve. They'll be very useful, I think. Tha'labi says that in heaven there is a screen of mother of pearl like this, and there are beams like laser beams that write the affairs of various distant planets, including the earth, upon these screens, and they play out very skillfully everything that is done. The angels consult them to find out what is going on.

Incidentally, it is framed in red rubies because that is the principle of the laser, the ruby. This is an Arabic writer from the tenth century, but he gets it from the Jews. It's framed in red ruby, and it siphons these beams in, which are like lasers. It says that God consults it three times a day to see where he is supposed to send angels and to see what is going on. Gadgets everywhere; science fiction all over the place. It's very interesting and ingenious, though, that they should have connected these things like that—the mother of pearl screen and the like.

Speaking of science fiction, do you know who the first LDS science fiction writer was? Some people think that we take naturally to science fiction. It was W. W. Phelps. He wrote a story which is in this book at some length, several pages. It's a science fiction story explaining certain things, the creation etc., in terms of space travel. It's very interesting. I'm going to Xerox it because it's real science fiction by that character, W. W. Phelps.

We are just going to put on the tail end of this because, as I say, it is important that we put it on. That's right; that's the way it should be. Just the final things we want to take into consideration here, these last two lines. It starts out here in the palace of Ptah where life begins to the place where all things come together and all things are brought to a conclusion. Then it starts at the top, "And Osiris was submerged in his water [there is something particular about it] and the two ladies saw him and were supposed to rescue him. And Horus gave an order and cried out to them, 'Ladies, go rescue him and take him from the water and prevent his drowning.'"

They run around, and just in time they catch him and bring him up again upon the land. Being upon the land, he asserts himself. He now enters through the gate [it also means initiation] of the glory of the land of the holy ones, the lords of eternity." The final test is the baptism. He emerges from the waters of life. Remember, this is the theme you are going to get in all your year dramas. This is the **de profundis** formula from the Psalms, "out of the depths I call."

|p2

It's the king, you see; he calls on the Lord to rescue him from the depths. The same thing happens in the first chapter of Moses in our Pearl of Great Price where Moses is delivered from the waters and comes out. The Lord says, "I will give you power over many waters, and you shall be the king. They shall obey you as if you were God, and you shall lead my people." It's the old acclamation of the king, the same motif that goes on here. And he's brought from the water. You'll see that in this passage of Moses; it's quite relevant actually, in Moses 1:25: "And calling upon the name of God, he beheld his glory again." He emerges again. Remember, he is overcome; he is overwhelmed by the depths. He calls out with his last breath of strength to be rescued, and then God saves him out of the depths (delivers him, you see). "He saw the bitterness of hell." That means he went down into the waters. He despaired; he gave up. It says here in verse 20 that he feared, "and as he began to fear, he saw the bitterness of hell." Then he received strength to call upon God and Satan was banished. Then he emerged again here, and calling upon the Lord he beheld his glory. And the voice of the Lord said you have won: "Blessed art thou, Moses, for I, the Almighty, have chosen thee, and thou shalt be made stronger than many waters [Moses was—both the Red Sea and the waters of Marah, and also the waters of death he is calling out from here], for they shall obey thy command as if thou wert God. [The king's representative on earth he is.] And lo, I am with thee, even unto the end of thy days; for thou shalt deliver my people from bondage (verses 20-26)."

It is God's people that Moses is delivering; the king only holds his authority this way. Well, in the same way he emerges and on doing so, this is what he does. He enters immediately in through the gate of the great holy ones of eternity. The word **holy** here is written very phonetically, **desheureu**; it's **deseret**, the word for "holy, set apart, sanctified." They use the word **deseret** a great deal. It's the red land, the holy land—very special. And, of course, the red crown of the North is called the **deseret** crown, and the **deseret** bee is the symbol. It all goes back to her anyway. "The lords of eternity to walk along the same paths of him who rises in glory on the horizon along the way." **Metchenu** is the word for "highway," and it's used all through as the way of life. At the tomb of Petosiris, for example, "I will teach you the way of life, the way of truth. God knows the way of the righteous, but the way of the wicked shall get lost in the desert and shall perish. So I will lead you on the way. . ."

This language all mixes in. It's very close to the Old Testament and to John and Genesis too. Well, on the way, on the highway. That's a picture of the way with the milestones along it. It's the word **wat** for way. Watling Street in England. **Wat** is to wait, to walk along, to stand along. It's cognate with our language all the way through here. ". . .to the heavenly throne, to the great throne here. When you reach the great throne, there he shall be united in salvation and safety." This is **Setep sa**. It means the chosen and the saved or eternal. These are the knots that you wear on your shoulder here on the sacred garment. It represents security and safety because with a knot you tie a thing and make it safe. The knot is secure and tied. It's pronounced **sah**, and it's the name that was later given to the palace at Luxor, but it means the holy and safe place—the place where the gods assemble in brotherhood. Notice the two brother signs, **sensen**, with the nose there for sniff, ". . . and they shall kiss one another and fall upon

|p3

each other's shoulders." This is like the ending of **The Pearl**, remember, when they all greet each other. "And he shall be entered into the brotherhood of the gods." **Sensen** is the two brothers. Our words twin and twain. **Shenayim** in Hebrew means "two," but in Arabic it's **ethnayn** (like twain) which means "two." It's perfectly good Old English. That's the word we have here.

"With his brethren the gods as at the place of good old Ptah-Tenen [Ptah has become the ruler upon the earth, but now he's up in heaven] where Ptah is in the heavens, who is the Lord of eternities, the Ancient of Days [literally the Lord of years] and then he shall become the Osiris, the one who enters his temple." See, he has now been sanctified. The idea is that Osiris doesn't stay in the grave. He comes and introduces the ordinances for redemption for the dead on earth. So he enters into his temple. Here is the house of the great old man. It is often rendered "the house of the Ancient of Days," in other words God's representative on earth. Notice, it is all representation here. As the Lord told Moses, ". . . as if thou wert God." We say the Egyptians are always mixing these things up. You see it in the museum. Well, that's part of the scriptures. You do that. And Moses and Elijah and Elisha, etc., the garment of Moses. Then he approaches his son finally. "Then he and his son shall be brought together—his son Horus who is reigning on the two thrones in the embrace of his arms" (as Sethe shows). This is when the father and son embrace as the last act of his being initiated and set upon his throne. "In the presence of all the gods who were before an eternity and who are after an eternity." So this takes us back into the eternal scene again. We've gone through the cycle here.

I notice for the first time there's a good photograph of this thing in one of the books for sale over at the bookstore in the museum. The book is too expensive. I couldn't get it, but it's the first good photograph I've ever seen of it. You can actually read it from the photograph—the original **Shabako Stone** the way it looks today. Should I review this briefly now before I point out this particular theme? Remember, we said that Hermann Grapow was the author of the three million words of the five-volume Egyptian dictionary. He says this theme of the creation and the world before the creation is that of the Pyramid Texts. You will find it in the Book of the Dead. You'll find it in the Greek and Roman temple inscriptions. You'll find it in the Old Testament. You'll find it in the Babylonian literature. You'll find it in the **Rig-Veda**. You'll find it in the Vedas and the Sanskrit literature of India, of course. You'll find it in the Old High German. You'll find it in the Gothic **Wessobrunner Gebet**, and in the **Voluspa** of our Scandinavian ancestors. And we mentioned the passages from Hesiod's *Theogony*, the oldest Greek work that talks about how it all began. We also mentioned Mircea Eliade who has done the greatest comparative work of all, bringing the primitives together with the early religions and the modern. He says there is always this central myth which describes the beginnings of the world, including the origin of plants, animals and man—of marriage, family, death, etc. Taken all together these myths of origin constitute a fairly coherent history. You'll find them the same wherever you go. It isn't the sort of thing any primitive would make up, or that you'd make up to tell a child. Or you think that if you go back to the primitives throughout the world you

|p4

find a vast variety of strange exotic rites. You don't. You find the same story everywhere. That's what James Frazer showed in *The Golden Bough*. He looked all over the world and he found these things everywhere. His conclusion was, which was held until quite recently: well of course people do the same things. It represents a natural degree along the development of the human mind. It's evolutionary. At a certain period of evolution people think in these terms. Well, it's much too elaborate a story, and there are much too close parallels in it to be dismissed that way, so nobody accepts that anymore.

It was just in the 1930s that the Cambridge School started what they called patternism. Wherever you go in the ancient world—ancient, primitive, or modern—you will find the same pattern being followed. And does it go back to some pattern in the human mind in which we just do these things spontaneously? C. G. Jung, the famous German psychologist, still maintains (he's very old now) that there are certain primal images that we all have. But all the gaps have been filled in now, and it appears that they do have a common origin and do go back to a particular thing.

Well, let me turn now quickly to the Babylonian equivalent to this. What do you find in Mesopotamia? You find here the **Enuma Elish** story. Unfortunately, we can't put this on reserve because the **Enuma Elish** is on seven tablets. This one of Speiser only produces the last three, and the first four are the creation story. Those are the ones we want. I have made a summary here which I'm going to have Xeroxed today, from the text published by Labat here. I think we can use that. Not to slow us down, but just to show us what we are dealing with—the kind of thing we have on hand here. Speiser, who is the main student of this, says, "The struggle between cosmic order and chaos was to the ancient Mesopotamians . . ." This includes the Babylonians, the Sumerians, the Amorites, the people of Mari; it goes clear over to Ebla. This is all the eastern area. Now, their language is close to the Bible. You notice this old Babylonian text is transliterated here. You students who have had Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic won't have much trouble. You'll recognize all the words. The grammar is a little different, but you get onto that pretty quickly. It's not bad, except the reading of the cuneiform. (When you get that in the mud, it's pretty terrible.) So you'll have to go to Brother Pack for that. He's very good, one of the best Babylonian men in the country, right here at BYU.

"The fateful drama was renewed at the turn of each new year." Just exactly as in Egypt, they dramatized the thing to celebrate the beginning of the world at each new year. "The epic which deals with these events was, therefore, [and this is important] the most significant expression of religious literature of Mesopotamia." Just as this is the most significant expression, the **Memphite Theology** is standard and fundamental right down to the end, right down to Genesis and John. In the same way in Mesopotamia, this remains the standard text and, as he says, the most significant expression of religious literature of Mesopotamia. The work consisting of seven tablets was known in Akkadian as **Enuma Elish** which means "as once above." It begins with the meeting of the gods above, the Great Council, well with the three on the great thrones. **Enuma** means "that which was happening on high" or "as it was once above, in the beginning." "In my first primeval childhood" as we read in **The Pearl**. Remember he starts out in heaven

|p5

the same way in his first primeval childhood. "It was recited with due solemnity on the fourth day of the new year festival." What's his name, a Babylonian scholar (I'll think of his name in a minute; I always say I'll think of his name in a minute, and I do too.)—he figured that this was what happened. At the new year (this is a Hopi rite, incidentally) the king had to go into the underworld. He went into a tomb and disappeared for three days. He had to show that he could overcome the powers of death. So he disappears into an underground vault for three days. While he is there he is humiliated. He's dressed in a false robe, he's given a reed to hold in his hand, and his face is slapped by the priest until the tears run. And he puts on a mock crown. Of course, immediately we think of Jesus. There's a book on this by no less a person than Robert Graves. That properly humiliates him and cuts him down to size. Meantime, he is in the grave. Does he have power over the resurrection; does he have the king's secret to be resurrected? On the third day he arises. He comes triumphantly through the Ishtar gate, and as he comes through, this is recited. This is the story that's recited reestablishing—just as it happened in Memphis there when King Shabako refounded the empire, after it was done by Menes. But Menes wasn't the first; it was very ancient. In other words this has a very old background and a worldwide background. Now the latest study by W. G. Lambert says the first major conclusion is that epic of creation is not the norm of Babylonian or Sumerian cosmology. It is a sectarian and aberrant combination. It has been handed down by numbers of groups. See, Babylon didn't have the united civilization that Egypt always had. They didn't have the one idea of the Pharaoh, the united land. It was always broken up into kingdoms and competing temples and religions and everything else. The sectarians all treat the same material, but they treat it in different ways. You get some of that in Egypt too, but not as much as you do in Babylon.

So he says, "This is a sectarian and aberrant combination of mythological threads woven into an unparalleled composition. In my opinion, this composition was not earlier than 1100 B.C." So it is at least a thousand years after the other. But you notice what they do. They have scrambled the motifs, as you could expect, but the motifs are still there. The evidence is all there, but it is scrambled. Just like when you have a stew. The stew has all been chopped up, the vegetables and things, but you can tell what went into it. You can tell there are carrots there, and you can put the carrot parts together, and the potatoes and the onions. You are not fooled at all. And even when they are badly scrambled up like this, you recognize the same familiar few motifs. But this is a most important text.

It will be familiar to you Hebrew students. You should be able to recognize it right from the beginning here, the introduction. "As it was once above." You notice this: What's a **nabi**? Of course, it's a prophet. **Naba** is to make an announcement. What's **shamau**? In Hebrew they follow the Egyptian idea and call it the two heavens, **shamayim**. They make it dual. God separated the two heavens. That first verse of Genesis actually says in the beginning God separated the two heavens. And that which was below. Its name **shem**, Ishmael, same as God. **Zakhara** means to name, to remember. **Thakari** in Arabic; Zachariah in Hebrew. It's the same one. So it goes along very familiar; it's the old Babylonian (1100 B.C.). Most scholars, however, don't agree with Lambert. They still would put it back to the beginning of the

|p6

Babylonian period. They would put it back around 1900 B.C. But still it was older than that.

This is the way it goes then: "As once above when the heavens had not yet received their name, received a frame from everlasting thou art God to endless years the same." Remember the old congregational hymn? We have it in our books. "Before the hills in order stood, earth received her frame, for everlasting thou art God . . ." It's the school song at Berkeley. It's very old. It goes back years in California. That used to be a congregational school when it started out. "As once above when the heavens had not yet received their name and the earth below was not yet named, the Holy of Holies, the most inner sacred sanctuary of the temple [see, the temple is the central point, the place where you go for the creation story and all the rest] had not yet been built." It's the **gipara**. There has been a lot written about this. It's the sacred holy of holies, the inner-most chamber of the temple. ". . . when the gods were born from the bosom of Apsu and Tiamat." Notice, Apsu is another familiar word to all of us. The Greeks picked that up and used it a great deal in religion, etc. Tiamat is the Hebrew word. In the Old Testament it's **tehom**. Apsu is our word abyss. Remember in the creation in Milton, "Dovelike sat'st brooding on the vast abyss, And mad'st it pregnant." Well this is the vast abyss. This is the old Babylonian and the old Sumerian. It's very old, you see, the old word for the abyss, the emptiness, the void that wasn't there before.

Tiamat means disorganized, and in the seventy-fifth section of the Book of the Dead where it describes the Flood, because of the wickedness, God says, "I will cause a flood to come and things will return to the **huhu** and **muhu** which they were before the creation. That means the disorganized state of chaos. That's what Tiamat is. She is the woman who comes right down into Gnostic literature as Sophia from which things have to be organized—the Apsu and Tiamat. I left something out here because in the text it calls her **Mummu**, mother. **Mummu** is the same thing as Tiamat. You notice there is always this tension between the matriarchy and the patriarchy, especially in Babylon. In Egypt there's remarkable equality. They keep things very even there. But here you have this trouble anyway. "Ages passed and Anshar and Kishar of the nobler race of gods were born."

See, you have issues coming along. Things were going on long before this. This is not just the beginning. It's like when the creator, Ptah, calls a meeting to settle a long-standing affair between Horus and Seth that had been going on. It's the same thing. In this case it was between Anshar and Kishar, the nobler race. "The days passed, the years followed. Anshar begot Anu, the firstborn equal to himself." So Anu is the high god, the god of heaven. You don't have to remember these, but just notice we are following the same pattern here. Anshar and Anu, the father and the son. Again, you get the same thing in the other text. "He begot him in his own image." Notice **tamish lashu mashala**. How would you say it in Arabic? Like him **mitlo**. **Mathala** is to be like, to have an image. In Hebrew, of course, it's **mashal**. In Hebrew you say, **lemashal**, to give an example. Well, **mashal** is an image or likeness. It says here in old Babylonian, "according to his own likeness and image." And this was Nudimmud. That's the one who's to be on the earth and is exactly like our Ptah-Tenen. This is the title

|p7

given to Ea as the creator of mankind. It was he who was the creator we are told, he who was a vast intelligence. Remember the Pearl of Great Price, "I am more intelligent than they all." A vast intelligence, omniscient, omnipotent, mightier than the father of his father Anshar. So we have generations, patriarchal line of descent here. The women are bothering things here—Tiamat, because she is going to make trouble.

Now, we begin the story: "There was a great assembly among the brethren of the gods to resist the influence of Tiamat. [That's our **tehom**, the power of darkness, the underworld.] They began to take measures. There was much stirring in the heavenly mansions for Apsu [the abyss here] and Tiamat [the female who ruled over it] . . ." They represent entropy. They want everything to return to a state of chaos and to a state of death and stillness. That's what things are doing; they are all running down. It's as if these people had an insight into the modern physics. These powers are trying to break it down, and we are trying to build it up against them. In the Old Testament it starts out **tohu vabohu**; it is still used in modern Hebrew. It means complete confusion, a mess, not organized. So it's the same thing here. "For Apsu and Tiamat plan to destroy the race of gods because of their rebellious independence." They did not want man to have his agency. Remember, Satan tried to destroy the agency at the beginning. So that is the issue. Are individuals to enjoy independence or not; or are they to revert to their primal state when everything is just lazy, gives up, collapses and goes down. Everything runs downhill. It's the heat death. It's the Second Law of Thermodynamics—everything running down, which is the normal course of things. And, of course, the problem arises—why hasn't it taken place long before—which is quite a mystery.

But this resentment of free agency is called in the poem "the beginning of evil" in line 44. "Their plan of destruction was reported to the gods. They heard about it, and when they heard of it they bestirred themselves. Their voices became silent and they sat perplexed. [This is a vivid scene; very Babylonian.] But the most intelligent, Ea the wise . . ." In the end it always goes up to Ea; he is your Ptah, depending on whether it's Ptah or Atum. Ea means the water. The temple is called the House of Ea. The word for temple is written with a Babylonian grating, like this. It represents the grating that was over the **tehom** in the temple, the lowest part when you went down. That was the underworld, which in the bottom of the Roman temple would be the **mundis**. There was a plug, the stone that was taken out once a year. This plugged the waters of the underworld. That's an important thing. Remember, when you go to the temple up here. What will you find in the lowest place? You will find the waters of the underworld where people are buried in baptism—buried in death to arise again, just as we saw Osiris having to go down to the lowest of the low and submit to the baptism, and then be dragged out again.

"Then the most intelligent Ea, the wise, the wonderful counselor who knows all things, perceived their problem. Accordingly, he traced out and determined a cosmic design. He devised against the evil one his pure, irresistible utterance. He proclaimed it and placed his dwelling above the gods." He made the plan of the temple—what the Egyptian would call the center. It's always quadrate. They always make it this way. This is the quadrata; this is basic.

|p8

The plan is universal throughout the world; the four parts. All our temples are boxed to the compass—should be. That one isn't, but they should be. It makes that one an endowment house rather than a temple because that's what temple means. Temple means a template boxed to the compass by which we take all our measurements.

To go on with this, "He proclaimed it and placed his dwelling above the waters." Remember we saw the waters of Nun from which all things emerge, the cosmic waters, the waters that surround us. One of the great discoveries of our time is that we are surrounded by water in space. Halley's Comet comes along, the well-known dirty snowball, and it's nearly all water. And you get clear out to Uranus there and see water-covered planets. "And after he had enchained the enemy [remember, Satan is bound in chains] and overcome, Ea celebrated his victory. He entered his chamber to rest and relax." He called his chamber Apsu (the abyss) because he had built it over the prison of his victim kept down there. "In this sacred place of destinies, the temple of divination, the god was begotten in the bosom of Apsu. Marduk was born, and he is the savior. This is the god who was worshipped at Babylon. Remember, this is a sectarian doctrine. Ea is not the principal god at Babylon, and Anu isn't either. He is the sky god, but it is the hero Marduk. "And he was perfect, endowed with double divine nature. His dimensions are incomprehensible, exquisite. He cannot be described. The sight has difficulty comprehending him. Tiamat conspired against the gods then, and sent forth the dragon serpent to fight them." Man and the dragon. It was the hydra, the red dragon.

These things all have association with the stars. These episodes are transferred to the heavens above; that's why we have them today. The longest and biggest constellation is Ophiucus which is the serpent that winds halfway around the heavens, a very important thing. And that's the hydra. It's not one of the houses of the Zodiac. But they come in here too. The red dragon, the ravening lion, the mad wolf—these are the creatures that tear down and destroy. In the Norse mythology in the end of the **Ragnarok** when all the gods shall come to an end and everything subside, everything collapse and pass away; then the Fenris wolf will take over, the mad wolf and the ravening lion, and the world will revert to the confusion and disorganization with which it began. It's a tragic ending. But this theme is the same one. But they are fighting against each other. This is opposition. "She exalted her son Kingu as the rival of Marduk." So we have the Horus and Seth rivalry here. There is going to be a ritual combat between Kingu and Marduk. The son of Tiamat, her favorite who was to be the champion, was Kingu. You notice there's a lot that's medieval about this. This whole thing was taken over in the chivalric order in the Middle Ages, and you get all this sort of hocus-pocus going on there. "She directed her hosts against the gods of heaven. She enthroned Kingu, gave him the tablets of destiny, and attached them to his breast." Now the twelve tablets of destiny. Remember, the high priest in Israel had to have twelve stones on a breastplate attached to his breast, and they represented the twelve months and the twelve tribes. But they also represent the destinies, each month of the year. This has to do with the Zodiac and all the rest. But in order to rule you must have the tablets of destiny. The Egyptians are the same way with the necessity of having the document. The king must have his mekes. There's a giant photograph of Ramses, and he's holding a

|p9

folded document in his hands. That's the **mekes**, and you can see his name is sealed on it. It's his right to rule—his genealogy as a matter of fact. It gives him his right and his legitimacy. Here you have to have these tablets of destiny or you're not going to have anything.

"In heaven there was consternation and another council. Anshar remained alarmed. He gazed at the ground and groaned [it's a vivid picture here], he shook his head, he ground his teeth. He turned to Ea, shaking his locks." This is Zeus shaking his locks. Same thing as in the *Aeneid* with Poseidon, the god who shakes his locks. They are not called black. They are called purple, they are so black. He shakes his black locks when he is in a rage or distress. "Then they called an assembly of all the gods." **Anunnaki** means the gods in assembly. "They were embarrassed; they kept their lips closed. All sat in abashed silence. No god was willing to move against Tiamat [she was too mighty] for none could survive such an encounter. Who can survive the powers of destruction and despair?" See, when Moses feared, then he knew the bitterness of hell and he was finished if he hadn't been rescued at the last moment. He couldn't stand up to it, and it's the same thing here.

"Then the Lord Anshar, father of the gods, arose in majesty, and having thought deeply, he spoke. 'He who is mighty of power, the avenger of his father, Marduk, the hero, shall overcome the power of opposition.' [So they have chosen their hero to go and win the victory for them.] The Lord rejoices at the word of his father [this is Marduk] He received the assignment gladly and rejoiced at the word of his father. With radiant heart, he spake to his father thus, 'Lord of the gods, destiny of the great gods, if I am to be the avenger, call an assembly and render to me my all powerful calling and proclaim it in the great assembly where all may rejoice together . . .'" (I want the power openly and clearly appointed to me among all the gods. So they would know who it was. Of course, they were willing to let him do the dirty work.) ". . . in the great assembly where all may rejoice together that my word may establish the destiny even as yours; that whatsoever I may create shall also be eternal, that the command of my lips may be firm and unchanging." Notice, "the command of my lips," **shepet**, is exactly as used in the Hebrew and in the Egyptian. Remember the **Enuma Elish**—the utterance of his mouth, the thought of his mind, the logos. It's by the creation of the word. Notice, "That my word may establish the destinies as yours; that the command of my lips may be firm and unchanging." That might just as well be an Egyptian statement; it might be from the Old Testament or anything like that. Remember, you must have the word in order to communicate. God doesn't work in a vacuum. We share a common universe of discourse, but how? As we said before, your sensory organs receive it, but they don't give it out. There's only one way you can tell how you have constructed the universe inside. We know perfectly well that the impulses that come to your senses are nothing but electrical impulses. They have no structure or anything else. You have to build it all up here. As it says in the **Enuma Elish**, then it goes to your heart and receives its form. Then it is repeated on the tongue; and by the word you convey it and share it with others. "There is no end to my works or my words," and this is my glory to share it with the rest of them. It can only be done through the word. So there's nothing particularly mysterious about the logos which is very important if you are going to

|p10

communicate and prove that there's more than one universe. How do I know that I'm not a solipsist, inventing it all myself—that you're my dream? You have dreams. I have dreams of teaching classes and being all confused like I am today, rather terrible dreams. But how do I know this isn't a dream? Because we can communicate; we can share and show your picture matches mine pretty well, etc. But the great evil of the deception by the word is that Satan was a liar from the beginning. He is the one who loves and makes a lie. If I start telling you what my universe is, you have no right to contradict me. If I tell you what I see, what I hear, and what I remember, and I'm lying to you, I've thrown everything away. There's no world between us; there's no universe. I've brought confusion upon the whole plan of raising God's children up—the plan by which he spreads his glory. Remember, "this is my work and my glory." So Satan is the old deceiver and the destroyer, but he's the one who loves and makes a lie. How easy it is to do, but what a great offense that is. A person takes it for granted you mean what you say, but he has no means of knowing whether you do or not because good liars are very clever. It takes such an important part in Shakespeare's plays, the deception that builds. And it leads to tragedy all the time. Somebody lies, and then you are in real trouble. So this is the same word he is talking about here.

As I said, it's surprising that they talk about the logos as a great mystery and nothing to be explained. But we are of the same universe of discourse as God; therefore, the word can exchange between us. He understands our language and we understand his; whereas the Christian world accepts right from the beginning, right from Alexandria, that God is the *Totalitor* el. He is totally other. We can have no communication. He is nothing like us in any sense whatsoever. So it doesn't go there.

Let's get along with our text here. Tablet number three: "At the assembly Marduk is proclaimed as the savior. 'Henceforth be thy command unalterable. Marduk, we have given unto thee the universal dominion over all things and make you lord over the earth and everything on the face of the earth. Take thy place in the assembly. Let thy word be sovereign there. Let thy destiny be the same as that of the gods that whatsoever thy word commands [notice the power of the word here] shall be created and destroyed as thou commandest. Speak and matter shall vanish. Speak again, and the same matter return intact.' Marduk spoke and behold material vanished [dissolved, vaporized, turned to another form]. He spoke again and material took substance. When the gods and his father saw that he had this power to create in his word, they said, 'He is qualified.' [He had proved it by this.] They rejoiced and they venerated him. 'Marduk is our king,' and they gave him the scepter and the throne and the crown."

Tablet number four: "Marduk confronts the powers of the evil charging Tiamat. [Of course, they have the *stichomythia*, the exchange of insults before the fight, which is part of epic literature.] 'Thou wouldst exalt Kingu's power to be equal to that of God Anu on high.' Having overcome Kingu in battle, he chained him and put him in the custody of the god Uggu who took from him the tablets of destiny to which he had no lawful right. Then Marduk progressed through the heavens inspecting their places of various worlds, and there he established a new world, an exact replica of the Apsu, the dwelling of Ea."

|p11

Remember "like unto the other worlds we have hitherto created." Same thing here—following the heavenly pattern. As President Joseph F. Smith said, this earth in its natural state is exactly like the world that came from the hand of God, and it's a duplicate of his own. "The Lord Marduk took its measurements. [They are extremely important here.] He built the famous **Midok**. He built his own palace, the **Eshar**, the temple of **Eridu**, the first temple on earth, representing the earth itself at creation [notice the name of **Eridu**, **eretz**, earth; we have had that before] after its pattern. The palace of **Eshar** which he built was thus the heaven itself. [The temple is a scale model of the universe.] He caused Anu, Enlil, and Ea [the three degrees of glory] to come and occupy the temple for its dedication."

Tablet six: "Marduk resolved upon a wondrous work. [He would make the human race and bring them down.] He opened his mouth and addressed his father Ea and told him . . ." See, it's Christ that made it possible for the human race to come here; otherwise they wouldn't have. We will see that in the next one I read. "I told him of what he had conceived in his heart. [Notice, it was Ptah who conceived in his heart always.] I wished to bring blood and bone forth and put them together, to organize them into a human being. His name shall be "man," **amelu**. Let it be his duty to serve the gods and satisfy them." In order that there be satisfaction, Marduk proposed a plan to the gods. "Let one of their race be put to death that humanity might be; one be made an offering for others. Let one of the assembled gods be delivered up as a guilty one that they might subsist." Well, this is the plan of salvation, of course, the Lord making the supreme sacrifice. It is being suggested at this time to make the plan workable on earth when men should come down. "Kingu opposed the plan. [Well, we know that from our Pearl of Great Price.] It was he who made Tiamat rebel and caused the war. It wasn't because he opposed the plan but because of the war and the violence he introduced that Kingu was defeated and cast down, and the great assembly gave all power of heaven and earth to Anu for carrying out the execution of the plan. Then he established with great care the ways of the earth, assigning to the gods of heaven and earth the laws that should apply here [**Shabako Stone** again]. A city was built like unto another Babylon. They labored on it for a year. A second year was devoted to building the temple which was the replica of the heavenly halls above. After first directing the great tower over the Apsu, they built the three-fold house of Marduk, Enlil, and Ea, the temple all in its three degrees of glory." Remember, Peter said, "Let us build three shrines here—one to thee, one to Elijah, and one to God. "The **Anunnaki**, the assembly of gods themselves, designed these holy shrines at **Esagil**, which is the temple of Babylon. This is to celebrate the founding of the temple of Babylon, **Esagil**, just exactly as the **Shabako Stone** was to celebrate the temple, the white house, at Memphis—the temple of Ptah.

"All came together in the great assembly at the place to dedicate it. There Marduk ordered all the fathers and all his gods to be seated and addressed them thus, 'This is Babylon, the place to which you shall come hereafter. Come together to rejoice at this place at the season of the great festival year after year.' [It sounds like Israel.] Thus the rites were installed, the laws were fixed, and the destinies decreed. There were seven gods that fixed the destinies of the

|p12

the human race. May God rule over them forever as their shepherd. [Remember, the Egyptian Pharaoh out there has the shepherd's crook and the flail that the shepherd uses.] "Let him rule over them as their shepherd when they gather here under his protection. Let them rehearse here throughout the ages to come at this spot what God has done that they may never forget it." When we go to the temple, we rehearse the creation all over again. That's what you are supposed to do, for this is the earthly image of that which was done in heaven. "Let the blackheads [that's the human race, the Babylonians] remember their prayers to the gods, knowing that for us by whatever name we call him we have only one God. He is our God. Truly, we have given him fifty names. It is he who nourishes and sustains us, whose mighty arm protects us against the elements and our enemies. [It sounds like the prophets in the Psalms, doesn't it?] Upon mankind he has created, he has placed the obligation of serving him that they be satisfied. Great planner, full of mercy and loving kindness, may he forgive their sins and deliver them by his grace, for Marduk is God, the creator of all things. Verily, he sustains the land and his people. It is he whom the nations acclaim Lord of Gods of heaven and earth." It sounds like the ending of the "Hallelujah Chorus" here because it is. They end in a grand chorus.

"He is the Lord who by his pure utterance, his incantations [**shiptu shu** is the word; the Hebrew word is **shepet** (lip), **safat saftun** in Arabic], his pure utterance raises the gods from the dead." Back to the resurrection motif. You never get away from that. "He is the pure God who purifies our ways. Let us praise him. [They have taken their places in the assembly to declare his name in the holy place.] Let all together proclaim his name." And then they all join in the hallelujah chorus at the end.

So this is quite a show for the principal religious doctrine of the Mesopotamians. We think of corrupt Babylon, etc. Of course, it became corrupt. They all became corrupt. But this was their basic doctrine. It's built around this after it has been shuffled around and scrambled, these motifs. But you recognize they are all there, and they hold together. This makes a theme which again gave great solidity to the empire and was the center of the political structure and everything else.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 11

Well, let's see what we have been trying to convey here. I just wrote down on the typewriter a few things here. So far we have considered this. Remember, there are many precious things, very valuable things, that have been removed from the scriptures. We say, "Well the Pearl of Great Price has restored them." We talked about a number of doctrines. First, what the original teaching was (which is well documented), how it was received, and how it was wiped out by conventional Judaism, Christianity, and the rejection of the world in general. That's well documented. And also its restoration, including the inclination of some people to return to it today. First we talked about literalism—the idea, are these things real? "No," they claim, "religion is spiritual; we're not dealing with literal things here." That was very important, the literal basis.

Then we go from there to the doctrine of the preexistence, such as in the story of **The Pearl**. Well, they used to believe that. They don't believe it now; it's condemned. But many are moving in that direction. And then the cosmological element. You've got to bring the real universe into it, the cosmology into it. This leads us to the story of creation. Was it creation out of nothing? Is it *ex nihilo*? We said, "What did they always teach about that?" The preexistence is the Council in Heaven. They go together, you see—preexistence and creation. We were talking about the Council in Heaven and we mentioned the **Memphite Theology**, the **Shabako Stone** (the oldest in the world). We also talked briefly about **Enuma Elish**. We could add many to them because they all follow more or less the same pattern. Pattern emerges here, and there are now endless articles on borrowings, influences and origin. Who started what? Why are these all so different? There are all sorts of cults throughout the world, and yet they all have common themes. So who is borrowing from whom? How did it originate, etc.? This is a waste of time. But finally they are beginning to find out that things do fall into patterns.

Recently, there was a long study by a student, who was in this class for three semesters, in the *Journal of History of Religion* of UCLA on this subject. He lifted the whole thing, which is the idea, of course. No, he did an awful lot of work. He's done a great job here. But it's about the mystery symbolism and classic recognition drama. Remember, we talked about the **Clementine Recognitions**. He doesn't mention that here, but the recognition drama, the old mysteries, the old method of teaching this stuff was in a dramatic presentation which centered at all the temples. That's where you start out with the **Shabako Stone**, etc. You think, "Well, there are countless combinations and plots etc." That's the joke. You put them all together, and you just get one. They all tell the same story. It's a rather complex one. And this is very interesting. He ends his thesis with a quotation from Martin P. Nilsson, who was a professor at Berkeley, a Swede who wrote a vast two-volume work on Greek religion. But he wrote it in the 1920s, and we know a lot today that we didn't know about then. So he could write this

|p2

then about Orphism, the Orphic rites and mysteries which emerged in the seventh and eighth centuries B.C. It's the concluding sentiment here. Notice that Nilsson thinks that Orphism first invented all this about the seventh or eighth century. "Orphism is the combination and crown of all the restless and manifold religious movements of the Archaic Period." Not the Archaic Period at all; it's the last period after the great collapse, 1000 B.C., when the climate shifted and all the ancient sacral kingdoms collapsed at once. It was a terrible time everywhere. In the introductory chapter of a book called *An Approach to the Book of Mormon*, we deal with the conditions in the time of Lehi when the old sacral kingship had passed away. The question arose, who is in charge around here? So you have the rise of the tyrants like Polycrates, Dionysius, etc. The tyrant is a very capable man who is ruling and who rules well, but he does not have a right to rule either by family descent or by popular choice. He hasn't been chosen, and he doesn't inherit his office. He just took it. Usually, those men were very capable; they had to be. You had the age of tyrants and revolution and everything else. Well, Orphism rose out of that.

"The development of the cosmogony [you are bringing in the cosmos here] in a speculative direction with the addition of anthropogony [the creation of man] which laid the principal emphasis on the explanation of the mixture of good and evil in human nature [the problem of good and evil; you notice this was all in the **Shabako Stone**—it didn't originate in the seventh or eighth century], the legalism in the ritualism of life, the mysticism of cult and doctrine, the development of the other life into concrete visibility, the transformation of the lower world into a place of punishment and adaptation rather than eternal hell, retribution [the idea of repentance], and the idea that life is not just a repetition of the present over and over again [you are not trapped in the cycle], the belief in the happier lot of the purified and the initiated [you have the rites and the ordinances, and they are supposed to provide you with a sort of happiness and can be found]. For all of these things, parallels, or at least suggestions, can be found in other quarters." These things have been floated around the world forever, and we will soon see why they were. "The greatness of Orphism lies in having combined all this into a system and in the incontestable originality which made the individual in his relationship to guilt and retribution the center of its teaching."

Well, for one thing, we still know very little about Orphism, less than anything else. But the point is these have already been combined into a system. That's what we saw already in the **Enuma Elish** and in the **Memphite Theology**. And "the incontestable originality [does that make it original?] which makes it a problem of individual guilt and retribution." It keeps telling us "to everyone who does evil, so and so." But these decisions are forced on us. They are not original. The ideas have been going around all the time. Of course, they have been going around. That's all people could think of. We have been unable to think of anything else all these years because the problem never ceases to face us all the time. The pressure is on all the time—the hopeless disproportion, the hopeless imbalance between our capacity and our performance. See, I know I could do a lot better than this.

|p3

I know I wouldn't fumble and stumble, mix my words up, and stray off in all directions. I could do better than that. Why don't I? What we are and what we could be are so different. John Eccles tells us that we don't use one ten thousandth of our brain power. We have it, but we never use it. Think of the capacity we have for enjoyment. I lie on my bed and fret when I look up and see all the books on the wall there. There's an Arabic book I would just love to read, but I don't have time. I knock my head off trying to learn to read this stuff, and when I get to it I can't use it because I am doing something else. All this stuff with Egyptian on it. I don't have any time for that stuff. Well, it's pretty sad isn't it that you can't begin to use it. There must be a reason for this. The solution must be found in other times and places because the time is too short here. We can't play a game of baseball in three minutes or in a closet. We don't have time enough in three minutes, and the closet doesn't give us space enough. That's the situation we are in here. We are time bound. We're in a time box. We can't move in any direction without bumping into something, but we don't have time for that. Of course, we don't have space for that either because we can't think of everything at once. In this life we are condemned to concentrate always on one thing at a time. The rest, if you see it at all, makes just sort of a background, side issues, etc. You are aware of it, of course, but you concentrate on only one object and you concentrate, as Eccles also says, on the object you choose to. That makes this life a time of probation. That shows what the desire of your heart is. With the possibility of thinking of a billion things, you prefer to think of one particular thing. You have judged yourself then. This is what I wanted among all these things.

So we are trapped in this time box with a limited horizon. We have tunnel vision only. I can just see this; I can't see all those other places at once, and that's just too bad. So we feel cheated, and quiet desperation is our lot. The luckiest man who ever lived was Oedipus. Think of the two great plays that have survived from Oedipus. The final chorus of the **Oedipus Rex** is (got to go into a trance now) "Oh, all you people of Thebes, glorious, maternal, eternal Thebes. Look, here is your hero, Oedipus, the one man who knew the celebrated riddle of the Sphinx, which had gone throughout all the world." Incidentally, they have more archaic stuff in the museum at Thebes than anywhere else. You go to Thebes and what do you find? There are sphinxes on half the vases. The sphinx did come from Thebes. When you go to Thebes in Egypt, which has exactly the same name, what do you find? Sphinxes. Interesting connection. We won't go into it now, but it is very archaic.

"There wasn't a single man anywhere, fellow citizens or anyone else, who didn't look at his fabulous luck with envy, **zelo**. [Our words "zeal, envy, jealousy" come from that.] And to this tragedy he has come." You couldn't imagine a man in a worse condition. He is going around begging; he has blinded himself. He can't go back. He is under a curse. Nobody can take him in under their roof. Here was the greatest man in the world, and look at him now. "Any mortal looking at this condition . . ." That is the **ahariff** of the Old Testament. Never judge a thing until the **ahariff**, the final solution, the last day. Then comes the moral: "Don't judge any man fortunate until he has finally gone around . . ." This is always translated wrongly as "reached the terminal of his life."

|p4

The word is **terma**, but the **terma** is the turning place in the race where you are supposed to be wrecked. If you get around that safely, you are all right. In the Roman races there were the three **meta**. At Olympia that was the tomb of Pylox, and the angry ghost always demands a sacrifice. So they would have the horse races, and the chariot was supposed to smash up at the **terrictipus** where the horses were terrified by the ghost. Then the human sacrifice had been provided. One of the chariots was supposed to smash up there. So until he has gone around the **terma**. The **terma** is the same as the **trophe**. That's the place where you turn back, and you bring a trophy back from where you have been. The last place you reach is the place where you turned, and you bring the trophy back to show that you have been there. ". . . without having suffered any such horrible sickness and everything bad."

Well, that's the moral. Don't call any man blessed because this can happen to the luckiest person who ever lived. But then comes the second play, the great play. (Well, really, one play is missing.) The final play is *Oedipus at Colonus*, which is the greatest play of Sophocles. There is still a possibility; there is still hope. Surprise, surprise. And it goes back into the ancient ordinances, etc. It takes us through the initiation, the temple, and all that sort of thing. That play has a moral too: "Put an end to all mourning now. Forget all that. This has all been a misunderstanding. All things are in the hands of God. Everything has been provided for. There is a plan. Your business is to find out what it is. But instead of mourning about it, try to find out because there must be a meaning to this," as he says.

Well, why not examine the implications of this strange situation. We're on the stage and we need the scenario. Oedipus returned to Colonus, the place of his birth. He went to the sacred place and they wouldn't let him in because he is cursed. But then Theseus comes from Athens and gives him the ordinances. His daughters perform the washings and anointings. Theseus says, "I can't tell you what happens after this. You come up to the veil, but be happy about this. There is hope." So that's Oedipus, the one who limps. We limp through life.

Well, there are three major plots, or rather eight major plots or possibilities, that confront us—past, present and future. Three lives to consider; is there a past, present and future? This gives us eight possibilities of the **I Ching**. If you read Fritjof Capra's book on the subject, you know something about that. This is what the plots are, then. This is the past (preexistence), this is the present (this life), and then we have the future life. We will say they are either dark or light. I'll use **D** for dark and **L** for light. The past (preexistence) is dark; we know nothing about it. It's mysterious and it's lost. Plot number one is the commonest plot actually. There are eight possibilities, and there are philosophies based on each one (important world philosophies and religions). There's a little fun in this life, so it's light. But what comes after is darkness. The story of the conversion of King Oswy, the first English king to accept Christian missionaries, is the story of that. They are having the banquet in the hall. It's light and bright, and they are celebrating. Either end of the great hall is open to let the smoke out.

|p5

A swallow comes in and is completely dazzled and frightened by the light. It flies around awhile, makes itself at home, and then flies out again. King Oswy sees it and he says, "Well, that is our life. We come out of this great darkness. We see a little moment of light, and then we fly out again." He says to the Christian missionaries, "If you can give me anything better than that, I'll listen to you." So he does because that is what Christianity promises, something better hereafter, but nothing before. So this is the standard scenario. It's really an evasion. We accept this life because we have to. We can't deny it. But for the rest, we just deny them. That's what most people do.

Then there's the most famous student song in the world, "Gaudeamus Igitur." This is the philosophy. It was forbidden by the church, and everybody sang it. "Well, let's enjoy ourselves while we can, while we are still young. After joyful youth, after miserable old age, the earth is going to have us. That's all there will be to it." This is an extension really of the Fifth Ode of Catullus, the most romantic and lyrical of all the Roman poets. The famous Lesbia, his lady friend. "Let's live, Lesbia, and love. All the rumors, all the traditions, all the possibilities—let's just forget them. Let's esteem them as worth one penny, perhaps a penny; but forget all that. Why? Because the sun goes down and the sun comes up; but once our brief light has gone out, what happens after that? There's nothing but one long perpetual night of sleep." Then he goes on. "And what's the solution? Give me a thousand kisses; then give me a hundred more." We'll just go wild in love; we'll just make sex and forget about everything else. That's the idea. Well, that's an escape from it because there's nothing else. Remember, as Alma [the book] says in the time of Korihor, "When a man dies, that's the end thereof;" therefore, the people raised their heads and decided they could do anything they wanted to do. But these are very important schools of philosophy. These were the teachings of Epicurus and the Epicureans. The man who started atomic physics (and it was a good sound theory he had) was Democritus. They called him the "laughing philosopher" because it's just atoms that make things and nothing else, so there's nothing to worry about. So you just laugh it off and enjoy yourself. Well, as Pascal said, it was a hollow laugh. It was the hollow laugh of the libertine. If you are an Epicurean you just enjoy what you can get here and don't worry about anything else. That is the famous "Nil Admirare Ode" of Horace. "Don't get involved in anything; just relax. You come to me and you will find me just a comfortable pig from the sty of Epicurus. Don't let these things worry you. Don't let anything worry you." **Nil Admirare** is a slogan. We have our light time here. Shakespeare uses a lot of this:

Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits and
Are melted into air, into thin air;
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve;
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,

Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

So he says it was pleasant while the show lasted, but it was only a show. It came out of nothing
It was just imagination, and it will fade into nothing. So enjoy it while you can, and that's all
there is. See, at base it's quite sad, isn't it? All the poems of A. E. Housman are on that
subject:

With rue my heart is laden
For golden friends I had,
For many a rose-lipped maiden
And many a lightfoot lad.
By brooks too broad for leaping
The lightfoot boys are laid.
The rose-lipped maids are sleeping
In fields where roses fade.

As I say, it's sad. So with Omar you say, "Take the cash, and let the credit go."

"How sweet is mortal Sovranty!" think some:
Others—"How blest the Paradise to come!"
Ah, take the Cash in hand and waive the Rest;
Oh, the brave Music of a distant Drum!

The bad time is coming; the drum's ahead. You are doomed; forget it. Don't pay any attention
to it. If you want to survive, you'd better, but anyway you don't. Some long for the pleasures
of this life, and some for the paradise to come. But you take what you can get now and let the
credit go. And what you do is get lost in wine.

Come, fill the Cup, and in the Fire of Spring
The Winter Garment of Repentance fling: [forget about repentance]
The Bird of Time has but a little way
To fly—and Lo! the Bird is on the Wing.

And then there's that gloomy one: "The Stars are setting, and the Caravan
Starts for the dawn of Nothing—Oh, make haste!"

This is the dark-light-dark philosophy, and it's a common one. It's the seven ages. It's the
quiet desperation. You seem to be all right and getting along. Remember "Richard Cory" in
the *Spoon River Anthology*. One fine summer's night he went home and put a bullet through
his head. Just like Oedipus, everybody thought he was the most successful man in town.
Everybody envied him, but Richard Cory, with no explanation, went home and put a bullet

through his head. As we are told in *Walden*, we all live lives of quiet desperation. We can get away with it by distractions. We can distract ourselves from it, and this is the furious concern today with sports, competition, success, drugs. It's all escape; it's all distraction because we are unwilling to face this horrible thing. It's too much to look at—to look at nothing. Remember Claudio saying, "The most loathed earthly life that age, ache, penury and imprisonment can lay on nature is a paradise to what we fear of death." So we try to anticipate it with crusades and competitions and wars. We try to anticipate a terrible end to use Hitler's expression, "an intolerable existence with a terrible end." We go on in this condition until we have an answer. We're not satisfied. We've got to win or lose; let's get it over with. We get a lot of that today, you know. And Tao and Zen—those religions anticipate annihilation by saying, "Don't expect anything; don't take anything seriously, and then you won't be disappointed." Our scenario for today is, of course, the car and the gun that sum everything up, and the explosion. (The mandatory explosion, I would say.) And the Book of Mormon is the tract for our times. It deals with that thing exactly.

Coming up the hill, I was thinking you might paraphrase the prologue to *Romeo and Juliet*. "Two families, both alike in dignity, In fair Verona, where we lay our scene." You could paraphrase it to two nations, both alike. This is the theme of the Book of Mormon and the present world to which the Book of Mormon is addressed. Two nations both alike in dignity, on this fair planet where we lay our scene "from ancient grudge break to new mutiny, where civil blood makes civil hands unclean. From forth the fatal loins of these two foes, a pair of star-cross'd lovers take their life; [the new generation, you see] whose misadventur'd piteous overthrows do with their death bury their parents' strife." They have to pay for the parents' grudges, the wars and armaments, and all that sort of thing. "The fearful passage of their death-mark'd love, and the continuance of their parents' rage, which but their children's end naught could remove." They would only settle their scores after everybody had been killed. That's what happened in *Romeo and Juliet*. The younger generation was wiped out, and the elders are still left to build monuments to them and utter platitudes in the last scene there.

Now, we have another philosophy which is dark (that's the cheerful one). Is it dark all the way? Well, of course it is. We all know Macbeth's famous speech: "Out, out, brief candle! Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player that struts and frets his hour upon the stage, and then is heard no more; it is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." He came out of hell; he's in hell, and he's going back to hell. That's Macbeth as far as he can see it. But Hamlet too. "How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable seem to me all the uses of this world! Fie on't! O fie! 'tis an unweeded garden that grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature possess it merely." So he asked himself, well, why shouldn't I bump myself off? Look what you have to put up with in this world: "The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, the pangs of disprized love, the law's delay, the insolence of office, and the spurns that patient merit of the unworthy takes." Everything we have to put up with here is a lot of nonsense. It's horrible, and there's no escape from it. Unless, he says, we could make an end to it. Who would "grunt and sweat under a weary life" when he might his own quietus make? With the dagger, just end it all right there. But he says, "No, what comes after may be even

{p8

worse. There is the respect that makes calamity of so long life." We are willing to hang on because it might be even worse. Who can tell after this? The famous line, "The undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveler returns . . . To die, to sleep; to sleep: perchance to dream; ay, there's the rub; for in that sleep of death what dreams may come, when we have shuffled off this mortal coil, must give us pause." They could be pretty terrible, and so we put up with it. But it's all the dread of something after death that makes us pause. It may be even worse after. So that's not very consoling. But it is all bad, bad, bad as far as he's concerned.

Well, is this part of a religion? Yes, it's Stoicism. These are the Stoics, and they are proud of it. It's a religion of defiance, "Invictus."

Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the Pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.

In the fell clutch of circumstance,
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Under the bludgeonings of chance
My head is bloody, but unbowed.

That is the famous "Invictus." If you want to enjoy that sort of thing, you are welcome. It's the heroic or epic position. Remember in the religion of the sagas, the *Ragnarok* and the *Götterdämmerung*; they are winding down to sure destruction. The gods themselves can only look forward to the monsters of disarray and the second law of thermodynamics—running down and being destroyed, the Fenris Wolf. This is what you get in Homer. "What happened to all these heroes? They were caught like rats in a trap. There was no way of escaping." They had been there ten years. As the great epic begins, what's happening? There is dysentery in the camp, and everybody is dying off. What a romantic war! There are funeral flames burning all over the camp all day long. The stink is terrible, etc. He says, "These heroes became a feast for the birds and bait for the dogs." So this is your heroic position, isn't it? The consolation that Achilles gives, the only consolation to a hero whom he is about to wipe out is: "But friend, I'm afraid you've got to be killed too. [That is a very real philosophy for the military.] But don't worry about it. What are you complaining about? Patroclus died, and he was a much better man than you, so what are you complaining about?" This was the comfort you would take in this sort of thing. So it's your heroic religion. And we all know about "Dover Beach." It's a great favorite with English departments, as you know.

Ah, love, let us be true
To one another! for the world, which seems
To lie before us like a land of dreams,
So various, so beautiful, so new,
Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,

Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain;
 And we are here as on a darkling plain
 Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
 Where ignorant armies clash by night.

That's the world we live in, he says. They thought it was such a wonderful world, "the world which seems to lie before us like a land of dreams." Well, that's what the gospel offers us. This is the world that came from the hand of God. It's a great place. If it has no certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain, who's to blame for that? So that's not a very cheerful doctrine is it? But it was held by a large part of the human race who didn't want to give in to this. The Stoics felt it was unworthy of their pride to just play around, get drunk and enjoy yourself as much as you could.

Then we have the light-dark-light here. This is the most important of all religiously because this is the one that's behind all the cults, all the dramas. This is behind Pythagoras. This is the Hermetic doctrine. That means the doctrine that came down from Thoth, Hermes and the Egyptians in the beginning of the world. This has been handed down unbroken, and it is the Hermetic tradition, from Hermes. It is shared by Pythagoras (most important of all) and Plato. The Gnostics or Neo-Platonists wouldn't take it literally. They said, "Well, it's all just spiritual anyway." Then the apocalyptic, the mystic. **The Pearl** belongs to this. He comes out of the light. He's in this dark and corrupt world. Then he goes back to the light again. That's what you have in the Book of Moses. He's with the Father in the beginning. Then he comes down to be tempted. Then he goes back again. In the Book of Abraham he gives us an account of the Council in Heaven. "Abraham, thou wert one of them." Many great and noble ones and he was one of them. Then he comes down here and suffers the ten trials of Abraham. He lives his life in tribulation and doesn't even have a grave where he can be buried. He has to rent it from the Hittites. As the Lord told his Apostles, "In this world ye shall have tribulation. But be of good cheer; I have overcome the world (John 16:33)." If these others are reliable, then don't worry about this one too much. There's a hymn in the Thanksgiving Hymns of the Dead Sea Scrolls that says if you knew what you were before or could see what you are to be hereafter, then you wouldn't worry about anything. Nothing could discourage you at all. In the Battle Scroll **Milhama**, it tells us, "When Israel is defeated in battle, don't be discouraged. Just remember what was before and what comes after. This won't last forever." So this is the one that carries on as we find in **The Pearl** and in the New Testament. We shall find tribulation. But why the tribulation here?

Well, let's have another one then. Now we get standard Christianity and Judaism. Dark—they don't believe in a preexistence. And dark, and light. You have eight possible combinations you will see here. These are the first four; these are the most important. Well, this is standard Christianity and Judaism. Dark-dark-light. The defective scenario, it is; it lacks in protology. That makes it a very unbalanced sort of scenario. The problem of evil becomes a mystery if you are suddenly out of nothing and you come into something. St. Augustine is your best guide here. That's what made him the kingpin of Christian theology of all sects. He gives us such

|p10

things as, "We come into the world predestined." This became the thing with the Calvinists. When you come here, God has already decided whether you will be damned or blessed. You are predestined either for salvation or damnation. There is nothing you can do about it. God has taken care of that. That's because they left this particular scene out. I say it's defective. The problem of evil is insoluble. They never could solve it. That's why so many of them turned Gnostics. The Manichaeans belong in here. Augustine for the nine best years of his life was a Manichaean because they accepted this. He wouldn't accept this later on because the people at the school in Rome before he joined the church laughed at such things. A preexistence or postexistence was not philosophically or scientifically sound, so he wouldn't accept it. Augustine said this world is nothing but a festering mass of corruption; that's all it is. The Gnostics believed that very firmly. Well, what could you do about that? There's nothing you could do about that unless God has done it already for you, no plan or anything like that. He said, "You have made some of us to turn to you, and our hearts are restless until we return to you." That's a good doctrine too, as far as that goes. This takes up the Middle Ages. Dante is the same thing where Beatrice says that she can't be damned because she wasn't made that way. "Your suffering can't touch me; the flames of this hell can't touch me at all because God made me that way." That's all there is to it. You start right out of nothing. It's *ex nihilo*. It's a dark world for a lot of people, but you can't really call it testing because the test is already decided. It's St. Augustine's own word; it's predestined. What is the purpose of coming here? There are four questions that St. Augustine asks, and his biographers say he never succeeded in answering them. The problem of evil and the problem of damnation of infants, for example. He said, "Why should infants be damned just because they haven't heard the gospel and die before they have a chance to be baptized?" That doesn't seem fair to him at all, but he has a solution for it, a rhetorical solution. Remember, he is a great rhetorician. He says it is a light damnation. It reminds me of Bottom in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. "I will roar as gently as any sucking dove." He'll be a roaring lion, but he won't frighten the ladies. He'll roar gently and softly. So St. Augustine actually says, "Yes, there will be a damnation, a real damnation, an eternal damnation, a hell damnation; but it will be a light and easy damnation." You figure that one out. As you see, they got themselves into these logical binds.

Now, what other things remain here? We have dark-light-light. That's what King Oswy wanted. Once the bird flies into the bright place, he doesn't fly out into the darkness. He flies out into the light. That's why he was willing to accept it. This is what the monastic movement intended to do. We have the writings of St. Antony who founded the movement; Antony and Pachomius who started the movement in the fourth century. The corruption of the world was so great. He lived in Alexandria, and the Christian world was so utterly vile. The only way to escape was to go to the desert and live by yourself, and then you could form communities. But it was to live the life of angels. So that's making this world a happy place. It's true you come out of the darkness, but by rejecting this world entirely, by contempt for this world (it's a Stoic sort of thing), you won't suffer from it. You get and live by yourself and spend all your time contemplating God. So you live in the light here looking forward to the light hereafter. This life of angels is a hard one, and they had a hard time making it work.

|p11

There are quite a few catches in it. We have more literature on that than anything else. At least half the Coptic literature is the trouble these people had living in the desert. The most interesting chapter in Gibbon is written about the monastic movement—how they started out. See, the world went so bad after it became completely Christian in the fourth century that they said, "This isn't the way the apostles lived. This isn't the way the old church lived. The only way I can do is to go out and live by myself." People do that around here all the time. There are all sorts of splinter groups that think they can go out and live united. But it doesn't work very well; it's sad. We have some marvelous accounts of this; the psychological troubles these people had. They immediately started having hallucinations, but they weren't happy hallucinations. One of the pictures you see, from the Flemish artists or anyone else, is St. Antony being tempted by the devils. He is surrounded by all sorts of fiends and evil spirits. He's out in the desert alone, and all he does is get temptation. These awful thoughts come to him all the time. He doesn't escape a thing. So you see the picture of St. Antony in his torments. That's no fun.

Then there is light-dark-dark. Do we have that? No we don't, but we might as well put that on here. That's an absurdity, of course. If you believe that you lived in a glorious life before you came here but this is a bad one and the next a bad one, that doesn't make sense at all. You know "Intimations of Immortality," the famous poem of Wordsworth, don't you?

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar:
Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home:
Heaven lies about us in our infancy!
Shades of the prison-house begin to close
Upon the growing Boy,
But he beholds the light, and whence it flows,
He sees it in his joy;
The Youth, who daily farther from the east
Must travel, still is Nature's priest,
And by the vision splendid
Is on his way attended;
At length the Man perceives it die away,
And fade into the light of common day.

Notice you have the four ages of man here. First the child with heaven lying about him. Then with the boy the light begins to fade already. The prison walls begin to close, but still he sees the light. Then the youth is going ever farther and farther away from the East, but he still has

|p12

some light to go with him. "At length the Man perceives it die away and fade into the light of common day." And where do we go after that? That's the interesting thing. We don't go anywhere; that's the point. Wordsworth isn't really talking about the preexistence. The English Department has always been very insistent about that. That's true. He doesn't take it literally. He was a Romantic poet, and the Romantic poets were trying to escape from the evil world. They didn't like the Industrial Revolution. As Wordsworth himself said:

The world is too much with us; late and soon,
Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers:
Little we see in Nature that is ours;
We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon!
This Sea that bares her bosom to the moon;
The winds that will be howling at all hours,
And are up-gathered now like sleeping flowers;
For this, for everything, we are out of tune;
It moves us not.—Great God! I'd rather be
A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn;

Now, what is his alternative to this? "I'd rather be a pagan suckled in a creed outworn." That's the Romantic movement; go back to paganism. Well no, the Romantic period of a Greece that never really existed. It's like our own Currier and Ives, Rockwell American society that never was. I should remember; I was there. But they go back to that. Schiller in the *Die Götter Griechenlands*, "Come back again, thou beautiful land—a glorious, gentle lovely age of nature." The Greeks lived in nature, and the Romantic poets try to do that. But Romanticism is escape. They don't accept it on a religious basis at all, and neither does Wordsworth here. So how far does he agree with these four ages of man?

What does the seven ages of man belong to? I think that belongs to this. Shakespeare makes mock of all seven, doesn't he? And he follows Solon who was probably a friend of Lehi. He had to leave Athens in 600 B.C. after giving them the first democratic constitution. He wrote a poem on the seven ages of man, and it's all downhill. The last scene of this eventful history is "second childishness and near oblivion, sans eyes, sans teeth, sans taste, sans everything." That's the end of the story. Well, it's not very happy.

You notice these are the great religious ones. Another one here is light-light-dark. But again, if you believed in the preexistence and this was a happy life, that's an absurdity. I don't think there's any religion that preaches that. Well, I don't know. Some of the Indians might preach that you came from a happy home. They enjoyed their life with the tribe, but now they have been utterly wiped out. Their chances have gone, but that was forced on them by circumstances here. But you wouldn't build a religion around that. That was the sun dance religion. They were trying to restore it, trying to turn the tide around 1906 when the Sioux Indians revived the sun dance. It electrified all the tribes everywhere.

|p13

Then we find the most optimistic of all which is light-light-light. We get that in the Book of Moses. It's the gospel, of course. You get it in Fourth Nephi, where they live after the manner of happiness. Nephi says, "We did live after the manner of happiness." Well, that's happy all the time, and you're supposed to be that. In our Pearl of Great Price is the best expression of it, in the Book of Moses 5:9-12. Is it possible to have them all? Yes, they say so, in spite of their sorrows. He thought it was bad, and it turned out that it wasn't. "As thou hast fallen thou mayest be redeemed, and all mankind, even as many as will. 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. And Eve, his wife, heard all these things and was glad, saying: Were it not for our transgression we never should have had seed and never should have known good and evil, and the joy of our redemption, and the eternal life which God giveth unto all the obedient. And Adam and Eve blessed the name of God, and they made all things known unto their sons and their daughters." It turned out that they were to learn while they were still here that they were perfectly free to enjoy themselves. They had been happy before they came here; they enjoyed themselves, and they have nothing but happiness to look forward to—as many as will, if you are willing to be obedient. So we have the Gospel which is all light, the other extreme from this.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 12

Let's pass these around. This is a talk Professor Baer is giving tomorrow night on who really robbed the Valley of the Kings. He has a very good sense of humor. You'll love Professor Baer.

Next time we reach the halfway point, and then we shift over to the text. But this introduction, on which we have hardly scratched the surface, is indispensable. I think you will find it so. The subject for today, for example. From now on almost everything I mention you will be able to find on reserve. You can get a lot of the stuff down at F.A.R.M.S. on the corner of University and Eighth North, on the top floor of the old Amanda Knight Hall. They have all this stuff copied for two and one-half cents a page.

Remember, we have been talking about literalism, cosmism, preexistence, and the Council in Heaven. All require the existence of other worlds. Of all the propositions that ever came forth in discussion of gods, the cosmos, etc, this has been the most obvious one, and the most inviting. It has also been the most hotly denounced and the most hotly resisted, especially in the seventeenth century. It was the big fight of the seventeenth century. Is there a plurality of worlds? If we go down the list here, we'll find the arguments for and against and the people for and against it. They are all very famous. They are all central to our whole civilization here. Nothing is more clearly set forth in the Pearl of Great Price than this teaching. I have all the passages listed here from Moses and Abraham. Let's read them after we've seen what the opinions were on these things. I'm going to keep score here. Who is for and against this plurality of worlds? (I've got to learn how to write better; I used to write carefully and very well.) In the ancient world from the earliest times in the old records, like the Egyptians, the absolute rule of the one is the idea. You have the one king, the one god on his throne. There cannot be two swords in a scabbard. There cannot be two suns in a sky. There could only be one ruler, an ideal king who sits on the throne. So there can only be one world, one heaven or anything else. But what gives him his glory is the hosts that surround him. He's in the midst of great variety and great numbers of the acclaiming hosts. What about the other worlds going around? The two go together. As soon as you require the god on the throne to have glory, he has to have something to rule over. This was a very definite concern. How can God have glory if there is nobody to acclaim him? Many thought that's why he created the world so that he would have somebody to cheer him and make him feel that he had done something wonderful. A foremost French theologian, Etienne Gilson, who recently died, wrote a book the title of which is **God**, and he said, "God is the self-thinking thinker who thinks only thought." He thinks only of himself because nothing else is worthy of his thought except himself, of course. He can't lower himself. Well, that's his ultimate definition for God. But he has to have more glory than that, so already you have the two sides here, the two ideals.

Even in the **Pyramid Texts**, the one becomes three.

Xenophanes, a philosopher of the sixth century B.C. and one of the Milesian School, said, "It is quite reasonable to suppose that there are boundless suns and moons and all of the same substance as this earth." So they were preaching that in the sixth century B.C. He was part of the school of the physical world teaching philosophy on the basis of physics which began in his generation in Miletus. And along with this goes the feeling of **pothos**. **Pothos** is an interesting word. Thucydides uses the term effectively. **Pothos** is the yearning for the beyond, the feeling that there is more there and the desire to get out there. It's funny, when the Russians gave up the idea of heaven, they became obsessed with this idea of **pothos**—of going out into outer space, the hope for realities beyond. It's natural and inevitably looks to dreams of other worlds. There are various articles and books on these subjects.

There are two well-defined approaches and traditions to the plurality of worlds. First of all we should mention that Xenophanes is for it (fifth-sixth century). Aristotle (Aristotelian doctrine) is against it (fourth century B.C.) What was his argument for that? Well, Professor Jaeger in his celebrated work on Aristotle says, "It is very important for Aristotle to prove that only one world is possible. [Of course, the Christian world is going to follow him.] Just as the mind may be focused on only one thing at a time, only one object is most worthy of our total contemplation, and that is God." You can't be distracted by anything else. There can only be one, and this applies to everything. Quoting a recent study by Munitz, "Aristotle's one-world theory with its foundation in the gross facts of familiar experience [After all, you can see there is only one world, and you can see the earth is the center of everything. Everything is drawn to the earth; everything falls to the earth; things that are heavy go down. So there can be no other. This is the center; man is the center. By your senses you can see the stars and planets revolving around the earth, around the place you stand on. This is the gross, obvious, observational evidence of the senses.] made reference to worlds beyond our own both unwarranted and unnecessary." We have enough here. We don't need any other worlds. They are not necessary, and it is unwarranted. This is obviously the center. You don't need to go any further and argue about it.

"Against this you have the intuitive genius of Democritus," says Munitz. Remember Democritus—the laughing philosopher, the inventor of atoms, etc. He is fifth century. Democritus is for it, and Aristotle is against it. We'll have to leave a place in the middle because with Plato you can go either way. "Against the intuitive genius of Democritus, there was no observational evidence whatever that there might be more than one world. [You can't observe it that way.] The observational range of astronomy at that time had no need for other worlds," he says. "Earlier, Plato's reason for looking upon the cosmos as unique, as only one cosmos, is essentially theological. There's only one perfection. That's it, and you can't have others." So Plato on one side was opposed to it [Aristotle's teacher was Plato], but on the other hand, his doctrine leads to the insistence on having more than one world. It was his idea of perfection that led to later Christian and Jewish involvement in pleniarism through possible

|p3

infinity of worlds. If God made the best, he did the best of possible jobs. Why would he stop at one? There should be more. We demand more of a good thing. You can't get too much of a good thing, so why limit it to just one. It's to Plato they appealed both against and for it. Professor Shorey made Plato a high church conservative, and Professor Gifford made him a low church liberal. That was at Chicago. Professor Shorey wrote a book on what Plato meant, the absolute opposite of what Gifford and the others said about him.

So these are the two well defined traditions, the issue stated in the now familiar **Clementine Recognitions**. We are always running into that. Peter is arguing with Simon Magus who claims to be very scientific. Peter is on the side of reality, and Simon Magus is against it. This is early second century writing. Simon says that the heaven can only be seen in the mind and, therefore, cannot be corporeal. You can't have other worlds. Heaven is only something you see in the mind. Peter in reply says that he too sees only in his mind when he thinks of an island which he has never yet visited. But he says the island is real. It is there just the same. "I had a definite idea what Caesarea would be like before I ever came here," he says. "Though the real Caesarea when I got here was quite different. But it was real." Then Simon challenges him, "What do you think is beyond the heavens?" Peter replies, "I believe in a great source of light that is real and not a mere fantasy, nor the product of sophistic assertions, but it is testified by law and by nature." So Peter is being the scientific, down-to-earth, common sense one. He says, "Of course, there are other worlds, and they are going to be real—things beyond the sun." Simon Magus says, "No, this must all be spiritual." And Simon's viewpoint was the winner as far as the church was concerned after.

The Jewish theory is the same way. We have the **Zohar**. What does that say? "God creates worlds and destroys worlds, and you too will be able to create worlds and to destroy worlds." This was a doctrine common to both the Jews and the Mandaeans. We find it in Bin Gorion. So the **Zohar** is definitely for it. Not only that God creates and destroys worlds (as in the Pearl of Great Price), but you too can become a creator of worlds if you follow a certain line. This is an interesting theory. "Other worlds have disappeared," says the **Zohar**, "because God did not dwell in their midst regularly and constantly or [as the text reads] because God had not come down to them." They must be visited by God, so they just withered and perished in time. There were unworthy worlds that passed away. That's an interesting thing because they do talk about unworthy races and pre-human races that weren't able to make the grade. Of course, we know that civilizations do pass away. Well, why shouldn't it happen with worlds too, if God hadn't visited them or if they rejected him? So the Jews worked on that.

There's a very famous work by the brethren **Ahwan** of Basra, edited by Dieterici. I have one of the few copies in existence of the text of this, and it's great. Back in the ninth century at Basra, where all the oil bombing is going on now, there was a society of the holy brethren. They were scientifically advanced. They knew all about microbes and molecules and everything else. They had a marvelous encyclopedia, and in it they say, "The business of the angels is to

|p4

coordinate the operations between the worlds, to keep them all functioning according to the same plan. There are many worlds. They are all coordinated, and they all work together in one big scheme." This is a very bold concept which, of course, we find in the Pearl of Great Price. So we will put the brethren of Basra here. It was a great school, a very important center at an early time. First Christian, then Moslem.

This was the doctrine of the Nazarenes, we read in the Migne collection here. "As the one-world school clusters around Aristotle, so the plurality of worlds developed with impressive logic and imagination by the Christian writers who pretend to teach the old Christian gospel of the Gnostics." The Gnostics picked it up because it was very popular, of course. So we will put the Gnostics over here. They knew they couldn't give it up. It was a teaching of the old church, yet they weren't inclined to it because they didn't believe in anything physical hereafter; no physical resurrection, no physical creation. God was not worthy of that. So some of the sects keep it, and there are many of them, because the Christian tradition demanded it. This is part of the teaching that went back to the early church as attested by a strict contradiction to their favorite doctrines.

Justin Martyr, the first Christian martyr, insists on it, and he's very important. Remember, he was the first philosopher to become a Christian. He was martyred for that. He never laid off his philosopher's robe, and he wrote apologies telling his philosophy friends in the school why he joined the church, justifying himself. But he insists that the Christians are not interested in mere abstractions. "They demand reality," he says. He promises the perspective of the Christian as Dame Virtue promised Heracles at the crossroads. He says here, "If you follow me, I can promise you unlimited worlds. The worlds go on without end." So we will put Justin Martyr down here. He's a very important one, very early too. As I say, the first Christian martyr, after Stephen. Remember, the first philosopher to join the church. Later, it was only the heretics that still clung to that old belief. Philastrius is one who collects a lot of arguments for and against it. We have him in the twelfth volume of the **Patrologia**. He's in the fourth century. As we have seen before, the philosophers of the fourth century rejected it. They didn't like any of this physical stuff at all. He says, "There are heretics who still cling to the old belief [you notice it is the old belief] that worlds are infinite and innumerable according to the silly opinions of some philosophers" to which he opposes Genesis 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This was usually the answer. He says, "That says the world is one and from one source, and you can't get around it. There can only be one." And this is followed closely by Methodius. Referring back to the cosmology of the Egyptians and Chaldeans, he argues that if the sun and the moon and other stars are divine and greater than men, then it is necessary that they also contain greater life. There must be worlds greater than our world. He says, "They would have greater peace, greater justice, greater virtue. Is that reasonable?" Well, why not. It follows all right, but they found it offensive. But he sort of remains on the fence, and a lot of them do. This is interesting in the early period. There's a good footnote in the **Patrologia** on that. Those who have the glory of God at heart

|p5

generally like this. It put Him at the head of the greatest possible show. They wanted God to have the biggest possible universe.

And our old friend Origen; where is he? He's stuck right in the middle and can't make up his mind. Remember, he knew what the old church taught and he was the best of theologians, but he also grew up on the campus of the University of Alexandria. He had to accept both. He tells us some interesting things here in his famous work on the first principles of the gospel. "Yet there may be other worlds, but what their nature and number may be I confess I do not know. If anyone could show me, I would gladly learn." That was the position of the church at the beginning of the third century. He was born in 185. "I don't know," he says. "There may be and I wish there was, but can you tell me about it?" Notice, there's no authority; the tradition is lost. The apostasy has taken place. They don't have anything. And, of course, St. Jerome. He said that Origen believed that the number of worlds was infinite, but he avoided being a follower of Epicurus by having them exist not all at once but in succession, one after another. So there would be lots of worlds, but just one at a time. Well, that explains a lot. Remember, the Pearl of Great Price says, "As one world passes away another comes into existence." But Origen is still carrying water on both shoulders here. Epicurus is one of the classic exponents of it. We mentioned him saying you should enjoy yourself, but the idea that there should be other worlds goes along with atomism and Democritus. Putting it on a physical basis, there is no reason why it shouldn't be repeated. Philastrius notes that in his day there was a wide disagreement in the church on the subject. Half the teachers took one side and half took the other.

Michael Scotus, the famous philosopher of the Middle Ages, got around this by supposing that God could create a plurality of worlds but that the nature of the world he did create made the existence of other worlds impossible. He said, "God could have done it. You can't deny him that."

"While some Christian tastes chided Aristotle for limiting God's control to a sphere of light within the circle of the moon [that makes it a very small show] preferring the broader scope of the schools in Babylonia, India and Egypt who taught that there were other worlds and whose teachings would be hard to refute . . ." That's a very interesting writing by a Palestinian writer in the *Oriental Patrologia*, also from the fourth century. The Aristotelian concept taken over by the doctors of the Christians and the Jews in the Middle Ages is akin to the doctrine of universal monarchy. All outside the monarchy are in the outer darkness and have no place at all. There can only be one kingdom. They went to work on that. The argument of perfection though works either way. "The Arab, the Jewish, and the Christian philosophers of the Middle Ages taught that the harmony of all nature requires that there be only one perfect universe." This was taken as the proof of only one God. So the strong arguments are against it. All of medieval philosophy now (Jewish, Christian and Arabic; the Arabs were leading at that time) says you have to have a perfect universe. The Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth has Peter saying to the Lord, "'Nothing was created before heaven and earth,' and in spite of Matthew 25:34 nothing existed before heaven and earth except the three names of the Father,

|p6

Son and Holy Ghost. The Christian Hermius of the fourth century contrasts the Christian belief in one cosmos with Epicurus' idea of many and infinite worlds which he says would require many heavens, many ethers etc. and that would be absurd."

Augustine, of course, is our big one. Like Origen, he is on the fence. He's the most important, but he decides against it in the end. Early, he was a Manichaean and was very strongly for it. I was reading in *The City of God* just last hour. He says, "There is no time without mobility." That's a good point. Something has to move in order to measure time. "There's no mobility without creatures. There was no time after which God began to create the earth." He didn't begin at any time. Then he says, "It has to be understood that nothing at all existed before he created this world; therefore, there can be no other worlds. Since there was no time, from that we conclude that before this world was created nothing at all existed." Very interesting thing he says here, "The world was not created in time but with time. Time and the world were created together." The Pearl of Great Price says that Adam went into a new time system when he left the garden. Before then he was on another time system entirely, but it's still a time system. Well, there was nothing before this world because there was nothing to make time in this argument. This conclusion was after much wrangling and soul searching. They considered this a very important issue.

John Chrysostom, a very important writer of the fourth and fifth centuries, rejects it. We have many volumes of his writings, and he was the greatest orator of his time—a tremendous influence. He says, "The beauty and utility of the heavens are all exclusively for the benefit of man." This is the point of view of that time. Talk about anthropocentric. He rejected the possibility of many heavens. He says, "The stars were created first and foremost for the benefit of sailors. That's why He made stars, so there's no reason to go on creating them for anybody else because there is nobody else there." That was the argument, but it got feeble as it went along.

Then we get the Middle Ages (twelfth century) and Thomas Aquinas. He explains why Plato's idea of perfection makes it impossible that there should be more than one world. He says, "Duplicated worlds would be futile and foolish. Why make more?" So Aquinas is against this and he reads Plato that way. "Even though their totality might be perfect, still there would be imperfect worlds." That's his commentary on Aristotle on the Heavens, **DeCaelo**, lecture 19, section 14, etc. So in the Middle Ages they settled it this way.

Now in the Renaissance and Reformation this doctrine emerged again, and did they have a fight about it. This was the big thing, the main issue in the Renaissance. The Renaissance was the expansive period; they discovered this world and other worlds. When it emerged in the Renaissance and Reformation, it called for counter measures. It was the greatest crime of Giordano Bruno who was its great defender. He was burned at the stake in Rome for preaching this doctrine. He was a great genius in many ways. This was in 1600, right at the turn of the century. When they go into the seventeenth century, then it becomes more scientific. But it becomes the main argument of the seventeenth century. Whether it's Pascal or Descartes or the

|p7

rest, they talk about that more than anything else. Bruno was teaching the "decentralized, infinite, and infinitely populous universe," and it cost him his life. He went everywhere, but they wouldn't accept him. They threw him out of Geneva. He went to Paris; he went to London. He was one of the great geniuses of his time. But this teaching that there is more than one world is what "cooked his goose." It rested not on the astronomy of Copernicus, as Lovejoy tells us, or Gallileo, but on the principle of plenitude. For a thing to be perfect, there must be the most possible of it. So there must be plentiful worlds.

Arthur Lovejoy's book *The Great Chain of Being* is very good on this subject. He takes it up here in the Renaissance and the Reformation. The other one is Alexander Koyre's book called *From a Closed World to an Infinite Universe*. It's a new one, and it treats the subject again very well. You can get these at the Bookstore quite cheaply. It begins with Nicholas of Cusanus. We'd better have him down here because he is very strong for it. He comes before Bruno. It sounds Italian, but he isn't. He's German. That's the town of Cusa in Germany. He's way back in the fifteenth century, 1401-1464. He became Cardinal Nicholas and traveled everywhere. He had great influence with the popes. He wrote a famous work called *De Docta Ignorantia* (On the Learned Ignorance). He was the most learned man of his time, and he said, "Learning consists entirely of knowing that you don't know." He takes as a famous example the squaring of the circle. That's following Socrates. You put a square around a circle and then you cut the corners off the square. Then you keep cutting those corners off. That can go on forever. You'll never get a square. He says that's the way with knowledge. You get nearer and nearer, but you never get it. And he picked up the saying from the Mandaeans, I think (which they applied to God), of the universe whose center is everywhere and circumference is nowhere. He says, "That's not God; that's the universe that we are describing." It certainly is Einstein's universe. The center is everywhere; you know, the exploding universe, the balloon and all that. Nicholas Cusanus said that the inhabitants of this world are inferior to inhabitants of other stars. That's one way to get into trouble. "They remain wholly unknown to us," he says.

Now I'm quoting Lovejoy here, "By the early sixteenth century, the theory of plurality of solar systems and of inhabited planets, of the infinite number of stars and the infinite extent of the universe in space were already common topics of discussion. [Was there an infinity of worlds and a plurality of solar systems?] What most attracted the seventeenth century was the idea of habitable celestial bodies with creatures more or less like ourselves." This was the big appeal. Lovejoy says, "This is a truly revolutionary thesis in cosmogony which was generally accepted before the end of the seventeenth century." Well, if they accepted it by the end of the seventeenth century, whatever happened to it? It comes in as quite a novelty in the Pearl of Great Price. In the middle of the century Burrell published his new discourse proving the plurality of worlds in which he called attention to the mountains and rivers on the moon and recalled that Pythagoras called the earth a moon. Pythagoras was the great one that was for it. He learned it in Egypt, of course. They learned everything in Egypt. In this century we have Campanella's famous work known as *The City of the Sun* in which he describes the sun as a

|p8

populated planet. It was taken very seriously. Lots of people got all excited about it. He paid for it though. He died in 1639 after spending 27 years in prison for teaching it. Then finally Gregory VIII let him out again. But you had to pay through the nose if you taught these things in some parts of the world then. The Protestants were as strong against it as the Catholics. It was a big fight. He believed the sun inhabited by beings far superior in learning to ourselves.

Now Descartes, the father of modern thought, what position would he take? He was against it; that's a strange thing. The great Rene Descartes, who introduced so much of modern thinking, belongs over here. He died right in the middle of the century, 1650. He says, "The question of many worlds is silly and irrelevant since this world is infinite and we must never dispute about the infinite. There's nothing you can say about it." Well, I guess he's on the fence, isn't he. "This matter of the sky and the earth is one and the same and there cannot be a plurality of worlds since it is all a complete self-centered whole." If it's just one perfect whole, you don't divide it up. Well, it is a whole, but can't you have other worlds? This is the argument. But he was engaged with that idea. "Even if the worlds were infinite," he says, "it is impossible that they should not be constituted from one and the same matter."

Well, we believe that. Of course, we have always taught that. "Like unto other worlds"; exactly as has been done in other worlds. We keep repeating that formula over and over again. "As has been done in other worlds." This is not new. There's nothing new about it as far as substance and structure is concerned, but the combinations are different. There's no end of difference between the worlds. He says, "Even if the worlds were infinite, it is impossible they would not be constituted from one and the same matter; therefore, they cannot be many but only one" because they are the same matter. Well, in that sense we agree with him. His argument is that no matter how many there might be, all must belong to one and the same system, so after all it is only one cosmos. The one who treats him is Koyre. He goes into quite a bit of detail on him.

Blaise Pascal, the great inspired genius, came right after him. He died quite young. He invented adding machines and things like that, a mathematical genius. But he couldn't accept it either. Why not, a great "noodle" like his? He couldn't accept life on other worlds because of his attachment to the Jewish and Christian tradition. "He was very pious which long since disposed of his earlier competitors who viewed as absurd the assumption of the existence throughout infinite space of countless other races of rational and presumably sinful beings." He said, "The Christian and Jewish tradition won't allow it. It's absurd. You don't need to go on endlessly repeating things. There's no point to that." Henry More, who was a follower of his, follows the familiar orthodox medieval premise, "The center of each of several worlds is a sun with its planets, and these altogether one world, I concede, and under the inexhaustible God, and God is height whose simple goodness makes the highest diety." Well, he's going into ecstasies about the fact that there is an infinite number of worlds. Well, Henry More says that, the orthodox medieval premise. "Each several world has its suns and its planets. If Descartes rejects the infinity of inhabited worlds, he nonetheless refuses to suppose

|p9

that the power of the Creator is so imperfect that no such stars could exist." He thinks it's absurd, but he says you're not going to limit the power of God; so God could make more if he wanted to. Descartes is sitting on the fence with that argument. "He could make them if he wanted to," he says.

Likewise with Leibniz, the great German philosopher of the time. Let's see which side he's on first. You'd expect him to be very much on it. Well, he is against it because he believed in the best of possible worlds (if you've read your *Candide*). He died about 1717, so we're now in the eighteenth century. He says, "No, because this is the best of all perfect worlds." Of course, Voltaire has no end of fun spoofing that. If you call this the best of all perfect worlds, what have you got? That's the whole theme of *Candide*. But he argues like a German philosopher. He's called **Pangloss**, the typical German philosopher. As Voltaire says, "He's a little philologist like all Germans."

Well, Leibniz says, "An infinite, immutable, and sempiternal God could not be conceived as limiting his creative action to a small stretch." Well, now wait a minute. He has to extend his actions out here, and where can he stop creating? This is the contradiction that you run into here all the time. Newton is very strongly for it. Newton takes us down to 1727. This is a very neat list we are making, isn't it? Remember, Newton was very religious. He interpreted the Bible literally and would not go along with any of the theology of his time. He was the greatest scientist probably who ever lived, but extremely devout to the end of his days. He speaks in terms strongly reminiscent of the Mandaean and Coptic brethren. He says, "For in God's house, which is the universe, are many mansions, and he governs them by agents which can pass through the heavens from one mansion to another. For if all places to which we have access are filled with living creatures, why should all these immense spaces of the heavens above the clouds be incapable of inhabitants?" He just turns around the argument—why bother to create all those things? He says, "Well, why not? Why let all that space and matter go to waste? Why not organize it?" The arguments work both ways. "Why should all these immense spaces of heavens above the clouds be incapable of inhabitants." By combining Democritus and Newton, the great Immanuel Kant (the father of heavy German philosophy, as you know) was remarkable—his anticipation of the present cosmology and this new sophisticated stuff. He preached about island galaxies and the formation of solar systems from spiral nebula and things like that (Laplace's theory). He went a long way in the study of the stars. Today, they have just barely caught up with him. Some books like Korte's pay great tribute to Kant for anticipating, not just by intuition but by reason, so much of what we teach today.

Incidentally, just before him is Athanasius Kircher. He was a Jesuit who was into everything. And he could get away with everything because he was the pope's pet. He made some good Coptic studies and thought he had deciphered Egyptian. He was not in trouble until he made this statement, and this practically destroyed him: "It would be in God's power to create similar worlds to ours at various distances from the earth." His idea of an **iter ex staticum** or travel to the planets produced, even among the scientific brotherhood, only an uneasy silence.

|p10

Even the scientists couldn't take that. So Kircher went off the deep end with that one. So he was naturally for it. He's a fascinating character. He never let anything stop him. He'd come out with wildest ideas. Some of them were good, and that's the point. He could get away with anything until he started saying that it would be in God's power to create similar worlds to this. Then we mentioned the great Isaac Newton who died in 1727. Then Kant concluded that "the cosmos must be infinite because of the infinite power of God." It works both ways. He carried it on to an infinite hierarchy of island universes of spiral nebula and all the rest. He had it all worked out, solar systems and the like.

Then this argument was used by the famous Richard Bentley who got into the argument with Dr. Arnold at Oxford, that celebrated feud that ran on for years. He was a classical scholar, but he had some pretty nutty ideas too. He says, "This is absurd. What good would an infinity of worlds do? What indeed could be the usefulness of these innumerable stars that are not even seen by us?" If you can't even see a star, what good is it? (as if God created all the stars for our particular benefit, never went any farther).

And then Leibniz again and this utilitarian doctrine. "What good would it do us if there were a lot of other worlds?" (Interesting question, isn't it?) "It's both a materialistic and atheistic argument, yet the doctrine of other worlds was opposed on the grounds that it was too materialistic; indeed it has been widely assumed among scientists that the discovery of life on other worlds would be an end to belief in God." This is a very important thing now. I've got some interesting things here. "Though Leibniz defined universe as one of a system of worlds that could exist but of which only a single one has been effectively realized." So God could have created other worlds, but he only created this one because there's only one perfect world possible and that would be it. So he said, "Well, of course, there could be other worlds and God could do it, but we can't figure it out. So leave it there."

"It may be hard for the present generation to believe that up to this very time it was the scientists who contemptuously rejected the idea of plurality of habitable worlds. While the old tradition lingered, the doctors had trouble making up their minds." (Now this is the official Roman Catholic position on the subject today, which is rather important. It's in a recent issue of the *Revue Biblique*.) "The doctors had trouble making up their minds in the church. They went both ways until the question was settled this way." The whole trouble, according to Grelot here, is that they couldn't get rid of false ideas of localization. There had to be such a thing as place. If there was no place, then there would be no problem. But localization is a physical thing. Forget locus, forget place, forget space and all that sort of thing. Take it all as spiritual and you can forget about this other worlds business. That's the present position here.

This is a very interesting statement by Whitehead. We put the Roman Catholic Church today on this side officially, and on this side we put Alfred North Whitehead, the famous English philosopher and mathematician. His deathbed statement is a very interesting one on this subject. He says, "The Bible excels in its suggestions of infinitude."

|p11

Here we are with our finite being and physical senses in the presence of a universe whose possibilities are infinite." He rises up from his bed, shakes his head and says, "And even though we may not apprehend them, those infinite possibilities are actualities. Don't reject anything. The Bible interpreters unfortunately have scaled and whittled down the sense of infinitude into finite and limited concepts." This is what they did in interpreting the Bible—the things we have been talking about. But we must leave the door open, and this is, of course, the great possibility.

An astronomer reports in 1955 (this is from a journal; notice how recent) a dramatic reversal in outlook on the subject of life outside the earth took place. Before then, in my day, because they had the pass-by or near-miss theory, it could not happen. The same reasons are used the same way today. According to the near-miss theory, a star came near enough to the sun to pull out so much substance and it figured out just right. In the 1930s that was the only one. That was accepted. But then it was junked, and now the new one is the other one. But now you have the 15 key coordinates that have to be fine tuned together. The possibility of coming up with another world by chance is infinitesimally small. So this must be the only one; there can't be any other world like this one. This was argued either way. It was the scientists that opposed it. Old Professor Larkin would throw you out of the room if you suggested it. If a science fiction nut suggested that there might be other worlds, it was absolutely not to be tolerated for a moment, which is surprising. It comes from the scientists here.

This astronomer, Luyten, says, "A writer like Descartes feels that discussion of the question represents the antithesis of real science. [Descartes said, 'This is not a scientific subject because we can't see those other worlds. We can't study them, so forget it.'] This is not real science since the same scientists held to one theory of origin of the solar system." Well, as they did in the 1930s, and another theory in the 1950s. "The collision theory—the origin of the planetary system by a chance pass-by with just the right distance, just the right time, just the right place, temperature, speed, and all the rest—was such an extreme rarity that it was all but impossible that it could have been reproduced at all." I'm quoting from another journal *Ein Codarschrift* and certain digests. "In 1960 many astronomers will prove conclusively and to their own complete satisfaction that planetary systems are quite common." But before 1960 you couldn't say that safely. I have an interesting reference here. This is W. Sullivan, an astronomer, speaking in 1964 on the subject of a project designed to receive or send messages to other worlds (this was Carl Sagan's pet, you know). He says, "This is a subject which we would not have dared to discuss on this kind of platform even as recently as two years ago." So recently they gave up the idea. There may be contacts, etc., but they wouldn't have dared to discuss it before 1962.

The discoverer of radar, very largely, was Arthur Clarke. He wrote *2001 Space Odyssey*. He's quite a scientist, as you know. He objected to some of the fancies that have inevitably grown from the acceptance of life's existence elsewhere. He doesn't question the possibility, but like Descartes, he questions whether it would have any significance that people have assumed for it.

{p12

He says, "Man will never 'conquer space.' It will never be possible to converse with anyone on another planet [because of the time lapse]. The whole concept of interstellar administration or culture is seen to be an absurdity. Any form of control or administration over other islands in space would be utterly impossible, and all parallels from our own history thus cease to have meaning."

Maybe he doesn't take some things into account. Last night, I was reading Nathan Ha-Babli, a medieval Hebrew traveler of the Middle Ages. The Great Khan was administering an empire effectively where you couldn't reach some of the cities and some of the forts without traveling three, four, or five months. And yet they kept the thing organized. Well, maybe you could get your space empire that way if you are willing to sit it out. Of course, you can go into "overwarp" and that takes care of all that.

Has he forgotten about the great empire spreading over most of Europe and Asia? The capital was often months or more than a year's journey from its agents and messages from the provincial centers of government. I was reading about the Khazar and the Hibar kingdom of the Jews in central India in the sixteenth century. They asked for help from Charles V. It was a matter of two or three years to reach it. Isn't that something? We'll finish this next time, and then we will read the passages from the Pearl of Great Price which are very striking on this same subject.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 13

This is the middle of the semester, and we switch over to our text at about this point. (We should have been on it all the time, you understand, but these things are all relative.) We were talking about plurality of worlds. How many have your Pearl of Great Price along? If you don't, you're lost. Go home. It's not that big a book. It can be carried in a fairly small briefcase. Let me see by a show of hands how many. Well, that's good. All right, let's look at Abraham 1:31 here. Now this is on this subject of plurality of worlds we were talking about. How does the Pearl of Great Price treat it? So we get to that vitally important first chapter of Abraham here. What does he say in verse 31? Notice, the gospel as far as he is concerned takes in a lot of things—the things we have been talking about. He has a record, and his father is the patriarch. These things have always been recorded and always been studied where the gospel is. "But the records of the fathers, even the patriarchs, concerning the right of the Priesthood, the Lord my God preserved in mine own hands [so he has the record; with his authority to carry on, he must have the record]; therefore, a knowledge of the beginning of the creation, and also of the planets, and of the stars [they are relevant; they come into the picture], as they were made known unto the fathers, have I kept even unto this day, and I shall endeavor to write some of these things upon this record, for the benefit of my posterity." Well this has always been part of the tradition in the gospel—to know where we are, to know what the setting is, to know what the plot is. What is the scenario? What are we supposed to be doing? This is the theme. The fathers were given this. So he is handing it on.

I should have gone first to Moses 1 which is very good here, as you know. The fourth and fifth verses here. "And, behold, thou art my son [notice, this knowledge and information is handed on to a legitimate heir]; wherefore look [he is going to be shown and really see it—not in the mind's eye, Horatio; he's going to see it; the Lord is showing it to him], and I will show thee the workmanship of mine hands; but not all, for my works are without end [that's going to be of extreme importance presently], and also my words, for they never cease. Wherefore, no man can behold all my works, except he behold all my glory; and no man can behold all my glory, and afterwards remain in the flesh on the earth."

So, here we have a big scene. We're only going to be shown a small part of it, but it's a real part. He says, Look, and I will show it to you, but I won't show it all to you because it is without end, and you can't see that now. So we're being sent to a much larger picture here. And then in verse 33 of this same chapter, it goes on, "And worlds without number have I created [that's a basic principle of the gospel]; and I also created them for mine own purpose." They don't concern us now, we'll see. Notice he says two verses above, "For mine own purpose have I made these things. Here is wisdom and it remaineth in me." When Moses wanted to know about the whole thing, the Lord said oh no, not this; you're just going to have

|p2

to limit yourself to the small scope that you can comprehend.

Then he says in verse 35, "But only an account of this earth, and the inhabitants thereof, give I unto you." This is all you can handle. We are supposed to have it, but we must know its setting. To know what sort of a place Europe is to live in, you have to know about the other continents. It is by sailing across the ocean that they discover the nature of their own community and continent. "But only an account of this earth, and the inhabitants thereof, give I unto you. For behold, there are many worlds [an important thing to know] that have passed away by the word of my power. And there are many that now stand, and innumerable are they unto man [the ones that stand now, new findings on this have been absolutely staggering, haven't they!]; but all things are numbered unto me, for they are mine and I know them." Then in verse 37, "And the Lord God spake unto Moses, saying: The heavens, they are many, and they cannot be numbered unto man [heavens in the plural here in a galaxy far away]; but they are numbered unto me, for they are mine." Now, here's the process, the local systems. There are local systems and larger systems. I should have brought the map along, but I'll do it the next time: "And as one earth shall pass away, and the heavens thereof, even so shall another come; and there is no end to my works, neither to my words [verse 38]." And the whole thing is "to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man [verse 39]," and to involve and let us hack in on the system—to get in on this thing of the eternities. Of course, it's a grandiose conception. Can you do anything to prove it one way or the other?

Well, verse 36 is important; we skipped that one. Notice, Moses is going to settle for this (we are going to have to settle for this), and Moses said, "Be merciful unto thy servant, O God, and tell me concerning this earth, and the inhabitants thereof, and also the heavens, and then thy servant will be content." Notice, the heavens are in the plural, used all the time in the plural. It's dealing with systems. We talk about galaxies and systems now. Again, you see, this is a complete refutation of the old idea that the earth was the center of the universe and the heaven was everything that revolved around it. There were the seven heavens. Heavens are something different this time. Every world belongs to its particular system and has its particular heavens, always mentioned together. And so he says, "Tell me concerning this earth . . . and then thy servant shall be content." First lesson he had to learn. The twenty-seventh verse of this same chapter: ". . . Moses cast his eyes and beheld the earth, yea even all of it." That, he could see, all of it, every particle. Notice, we are dealing with particles. Particle physics is very important today. Do we mean he counted every particle, every molecule? Well, we would say if he saw every particle, he saw every class; he saw every particle of which it was composed. He saw the quarks; he saw the protons; he saw the neutrons and all these things. If he knew all the particles, then he knew of what the earth was composed. I don't think he had to count all the protons and neutrons, especially since they are changing into each other constantly all the time. But he did see that there were particles, and he saw them all. And here in verse 27, we are told, ". . . and there was not a particle of it which he did not behold, discerning it by the spirit of God." And in the next verse, "And he beheld also the inhabitants thereof, and

|p3

there was not a soul which he beheld not; and he discerned them by the Spirit of God; and their numbers were great, even numberless as the sand upon the sea shore." Now, this is used constantly in Oriental writings. It's used many times. The Egyptians use it. I was just reading a text, and it talks about Joseph. He supplied the people with grain and it says this. In Genesis it says the same thing. In Genesis 37 it says he provided grain for the people as numerous as the sands of the seashore [see Genesis 41:49]. It could not be numbered, very great. It goes on using the same expression applied to grain or anything you can't count. Can you count the sands of the seashore? No. Well, that's how many there are if it's beyond counting. That is the standard expression for that. I know people who say if you count the sands of the seashore, every one of them, that last one represents the last world or the last person because that's exactly how many souls there are, as many as there are grains of sand, which is rather silly.

What does the next verse say, "And he beheld many lands; and each land was called earth, and there were inhabitants on the face thereof [verse 29]." Again, you see, the earth is divided into different lands. The word earth is *eretz* and the word land is *eretz*, so you are going to use the very same word for all of them because they are separate communities, separate worlds. When I was a little kid, it was darkest Africa; and most of Africa was unknown. It wasn't until the 1920s that central Asia and Africa were explored. Central Asia was unknown; Africa was unknown; the Arctic had never been discovered. We always used to get so excited about Perry who went to pole, and they had the big fight. Did Perry get to the pole first? The trouble with Shackleton and Scott and all the rest. Those were all in my day. Nobody had ever been to the poles. Many of the islands of the sea were still undiscovered. Most of Asia and Africa were unknown. Imagine that. Each was a separate land and separate community. For years and years they didn't know anything of each other. There's quite a collection of early Jewish writers, people like Nathan Ha-Babli. Way back in the ninth century, he was a great traveler. He was born in Abyssinia among the Jewish community there, and he traveled all over Asia locating and interviewing people who might be members of the Ten Tribes. He got Ten Tribe notices all over the place. There are many people like that. There's a very notable one who went to America for that purpose. He went much later, in 1640. That was Antonio de Montezinos who was a famous Jewish traveler. He said he found, not the Ten Tribes, but small Hebrew-speaking enclaves. They didn't speak it, he said, but they recalled it. They had phrases and uses, and they were Jewish in their practices—all along the Cordilleras in Central America, and he went into Equador. He was one of the first to go into many areas there. So there were lots of earths, lots of separate lands, if you're thinking of it that way. It's not the same anymore. It's one globe, one world, now.

Then Moses calls on God and says, Tell me why this all is. And God says, I won't tell you why it is. It's none of your business yet. "Tell me why these things are so, and by what thou madest them [verse 30]?" We used to talk about that as the epic question. When the epic situation is stated in the first few lines of every epic poem (*The Iliad*, *The Odyssey*, *The Aeneid*, etc.), there is the question: Why was all this? Tell me, Muse, why this was? In *The Aeneid*, "Tell me why a man of such noble piety would have to go through such labors"

There's the introduction, the first ten lines or so of an epic, and then the poet asks the question of the Muse, as Milton does in *Paradise Lost*. He says, Tell me how this first happened, how our first parents sinned, "whose bitter fruit brought death into the world, and all our woe. Tempted to that vile revolt." Why did it all happen? He's going to ask the Muse to tell him what is going on. This is the epic question, and Moses asks it here. When a great panorama is spread before your eyes, the first thing you say is what's it all about? Can you explain to me what I'm looking at? This is a noble prospect; tell me all about it. Summarize the gospel in two sentences. The person is always rebuked; you can't do it in that short a period. Then the epic usually runs to a thousand pages or so that follows, dealing with just an episode or two. But here he says, "Tell me why these things are so, and by what thou madest them?" How did you ever do it, and why? This is quite a question, and God said, I'm not going to answer that now.

"And behold the glory of the Lord was upon Moses, so that Moses stood in the presence of God and talked with him face to face. And the Lord God said unto Moses [a good question, but] for mine own purpose have I made these things. Here is wisdom and it remaineth in me [verse 31]." (You'll have to be content with your world. That's all you can handle now.) And then Moses says, Yes, thy servant will be content. Then in verse 40, "And now, Moses, my son, I will speak unto thee concerning this earth upon which thou standest; and thou shalt write the things which I shall speak." And then the first verse of the next chapter: ". . . Behold, I reveal unto you concerning this heaven, and this earth [this system, I am confining you to a particular system]; write the words which I speak. I am the Beginning and the End, . . ." So we have a multiplicity of worlds, and we are limited in our view. Turn to the seventh chapter now. That's a very important one here on the same subject, where Enoch is the enlightener. Verse 36: "Wherefore, I can stretch forth mine hands and hold all the creations which I have made; and mine eye can pierce them also, and among all the workmanship of mine hands [Notice the use of the word hands; he's not going to hold a red giant or a white dwarf even in his hand; nobody does that sort of thing; you know what that means.] there has not been so great wickedness as among thy brethren." Now, that is quite a recommendation for this world we live on. ". . . Satan shall be their father, and misery shall be their doom, and the whole heavens shall weep over them [see, there are other heavens and other worlds, not just the earth], even all the workmanship of mine hands; . . ." Again, this is another grandiose concept that you will find in modern times. First, in the Pearl of Great Price the idea is that all the worlds contribute when a new world is to be made. Everybody wants to make his contribution and have a share in it. It's of interest to everyone. Everyone is concerned. We are in a state of quarantine here, so we don't know about these things. Remember, the veil is dropped for us. But he tells us here that all the heavens, all the workmanship of his hands, it all weeps to see one world destroyed. We have some literature on that which I may mention. We will take at least one hour for the creation. That's a thing that must be accounted for. There are basic questions that have to be answered—questions of time, questions of scope. Those questions are not taken care of in the Bible or in a lot of theological writing.

|p5

When they see another world, they have all contributed, you see. So they don't like to see it have to pass away. It's a terrible thing, and it concerns everybody. It gets around. I was talking to a physicist yesterday who told me there are certain phenomena now that are being observed. No, it was on Sunday. He came down and we had a nice talk. He's up at the University of Utah. He says in particular physics now, to account for the action of certain particles, it must be assumed that there is a force that moves with eight times the speed of light. Until now *C*, the constant, has always been 186,300 miles a second. That sets everything; that sets the boundaries, the limits beyond which we can't go. Now, it seems there must be forces to account for reverses, especially in certain mirror effects and the "arrow of time" and the like, that must go much faster than light. Who knows? But he's talking about a lot of things going on out there that are not confined just to this earth. ". . . Should not the heavens weep, seeing these shall suffer?" And a prison he says he has prepared for them. Then in verse 40 he says here, "Wherefore, for this shall the heavens weep, yea, and all the workmanship of mine hands." They not only exist without number, but they are all connected. They are all associated with each other. There are connections and understandings between them. We will mention that a little later. And, of course, the explanations to Facsimiles one, two, and five assume . . . (turn to your facsimile, which is opposite page 35). Here is the first creation nearest to the celestial. (That means there are other creations.) First in government, one day to a cubit. Notice, there are measurements of time. Things are measured, things are timed, things are spaced. Everything has structure here. And number two, next to Kolob. ". . . the key of power also, pertaining to other planets; as revealed from God to Abraham . . ." The next grand governing creation near to the celestial (we're getting a hierarchy here). And then the fifth one is Egyptian, and one is borrowing from the other. Note, there are governing powers. What is happening is that energy is being swapped around here. This planet receives its power through the medium of others who transmit the power to others; and so it goes. What we have is a system here. We are not studying it now. We are just mentioning the fact that we do believe in the plurality of worlds and the Book of Abraham insists on it.

Notice in the third chapter verses three, four, five, six, seven, and nine, he repeats that you must always understand what you are seeing in terms of the earth on which thou standest, from where you view it. You don't see things from above or with the eye of God that embraces all things at once. You have a limited point of view, and that's going to restrict you. So throughout that third chapter, he says things like: "And I saw the stars, that they were very great, and that one of them was nearest unto the throne of God [there's a multitude of beings, verse 2]." Then he says here, "I have set this one to govern all those which belong to the same order as that upon which thou standest [verse 3]." So Abraham lives on a particular order that belongs to a particular star. We know that the sun is a particular kind of star of a particular order. This is the order to which Abraham belongs, where he stands at present. This is where he is now, and he says everything has to be seen from that point of view. In the next verse you notice, after his manner of reckoning, a thousand years, according to the time of your order, "unto that [order] whereon thou standest [verse 4]." In the next verse he says, "The planet

|p6

which is the lesser light, lesser than that which is to rule the day, even the night, is above or greater than that upon which thou standest . . . [here is a planet greater than that upon which thou standest, verse 5]." Again this formula, "the earth upon which thou standest," is used twice here. So it used seven times in this one chapter. It always specifies that all your reckonings and all your views and pictures of the universe are only what can be seen from the place where you are standing. And this, of course, is a very important principle today. It's the anthropic principle. It has become absolutely basic in astronomy in the last ten years or so. It's new and it's extremely important. Seventh verse, ". . . reckoning of the time of the earth upon which thou standest." Again, the ninth verse, ". . . Kolob is set nigh unto the throne of God to govern all those planets which belong to the same order as that upon which thou standest." Notice, Kolob doesn't govern all the planets in the universe, only those of the same order that concern Abraham. So he is shown Kolob for that purpose, because it concerns him. Then in eleven and twelve, "Thus I, Abraham, talked with the Lord face to face . . . and he told me of the works which his hands had made, And he said unto me: My son, my son (and his hand was stretched out), behold I will show you all these. And he put his hand upon mine eyes, and I saw those things which his hands had made, which were many [the same hand that had made all these things] and they multiplied before mine eyes, and I could not see the end thereof." We can make it very plain here what the situation is. Then in verse 13 it talks about Abraham's local system: This is **Shinehah**, which means in Egyptian, one eternal round. **Shenha** means to go around forever. This is the sun, and that is what the Egyptians call it. "And he said unto me: Kokob . . ." That's the Hebrew word for a star. It's a very interesting word, the same as the Babylonian word and the Arabic word also, **Kakkabum** and **Kawakibu** "And he said unto me: Kokaubeam, [that which is the plural of Hebrew], which signifies stars, or all the great lights, which were in the firmament of heaven." So here we are getting local systems and all the rest of it. Then we are told about the council in verses 21-28 of this same chapter where they get together and start making things. We are talking about plurality now, not about the creation.

I want to mention just a few things here. We hadn't come to the end of it quite. This is the point, and it's a very important thing namely and to wit: For some strange reason, which will be obvious, it has been commonly held that the mere idea that there are other worlds, or planets or people besides this, and that there are other worlds greater and that our sun is a small star—that would wipe out the whole foundation of Christianity and Judaism. In fact, it would wipe out the whole foundation of religion if we once discovered that there were other planets. That idea has been commonly held by scientists and churchmen alike for the obvious reason, to begin with, their definition of creation. Creation is just once for all, everything out of nothing. Well, there are a lot of things to be accounted for. Philosopher Baillet said in 1954, "He sees the plurality of worlds. What a mockery of human design. What an annihilation of human vanities." A plurality of worlds is a mockery of human design. What we do here is nothing. If you want eloquent passages on the subject, all you would have to do is go to early Christian literature. It tells us in a Coptic Christian writing that when you approach the throne of God, the sun is as small as a grain of flour. It is absolutely lost.

|p7

It disappears in the multitude of stars, and it looks about the size of a grain of flour when you get that far away. That's an early Christian writing. They were not cut down to nothing. The contemplation of the universe had already cut the early Christian down to size, and he felt it was a salutary experience.

Now here's a vision of Paul (the second century). It has survived both in Latin and in Syriac, the **Visio Pauli**. Paul says, "I saw all this earth, and it was like nothing in my sight. And I saw the son of man and the human race, and it was nothing." That's what Moses tells us here in our Book of Moses, "Now I know that man is nothing, which I never had supposed [Moses 1:10]." So the earliest Christians were quite aware of the fact that you are not to be upset if you find out that this world is "very small potatoes" in the universe. "The thought that this is the only world did not heighten man's pride, but it placed him at the lowest point of all, to which all things fell and to which he was confined. Which was the more pleasing? While the new cosmology [we're quoting Arthur Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*] provided astronomical reason for humility [that's true; we are very small], this was destroyed by the same new cosmology which denied life on other worlds but at the same time provided a substitute for the glory lost in the doctrine of incalculable vastness." They always had this idea that the universe was very vast. The size has nothing to do with it. The fact is whether it was closed, it had limits to it. And this is the subject of Koyre's book *From a Closed World to an Infinite Universe*. It's always assumed that getting rid of the geocentric doctrine cost man his high place in the universe. The earth is the center; therefore, he is the most important. It's just the opposite, as Lovejoy says. He points out that the geocentric doctrine does not exalt man. It debases him actually. What if the earth is the center of all things, as Aristotle says, then (quoting Lovejoy) "for the center of the world was not a place of honor. It was rather the bottom of creation [everything sinks to the bottom, you see] to which its dregs and baser elements sank. The actual center was indeed [what's in the center of the earth?] hell, of all things. If you want to go to the center, you'll find hell." You get that in Dante. "In a spacial sense the medieval world was literally diabolic." The nearer you get to the center of things, the nearer you get to hell. After all, the Devil is the prince of this world. It's a wicked place, it's a nest of vipers, it's a veil of tears. "In this world ye shall have tribulation," the Lord tells the apostles. Being a denizen of such a place is nothing to be proud of, and the Christians really rubbed it in. You don't have to push people off the sidewalk because you have to live on a central world. That would put you in a worse position than ever.

"But the modern assumption is that the discovery of other worlds older than ours and greater than ours would necessarily be a shattering blow to our pride." This is Arthur Clarke. We mentioned him before. He was the man in British Intelligence during the war who discovered the principle of radar, which was revolutionary in spotting the approach of German planes. He has been writing a lot of science fiction. Of all places, he lives in Ceylon now, which is turning out to be not such an ideal place because revolutions are everywhere. Who was it who gave a speech here many years ago in the old Fieldhouse? (I'll think of his name.) He was a famous New York humanist. You probably wouldn't know of him at all because it was forty years ago.

|p8

It was just before World War II, and this friend of his had been in World War I, and he said, "I'm not going to get caught in that world mess again." He owned an apartment in New York City. He sold it, took all the money and bought a ranch on an island in the most remote, inaccessible place in the world. He thought the war would never catch up with him in that place. The place he bought it on was Iwo Jima. So you can't escape trouble to which we are born, as the sparks fly upward.

Living in Ceylon, Arthur Clarke would find out that he did not escape from all the troubles of the world. "The troubles of our proud and angry dust are from eternity and shall not fail," as the poet said. This is what he writes. (Remember Clarke is the one who wrote *2001 Space Odyssey*) What he produced in a thing like *2001 Space Odyssey* is a shattering blow to our pride. "Few of our current religions can be expected to survive it." It's so different from the conventional view of the creation of the world. "The assertion that God created man in his own image is ticking like a time bomb in the foundations of Christianity. We will have to face the chilling fact: if there are gods whose chief concern is man, they cannot be very important gods." He's saying we're not important. This proves that we are not important; therefore, our God who created us and the earth and all that's in it is not important. After all, St. Aquinas said, "What glory is there in being a god over a lot of spiders?" We count about as much as a lot of spiders would. Why should God flatter himself to be a god over us. Arthur Clarke is saying the same thing. But, you see, from our point of view we have already stopped the time bomb from ticking long ago here. If there was a time bomb there, Joseph anticipated that. So the Pearl of Great Price beat Mr. Clarke to it. Remember Moses says, "Now, for this cause I know that man is nothing, which thing I never had supposed [Moses 1:10]." At the same time, Moses recalls in that first chapter how he has just stood in the presence of God. He is in the image of the Only Begotten—that paradox. But by the principle of pleniarism (plenitude, plenty). There must be plenty, and how much must there be? The idea is that you can't get too much of a good thing. If God neglected to create a beautiful world, which he might have created somewhere, then his creations would be imperfect. They would be lacking something. Something would be missing. "It would leave an empty space against the sky," as the poet says. So it has to be the most things possible. Let's quote Lovejoy again, "The more essences (regardless of their rank in the scale) there are realized in the universe, the better it is. A universe in which there was no evil would not be so good as the actual universe in which there is evil because something would be missing." You have to have evil too. All that is necessary has to be. Sounds like Leibniz, doesn't it?

So we are led to what is called today, by Buttar, etc., the crisis of science fiction, for example. This has led us into interesting things. As the propositions become more demanding, they lead us into a sort of crisis. The science fiction writers have it too. The problem is that of the cosmos without God. The famous theologian Bauer writes on that in *Der Himmel ohne Gott* on the problem of cosmology and metaphysics, and Lamb in *The Religious Implications of Extra-terrestrial Life* [these are titles of new works]. Will the idea of extra-terrestrial life destroy the image of the Bible, our ideas of creation and life?

|p9

It is a religious question first and last. As Karl says, "What are we to think of the plurality of inhabited worlds?" That is the *Ecclesiastical Literary Journal* of the Catholic Church published at Toulouse. And Torm writes on the same thing in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, "On the Plurality of Heavens, On the Plurality of Worlds." The clergy have taken this up because it is worrying them, of course. We're suggesting possibilities here. The surprising thing is that the scientists have been the ones to deny it longest. As I said, Professor Larkin would throw you out of the room if you suggested there might be another world. It would make you a science nut because of the impossibility of it happening. With that near-miss theory, the conditions are so rare and so far apart. So many things must be fine-tuned together that the possibility of it happening more than once is not likely. It happened once; that was a fluke. It could never happen again. That's what the scientists used to tell us right down until the 1960s.

Now we have this ancient idea of three I's. Remember, we talked about light-dark-light. We have the three periods. There is the past (preexistence), the present (present), the future (hereafter). Every religion takes all three into account, except most religions reject number one, the preexistence. The Christians do, which makes it faulty and defective. It seems that only our religion has light-light-light. Light before we came here, light here, and light hereafter. As Adam and Eve were told, you can enjoy yourself here if you follow instructions, and you can live forever in eternal happiness hereafter. That's a wonderful arrangement. Why don't you find it in more religions? It's an interesting thing. A simple word answers that; it's revelation. But the ancient idea of three levels is a plurality of worlds too—with the world above, the world between, and the world following. What's the Old English word for world? **Midgard** the middle earth. A **gard** is a **gorod**; it's a thing with a fence around it (garden, a **garth** is an enclosed place). The Russian word for city is **gorod**, **novgorod**, etc. It's anything with an enclosure. So we are living in the middle enclosure. There's a heavenly enclosure above, and there's hell down below. All three follow the same pattern. This is fixed in the Babylonian system. It was first pointed out in the hierocentric. It's the hierocentric order of the Babylonian temples in the **Enuma Elish**. A temple here is a duplicate of what is above, and what's below is a duplicate of what is here—the rule of the three levels. With the world above, below and between, they follow the same.

Father Louis Speleers, a famous Egyptologist and Belgian Jesuit, takes the Egyptians to task for accepting other worlds than this. He says, "That's absurd. That's a derangement of their brains. While the Egyptians think of a real life elsewhere in the universe and hereafter [this is the official Christian position that is taken by the Roman church], the Christians forget all of that. They seek only and exclusively for the vision, if not the possession of God, the mystic vision. [That's the beautiful vision; that's all you can expect hereafter.] For the Christian there is only one creation. It is **ex nihilo**." This is the way he defines creation: "Creation is the incarnation, the materialization of God's idea of what does not exist." That's a good definition isn't it? Because only God has a right to exist, as the Moslems say. Anything else is **shirk** which means sharing, anything that shares.

!p10

Since only God has a right to exist, "thine existence, man, is a crime compared with which all other crimes are as virtues." To have the presumption; only God has a right to exist. What are you doing here then? This is the point. So that is the crime of **shirk**, of presuming to share the universe with God—that anything else besides God can exist. It can't possibly exist. But then you run into trouble here with the Moslems. You ask him what his credo is, and he says, "I believe in God, and the angels, and his prophets, and his messengers [apostles or missionaries], and in the holy books." Then you say to the Moslem, "Now, wait a minute. God does everything. He's everything that counts?" That's exactly what Irenaeus said to the Gnostics. He said, "You're just wasting your time talking about anything else but God because nothing else is there. Just say he did it all." Then immediately he has to explain why all this evil came in. So he gets himself right into the same trouble as the Gnostics. Then you ask the Moslem, "All right, you believe there is only one God. You accuse the Christians of complicating things unduly and getting things all messed up." Moslems say, "Why do you have to have a Father and a Son and all that? That's outrageous. He does not beget; he is not begotten. We've gotten rid of all that. Islam is much more majestic, much more simple." You ask, "Well, then what are you doing with all these angels? Why are they there? What about the messengers? What about the prophets and the apostles that he sends? What about the books? Why do you need them at all? Why don't you just have revelation if you'd have anything?" So they are in the same boat with all the rest. There's an awful lot you have to explain. You can say God did it all, but that doesn't answer everything as far as we're concerned.

The Egyptian is more realistic then actually, isn't he? So the church defines creation as "the incarnation, the materialization of God's idea of what does not exist." In Christianity no creature has an existence of its own. We are all just in God, of course. As Augustine says, "You have made us of you, and we are unquiet, restless and lost until we return to you and get reabsorbed." As St. Jerome says, "Until we all return to the nothing from which we came." Then we will finally be happy. So he says here, "The creature doesn't exist by its own right at all. God takes consciousness of what does not exist by the intermediary of his creatures." We exist simply to give God an idea of what does not exist because anything but God does not exist. (This is what theologians get into.) "The whole idea of plurality of existence hereafter is vague and banal," he says. "All of this is as literal and as concrete as the Christian metaphysic is abstract and spiritual." To talk about literal and concrete things (that's what we have been talking about, you know) is a poor way to do it, he claims. "The Christian metaphysic is abstract and spiritual. It doesn't touch material things at all," he says. "This literature [Egyptian literature] is created by people with a disease of the brain, brains which do not function like ours." They don't accept Aristotle in the excluded middle, for example. Well, this takes a Christian position to which Mormonism was a complete rebuff. There's more to the doctrine of difference than we suppose, but in the end it's on these doctrines that our faith rests. So we get to this light-light-light business, these three levels. You ask, "Why don't other churches have this? This is the happiest one you could have. Why didn't the early Christians have it? But, of course, they did. But we don't allow them this. We don't allow them any preexistence at all.

|p11

Some do allow preexistence, but it was a miserable one. It's dark to light to dark. But the reason they don't have this is all in one word. It's revelation. So it all comes down to, revelation.

Do the others believe in revelation? Well, here are some interesting quotes here. Revelation as a present reality: The first volume of the *American Anthropologist* which we have here has a scientific analysis of Mormonism. It says this, "Mormonism is a portentous danger sign, a monstrosity [this is a scientific journal] born of deceit and bred in falsehood, a monster of iniquity and deceit." Well, what's wrong with it? "Its precepts and teachings are not in themselves immoral [he reassures us]. There is nothing immoral in the Book of Mormon, but its adherents have discovered the most dangerous weapon against the moral world order in the doctrine of a continuous revelation, a portentous danger signal to enlightened civilization." It says elsewhere in the article, "There is the cloven hoof." Revelation, anyone who believes in revelation. We mentioned this before. Revelation, dispensation and restoration were three dirty words. You couldn't use them. Now all the churches and journals do. I have a chapter added to a book of mine called *The World and the Prophets*. That tells how they have come around. It's called "The Return of the Prophets?" All the priests, and the pope especially, are trying to sound like bold prophets now. You'd go to the stake for taking that position before, that revelation was possible. This was the position they all took: "Continuing revelation, a portentous danger signal to enlightened civilization."

In 1898 the League for Social Services included some of the most illustrious Americans. It had George Washington Choate and Jane Addams. It had the most distinguished intellectuals of America in that time. They all signed and published a declaration, "Ten reasons why Christians cannot fellowship the Mormon Church." The first three reasons are the most damning: 1. They teach that they have the only true gospel. (Well, if it's true it's not like anybody else's, so how can the others have it too? There's no resemblance; there's a terrific difference here. We try to gloss it over.) 2. Revelations are still possible. (We cannot forgive them that.) They say, "We would like to fellowship. They are wonderful people, etc, but as long as they teach that they have the only true gospel . . . And yet that's why we had the Reformation, because one group and another each claimed that it had the only true gospel. They went to the point of making war on each other and suffering great persecutions for making that claim. They were willing to go to the stake, "Courage, Dr. Latimer, we have lit a fire this day in England." They were willing to go to the stake for the 39 Articles and things like that. When the Lutherans and the Calvinists began, they believed that they had the only true gospel, and the Roman Catholics didn't and neither did the other sects that were quarreling with them. 3. Joseph Smith was a prophet of God (that you could have a prophet). Now many people on TV freely throw out the word revelation. "It was revealed to me," somebody will say. They put themselves in the position of prophets. "The huge corpus of anti-Mormon literature confirms the shocked reaction of the nineteenth and twentieth century civilization at home and abroad to the story Joseph Smith tells of himself in the last book of the Pearl of Great Price." That is a very important one; that's the one we should begin with. This is to establish the

|p12

proposition of revelation. If revelation is so, then we know where we stand on things like this. You can never prove this, you know, as long as you live. You could argue "until the cows came home" and evidence would never do it, but you rest on revelation. "The same principle of on-going revelation is not only central to every chapter in the Pearl of Great Price, but it is the only way in which each chapter is to be accounted for [according to us]. Yet it can be shown that the propositions named above apply here. That the early church had revelation is not disputed. It begins with an angel appearing to and conversing with Zacharias in the temple." Nobody had seen an angel for four hundred years (the first chapter of Luke). It's very vivid. Luke insists on giving everything a clinical explanation, making it very lucid. Where the angel stood, exactly over by the altar here. How Zacharias was absolutely flabbergasted, struck dumb. He hadn't seen an angel before. When he went out after the long preaching with the angel, he was completely shaken. The people saw that he couldn't speak. They knew that he had a terrible experience in there. He was gone a long time. It said the people waited and waited and marveled that he hadn't come out yet. The people are usually patient during religious ceremonies. When he came out, he was shocked. Then the same angel appeared to Mary. It tells us the house, the street, the town, how he appeared to her, what he told her. This makes it very literal and clinical, like appearing to Joseph Smith. But revelation was not a thing that could be controlled, and the church renounced it because it couldn't be controlled. St. Augustine wrote a famous work, *Doctrina Christiana*. He said, "After all, the trouble with revelation is that you can't control it. The spirit bloweth where it listeth, and there is nothing you can do about it. We must have revelation that can be turned off and on as a tap so you can have revelation when you want it and in any quantities you want it, and you don't have to have it when you don't want it." In other words, you will control it. Well, you don't control revelation. You know that. So he said, "You will find that in ceremony and authority. You can impose authority. A breath can make them, and a breath hath made." Anybody can be appointed to any office under the sun, but it's interesting to note that since the beginning of time no one ever became a scientist or an artist or a scholar by appointment. But you can hold all sorts of offices. You can become president, you can become a dean, you can become a king or a queen by appointment. But there are some things you can never become by appointment though you pretend there are such things. But St. Augustine says, "No, we have appointment and authority and then we have things that we can control, namely ceremonies and ordinances. That's what we do, so we don't need revelation anymore. It's very uncomfortable. What we want is something more available and something more secure and reliable—something the people can rely on. Revelation just comes to one man. We want something you can prove." The Catholic Church defines three sources of revelation: the scriptures, traditions of the church (interpreting the scriptures), and reason about it. When the Protestant Reformation came, they said, "the scriptures alone" and immediately began to fight about what the scriptures meant. So they bring reason in too, reason and the scriptures. But revelation is not only out, it's wicked to suggest it. It has been until very recently, at any rate. "Its unreliability is apparent in the **Pastor of Hermas** who insists that God alone . . ." This was discovered in the sixties, a very valuable writing. It's from the year 120, written in Rome, and is valuable and authentic. You have to study it in theological schools everywhere.

|p13

"Hermas tells us that God alone can determine the time and place of revelation, a great inconvenience on the church, an intolerable restraint which the church replaced by more manageable service and forms of observances," as Duchesne, a great Roman Catholic scholar points out. "We had to have something we could handle; we couldn't handle revelation."

And Danielou writes in his book on Origen (he was the best Catholic scholar, who died under strange circumstances recently), "Traces of that holy spirit who appeared in the form of a dove were still to be found among the Christians as late as Origen's day." Notice, it lingered in remnants. What did the rabbis have after God ceased to speak to the prophets? They had the **bath-kol**, which means the daughter of a voice. A **bath-kol** is an echo. It's just like a voice swept on the wind from a distance, but it's not direct revelation. It's the same thing here when Danielou says there were traces (just traces) of the holy spirit who appeared in the form of a dove still to be found among the Christians in Origen's day. Eusebius, the father of church history, reports many events illustrating the immense hunger for revelation in the church after it was withdrawn. When the church lost revelation, a terrible thing happened. I've written a number of articles on this in a book called *When the Lights Went Out*. There are three of them collected there on this very subject, so we won't go into this here. The people were willing to accept anything, so all sorts of quacks went around claiming to have revelation, and that undermined the whole thing.

Pachomius and St. Antony were the founders of the monastic movement. Pachomius, who died in 346, resisted the supplanting of visions by relics and miracles. He said, "We've either got to have the visions or not, but relics and miracles will not take their place. It's true they can be controlled, but that's not good enough." He insisted that his successor be a man who had had visions. He said, "You cannot succeed me unless you are a visionary man [like Lehi]," even though they must send far and wide to find such a one. "The man they did find finally was Petronius who through his purity had been allowed to see some visions, but at that time the heads of the monastic societies were expected to have revelations, as Crum tells us. Cyprian rests his case against certain heretics on the revelations of a pure little boy who in a state of ecstasy denounced them [the last person in the world to claim revelation]." But he had to have fits in order to give him the revelation. The best he can do for it is, as they use in the Roman Catholic formula, "God suggesting or the Lord suggesting." They say, "With the agreement of the Spirit." But the recent statements of the pope include the astonishing expression, "It has been revealed." Ha ha, he wouldn't say that, not very long ago. This is the last of these basic principles we have been talking about. Revelation, they all rest on this. This was a thing which was in the early church, which the Christian world denies, and which is now being restored. Now, we will get to the text the next time.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 14

This is the midterm, and if we were giving an examination at this time, these are the questions we would ask: What are the terrible questions? Why are they terrible? Where can you look for answers? Have any been answered to your satisfaction? Well, not yet in this class certainly. I say "yet." What makes you so sure? Are the terrible questions really important? Can we evade them? So it all centers around that particular issue, and that's the sort of thing we will have an essay on for the final, something related to this. Have you found any answers yet? We will find them if we look for them, and you may have been satisfied with what you learned in Sunday School when you were ten years old. As Paul says, when I was a child, I thought as a child, but now I'm grown up, I think differently.

Here are just a couple of remarks on revelation which I think you will find very much to the point. They are so nice and concise here. This is Paul Tillich who is considered the most eminent Protestant theologian of our time and just died recently. "The loss of the prophetic tradition belongs to the tragedies of Christian history. It actually was lost as far as the official church is in command." Notice, the greatest tragedy was that they lost revelation.

You all know about Paul Tillich. He was giving a very highly funded annual lecture on resurrection. Years ago, somebody gave this huge fund for an annual lecture on the resurrection, and Tillich began his talk by saying, "Well, now, of course, we all know there's no such thing as a resurrection." Everybody laughed appreciatively, and then he went on from there. This is the position they take. But Tillich said, "The loss of the prophetic tradition belongs to the tragedies of Christian history." It was actually lost as far as the officials are concerned. So now we read in S. V. McCasland, who is a very eminent theologian, "The return to the ideas of inspiration and revelation may be put down as one of the remarkable trends of our biblical scholarship in the last decade."

That's in the 1950s. It wasn't until the 1950s that it started coming back. Then, as I said, everybody started having the idea. They would burn you at the stake before. That was Joseph Smith's great crime, as we saw in the *American Anthropologist*. But he says, "The return to the ideas of inspiration and revelation may be put down as one of the remarkable trends of our biblical scholarship in the last decade."

Here is W. J. Hegga writing on the Catholic Church. The title is "The Flexibility of the Catholic Church—Revelation and the Development of Dogma." At this time, in 1962, they were having ecumenical council and thought, how can we make changes in dogma if we don't get revelation, if we just do it with our brains? People have been noodling this around for ages and come to different conclusions. Are we any better than they? Well, without revelation we're not going to get anywhere. So he titles his article "Flexibility and the Development of Dogma."

|p2

He concludes that revelation might be possible after all. There's a concession for you. They held a big meeting of all Protestant ministers (H. A. Kelly, D. D. McIntire), and the problem was this: The silence of God—how is it to be explained? Why doesn't he reveal himself anymore? Why is God silent now? Well, anybody who mentioned that God wasn't silent anymore was in real trouble, you remember. The last revelation ceased with the Book of Revelation. And so it goes. Here's another one by Patuchovski, *Revelation and the Modern Jew*. They are coming back to it too. In the Bull of 1950 the pope declares that "the doctrine of Immaculate Conception of Mary is established by our supplication to God. We have continually prayed to God, and we have invoked the spirit of light and truth; and by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the holy apostles Peter and Paul and our own authority we now pronounce and declare as definitely revealed this doctrine that Mary was immaculately conceived." It wasn't until 1950 that he could say, "It has now been revealed." Such a thing would get you to the stake in a great hurry a hundred years ago. And so it goes.

So let's move on to something else. This is the paradox we just encountered in Moses where he tells us . . . (I forgot my big text, but I've got the little one. Never be without a three-in-one, whatever happens. Be without a handkerchief, but never be without a three-in-one.) In Moses 1:35 he says, "But only an account of this earth, and the inhabitants thereof, give I unto you. For behold, there are many worlds . . . and innumerable are they unto man . . ." (I'm only going to tell you about this one, but there are many others.) Then in the next verse Moses says, ". . . tell me concerning this earth, . . . and then thy servant will be content. Then, ". . . God spake unto Moses, saying: [how does he talk about this earth?] The heavens, they are many, . . . And as one earth shall pass away, and the heavens thereof even so shall another come . . ." He begins by telling him there's not just one, but then says, You're going to leave that alone now. Leave the other worlds alone, but remember that they are there. Keep them in mind. Why? Well, as Aristotle says, "You can't understand anything unless you know the category it belongs to." There must be a genus and a species. That's why God is incomprehensible because there is nothing to compare him with. He doesn't belong to any class. Everything (houses, dogs, keys, floors) belongs to a class in which you find other things. You can classify it in that order and compare it with things most like it. That's taxonomy, the thing that the biologists argued about for so many generations. How do you define a genus and a species? They are still not defined, you know (what makes a genus and what makes a species), except they look alike. If it looks like an elephant, call it an elephant. So they tell us, for example, that the shrew, a little tiny animal, is closely related to the elephant. Other animals aren't, that look much more like elephants. But you have to keep them in mind. As Aristotle says, to understand anything, you must understand the category to which it belongs, what it is like and what it is not like. And that's why God is incomprehensible. Everything else has genus and species. If you understand this earth, you must understand it in terms of other planets. If it is unique like God, you are not going to get anywhere with it. The first thing to understand about this earth is that it's not the first world and not the last. So he says to Moses, Now I want you learn about this earth, but first of all remember it's like many others, "like unto

|p3

the other worlds that we have hitherto created." An endless line of them. It belongs to a category, it belongs to a species, it belongs to a family, it belongs to other things, and you are in a much larger picture. Why is that so important? As in the case of God, it's the only way we can avoid the absolute, and absolute is absolutely crippling and meaningless. When you say absolute, you have taken care of everything. When you say, "How can such a thing happen?" All you have to say is, "God can do anything," and you've got your answer, which is no answer. The absolute God doesn't answer anything or get anywhere; neither will an absolute earth. And especially the problem with evil.

There is a great literature of ascension where the hero ascends to heaven, sees the throne of God, comes back and reports, and leaves a record of it. The ascension literature is a very important part of apocalyptic, and it is very large. I'm not going to talk about it now, but there is an important theme to it. You have, for example, the Ascension of Elijah, the Ascension of Paul (all recently discovered among the Jews). You have the Ascension of Rabbi Ishmael who took the place of Enoch. You have the Ascension of Enoch who was taken to heaven. You have the Ascension of Abraham, the Testament of Abraham, the Apocalypse of Abraham, especially the Apocalypse of Abraham. In fact, there's hardly a prophet or an apostle of which we don't now have an ancient record of an ascension, when he went to heaven. When he goes to heaven in the case of Enoch, for example, which is the most important (that's the classic one), the hero asks his guide (he always has a guide, the Angel Michael or someone else). He goes there and he sees a venerable man sitting on a throne between two gates. Sometimes the venerable man is described as Adam, sometimes as Abel, sometimes Elijah. The judge is weeping and then he laughs. Then he weeps and then he laughs. This is found in some ancient ascension stories. Why does he weep; why does he laugh? Well, he laughs because of the spirits he is able to send (as the judge, he tests them) on to heaven through this door. It's a very ancient theme.

Remember, in the dream Virgil writes about the ivory gate, There are two gates, the gate of ivory and the gate of horn. The gate of ivory leads to bliss and heaven. The gate of horn leads to other things. Xenophon tells the story of Heracles at the crossroads. You come to the crossroads of the way of light and the way of darkness. It's universal, the doctrine of the two ways. But the reason he is weeping is that some people get by and go halfway to heaven. Why is he weeping? Because a lot of them must go to hell. What is the proportion? Some say seven thousand, some say seventy thousand. For every person who makes it to heaven, there are seven thousand or seventy thousand who must be condemned to hell. That's the proportion in this world. So you wonder then if God created the world out of nothing and all of a sudden, and these creatures are his own, is that exactly just? Why shouldn't anyone be weeping that he has created only one person in seven or seventy thousand to go to heaven? All the rest are denied anything but eternal damnation. They came into this world, which is bad enough, and then that happens.

Question: Where do you get your figure? You ask them; that's the way it is given. It's some odds. You could say seven to one. But at any rate is it fair to send all these people who didn't

|p4

exist before (you just made them what they are) to hell? Why did God make a doomed and suffering race out of nothing? This doesn't make sense that he's wholly responsible for what we are. You get the well-known verses from the *Rubaiyat* again:

Oh, Thou who did'st man of baser metal make
And who with Eden did'st create the snake [He made all these things]
For all the ill with which the face of man is blackened
Man's forgiveness give and take.

If God made us of baser metal, why shouldn't we sin? As he puts it in another verse:

Oh, Thou who did'st with pitfall and with gin
Beset the way I was to wander in
Wilt Thou then with predestination round enmesh me
And impute my fall to sin?

In the first place he made us of base metal and prone to sin. He must forgive us that way. We are not to blame for it, and we will forgive you for making us so miserable and having to go through all this. Then he says, "Why will you predestine us (following St. Augustine) to damnation before we are even created? This is what happens. These seven thousand are predestined to be damned according to Protestant and Catholic doctrine. There's nothing they can do about it. And "wilt Thou then with predestination round enmesh me?" He has set the traps for us. And then when you sin, He says, "Ha, you sinned." Here He sets a careful trap; He makes you a weak creature; He watches you walk into the trap, and He catches you and says, "You sinned." That doesn't seem fair, does it? This is a problem of evil, one of the problems that has never been solved. So our existence as a one-act play, in other words, makes no sense.

All the critics of *Oedipus* agree on that. *Oedipus* didn't have a chance. He didn't commit a real sin. He didn't know what he was doing. He shouldn't have gone through that. Well, Sophocles sees all that. They don't get the answer at all, which is in *Oedipus* at Colonus. That wasn't the only existence *Oedipus* had or will have. Euripides' Chorus is the same way. There is nothing you can do about this. In at least five of the last seventeen plays of Euripides, he ends with this same chorus. He says, "The gods take many forms and many unexpected things they bring to pass. And the things we'd always been taught to expect all our lives really don't go into fulfillment. And the thing you never would have expected, God finds a way for it to happen. So how are you going to explain this tragedy?" this chorus is saying at the end. "There's nothing you can say about it. That's just the way it is." Loosely translated, "that's the way the cookie crumbles." Life is unfair, as the big corporation says, when it really rips you off. "Well, we know it's unfair, but life is unfair." You're supposed to feel good about that. These aren't proper answers at all, so the one-act drama doesn't account for things. As far as we're concerned, it is not a one-act play. It has a terrific background. It's always been going on, and it falls naturally, as all the ancient plays do, into three parts. You can see

|p5

why—past, present and future. You begin with the epic which tells a story of a family, like the Oedipus story. The family of Labdacus begins with an ancient curse way back in the beginning. But there was something before that. Or the Prometheus takes you back. This is the second generation. There is going to be a third. Prometheus tells us what happened in the first play, what happened before in the Council in Heaven; next, what's happening here; and then what's going to happen hereafter. So you have first an epic. An **epos** is the broadest period of time. Then you present this particular slice of it, only a segment. You can only see a segment, but it's a great trilogy. It's three great plays. You break the trilogy down into three plays. That's what it means, three plays. Each play is divided into acts. There should be three. The past, present and future prescribe the general pattern of three. It doesn't have to be that, but this is what they nearly always follow. And each act breaks down into scenes. A scene, you may have noticed from Shakespeare, is whenever the scene changes or an actor leaves the stage or an actor comes on the stage. Then you have a new play; then you have a new situation, a new group of characters, a new *dramatis personae*. You have a new setting and a new scene. You go somewhere else and you have other people in it, so that's another play. Each of these are independent plays, yet they all belong together. You can't separate them. You come right down to a monologue, if you want, but they are all the same. You cannot understand a scene—it's not going to make much sense, unless you know the play it belongs to, unless you know the act it belongs to. You can't understand the act unless you know where it goes in the trilogy. And you can't understand the trilogy unless you know the big story, the epic. And the epic is on-going. It always goes back to the preexistence. It always takes you back to the courts on high. This is the thing that was corrupted by the Greek poets for fun, of course—the night life of the gods sort of thing. We don't know what happened back there, but it's always the on-going story. And, of course, this is what the Pearl of Great Price makes very clear to us.

There's also the physical reality we must consider. Now the pope has taken refuge in the "Big Bang" for example. In 1955 he did that. That's a singularity. That's not satisfactory. Remember, the singularity had to begin with the Big Bang. I was just reading in someone who said "the hateful word 'singularity' because you can't explain it." What was there before the Big Bang? All matter, all space was contained in one point that had no dimensions whatever. Well, that's absurd; to say the least it's singular. So they call it singularity, and it gives people a headache. They don't like it at all. But you begin with a singularity, and then comes the Big Bang. But the earth doesn't show up for a long time. It doesn't belong to that particular phase. You have to go through a photon phase when there's nothing but light. Then you go through a hydron phase and get hydrogen, helium. Then you're back to lepton phase again. Then things go together. You go through various phases. You go through a galactic phase, then a stellar phase, then supposedly a bio-phase some people suggest. But the thing is the earth didn't come along for a long time, and it's part of a very long process. There must have been something before the singularity. This is the thing that Henry Eyring, a great chemist up at the University of Utah, talked a good deal about. If all that stuff was compacted together, what jammed it together and where did it come from? We haven't answered a thing that way.

|p6

The pope wants singularity because it looks like creation out of nothing. Nothing there and then all of a sudden the big bang. You know how things happen there. But the earth isn't part of that show, nor the stars nor the galaxies. There may have been an incomprehensibly long and varied background, but there was a background. They used to put it at four and a half billion years. Within the last ten years they have changed it to fifteen and a half. Now they have more than doubled that because they can see farther out now with the new telescopes and techniques. So now they have it down to almost thirty billion years. They have almost doubled it, and it goes on doubling all the time.

We have been told about some of it in our scriptures, etc. Where do we find it? We have found it in the *Doctrina Arcana*, the ancient teachings handed down. What testifies to them? What kind of proof and support do you have to those ancient teachings handed down? Well, the best thing you have is using a comparative method and using a statistical method. How come Joseph Smith hits it on the head so often? Because he came just at the right time. In the middle of the nineteenth century everything took a new course. Science took over completely in everything—in humanities, geology, geography, astronomy and everything else. You get a different ball game. Joseph Smith came before that, and he gave us the whole thing before he could have drawn on any of that stuff. If he had come just twenty years later, you could have said again and again, "Ha, he lifted that from this, or he got that from this." Just as they say today that he got "it came to pass" from the Bible because you will find that in the Bible too. But of course. In fact every word in the Book of Mormon you will find in the dictionary. But that doesn't explain anything. But there was the council in the beginning and the plan, and that's what we have been talking about. We've been talking about the old documents. But there are scientific questions to be answered. We're not going to linger on them. If we get trapped in them, there are two disadvantages. One, I don't know anything about it. Two, it gets so interesting. You get involved and you never get off, and the time is limited. That's not our concern right now, but these we have to consider because we do talk about the creation. We have accepted the literal interpretation. We have accepted a multiplicity of worlds. We have accepted all the things that bind us to pay some attention to science. Now, granted all the answers of science are, as Popper tells us, so very clearly hypotheses, and they are all tentative leading to other tentative explanations. Nevertheless, we are prompted by data, and that data must be taken into consideration. What about it? You say, "Well now, we don't know how many other worlds, etc." We do know something basic. There are other things out there. So we have then the cosmological problem, the geological problem, the biological problem, and the historical problem. Those are the main ones that concern us in the creation business in which we need not linger. But they are all treated very nicely in the Pearl of Great Price. That's why we mention them.

Let's take the cosmological problem. The old record we were talking about. There's one thing that is on reserve that I would refer you to. It shows what a remarkable knowledge of things the ancients had, just taking it as science fiction. If they are speculating, they certainly have astonishing insights into things. So we're not going to talk about this, but we are very briefly

|p7

here. This article "Treasures in the Heavens" [Nibley] you will find on reserve. Things have been going on all along. This is what the early Christians preached. They were very much taken up with this idea that it's part of the larger picture, that the place has been seething with action long before our story begins. "This preoccupation with locus assumes a plurality of worlds, and indeed in our 'treasure' texts we often find 'worlds,' 'earths,' 'cosmoses' in the plural in the early Christian writings." One thing about this, it has massive footnotes, so you find plenty of references. You won't be suffering for lack of references here. "It is only the Fallen Angels led by the blind Samael [who is Satan] who insists: 'We are alone and there is none beside us.' [In his vanity he won't allow other worlds.] To the Sons of Light, on the other hand, there is opened up the grandiose vision of worlds 'united in the common knowledge of Him who made them, exchanging joyful and affectionate messages as they keep faith with one another . . .'"

Now this is pouring it on here. This is from the Mandaean books and the **Odes of Solomon** and the twelve questions, Mandaean and Coptic, and Dead Sea Scrolls. You will find these are quite frequently mentioned here. This is the way they talk. Here are these worlds "united in common knowledge of Him, exchanging joyful and affectionate messages as they keep faith with one another in the common Plan, and talk to each other and establish concord, each contributing something of its own to the common interest. The members of the vast complex are kept in perfect accord by the sustaining Word of God which reaches all alike, since it possesses through the power of the 'treasure' the capacity for traveling unlimited distances with inexpressible speed." So everything is coordinated and held together no matter how vast. "The Word is also the Son who has 'betaken himself to the numberless hidden worlds which have come to know him.'" We don't know them. There are numberless hidden worlds we know nothing about. As the Lord says, "They are known to me. Here is wisdom and it remaineth in me for my own purposes [you don't; they are hidden to you]." (Moses 1:31) ". . . angels with special assignments and marvelous powers of getting around, who constantly go forth on their missions and return with their reports." That's a very common theme: "We will return and report."

Then the very old writings here: "With all its perfect unity and harmony, the system presents a scene not of monotonous uniformity . . . [as you might expect]." One star looks much like another. You have a hundred elements. Everything is made of the same elements no matter where you go, so isn't it very monotonous, just more of the same, more and more worlds? What satisfaction in that? Ah no, there's an easy way out of that. ". . . presents a scene not of monotonous uniformity but rather of endless and delightful variety: . . . 'they are all different from each other, and He has not made one of them superfluous[there's not one too many because it is like anybody else]; hence, each has good things to exchange with its neighbors.'" That same author, the inventor of the radar, Arthur Clarke, says, "If you had a million computers [this is playing a game of checkers] and each computer made a million moves a second, how long would it take to play all the combinations possible among your checkers, just sixteen checkers?"

|p8

In ten minutes you could do an awful of lot moves. It would take three hundred billion billion years for you to play all the possible games of checkers. You can figure it out; it comes out very quickly. Just use the factorials, and it comes right out. To play just a game of checkers. So don't worry about running out of combinations because given these elements they can do all sorts of things with them. Look at one that is used by Fred Hoyle, the eighty-eight keys on the keyboard. All your music comes from just eighty-eight notes. All the melodies come from just eight. So they never get tired.

"At a new creation there is a reshuffling of elements, . . ." Incidentally, that's a quotation, the last one, and that's from **Ben Sirach**, one of the most old venerable and universally accepted of all writings. It belongs in the Bible. It's in the **Odes of Solomon**; it's in the **Ginza**; it's in the Mandaean **Johannesbuch**; it's in Berlin **Manichaeon**; it's in the **Pistis Sophia**, the oldest and best of all the Coptic writings. So this is a common teaching here. "At a new creation there is a reshuffling of elements [that's what you would expect], like the rearranging of notes in the musical scale to make a new composition. It has even been suggested, as we have noted, that old worlds may be dismantled to supply stuff for the making of newer and better ones." That's the one where you get the **sorm** that's mixed up.

This is how it happens (quoting from "Treasures in the Heavens" by Nibley): "Beginning with a very old Egyptian idea, recently examined by E. A. E. Reymond, that the creation of the world was really a re-creation by 'transforming substances' that had already been used in the creation of other worlds, the Jewish and Christian apocryphal writers envisage a process by which the stuff of worlds is alternately organized into new stars and planets, and when these have served their time, scrapped, decontaminated, and re-used in yet more new worlds." As we know today, this world wouldn't exist if a star hadn't exploded. It had to explode after it had gone through its life cycle and done all the pretty things it should do. Bam, it was blown to smithereens. That alone produced the heavy elements that are necessary to make a world like this. So as one world completes its cycle, the whole thing has to be re-cycled again into a new one, and then goes through the same process again. Newer stuff is constantly re-cycled is the **tohu wabohu** (which the Egyptians call the **hu**) of the Jewish teachers who saw the ultimate forms of matter in fire and ice. It was either complete energy as it is in the photon period when there's nothing but light, nothing but energy. No particles have any weight, no mass whatsoever—nothing but fire or nothing but ice. Nothing moves at the completion of the cycle of entropy when everything dies down to a dead unit, nothing but a pile of ash. So it is either completely cold or it's completely hot.

According to Jewish teachings, these are the two ultimate forms of matter. "Likewise," according to the same authority, "the world holocaust of the Stoics was merely a necessary preparation for the making of new worlds from old materials. The whole thrust of Weiss' book is that until the early Christian Apologists [in the fourth century] we find no trace anywhere of a doctrine of creation out of nothing." Well, we've seen that before. So this is interesting.

"And so we have in the **Pistis Sophia**, continuing the Egyptian teachings, the picture of a constant remixing (**kerasmos**) [it uses the Greek word **kerasmos**, mixing up all the time] going on in the universe in which old, worn-out, contaminated substances, the refuge [or garbage] of worn-out worlds and kingdoms, is first thrown out on the scrap-heap and returned to chaos as dead matter [what do you do with it then?] then melted down in a dissolving fire for many years, by which all impurities are removed from it, and by which it is 'improved,' and is ready to be 'poured from one kind of body into another.' This whole process by which the souls as well as substances are 'thrown back into the mixing,' is under the supervision of Melchizedek, the great reprocessor, purifier, and preparer of worlds. He takes over the refuge of a defunct world or souls, and under his supervision the five great Archons [they are the five principles; they are always talking about the five principles; this is Egyptian too] process it . . . each one specializing in particular elements, which they thus recombine in unique and original combinations, so that no new world or soul is exactly like any other."

Well, they get it going by going into something like a spiral nebula. "In this full blown pleniarism there is no waste and no shortage: 'If there were any superfluous or any lacking, the whole body would suffer, for the worlds counterpoise one another like elements of a single organism.' The worlds go on forever: 'They come and come and cease not, they ever increase and are multiplied, yet are not brought to an end nor do they decrease.'" Well they took that answer to the three questions: Is the universe expanding so slowly that gravity will finally take hold and draw it back together into another singularity? Is it growing so fast that it will go on forever? Or is it balanced in equilibrium so it will get so large and never get any smaller? So this says it is eternal expansion. The whole process is thrown back into the mixing. "It is essentially the Plan that all physical things should pass away." Well, that's the way it goes. The mere mechanics are quite astonishing.

We go on to a new world now. This is important too. "The mere mechanics of the creation process described in our 'treasure' texts display truly remarkable scientific insight. For the making of the world the first requirements, we are told, are a segment of empty space [for there is space there, first of all], pure and unencumbered, and a supply of primordial matter [matter unorganized] to work with." Those are the two things you need according to this doctrine; again, both of them well documented here. (We will go down for there is space there, and we will take of these substances and we will make a world; "yonder is matter unorganized.") "Mere empty space and inert matter are, however, forbidding and profitless things in themselves, disturbing and even dangerous for humans to be involved with—contemplating them, the mind is seized with vertigo until some foothold is found in the void [you go crazy]. The order and stability of a foundation are achieved through the operation of a 'Spark.' [The Spark is very important; it is what starts this inert matter into life again.] "The Spark is sometimes defined as 'a small idea' that comes forth from God and makes all the difference between what lives and what does not . . . " Remember the thought of his heart in the Shabako text. It was conceived in the mind of God and then on the tongue of God, and that brought it about.

|p10

But first "it is this idea that makes all the difference between what lives and what does not."

The **Vision of Kenaz** is very interesting. It was the Prophet Zenos who lived between Moses and Isaiah, and he gave the prophecy about the vineyard. The Book of Jacob in the Book of Mormon tells the story of the vineyard at great length as it was accounted by the old prophet Zenos. Of course, **Zenos** wasn't discovered until 1906. So the Book of Mormon knows about Zenos too. But Zenos says that. "Compared with it all the worlds are but as a shadow, since it is the Spark whose light moves all (material) things.' It is the ultimate particle, the '**ennas**, which came from the Father of those who are without beginning,' emanating from the Treasure-house of Light from which all life and power is ultimately derived. Thanks to the vivifying, organizing power of the Spark [we'll call it that; we don't know anything better to call it. It's a very good word because of the electrical analogy. What is the spark that jumps the gap; nobody knows—unsatisfied electron, I suppose], we find throughout the cosmos an infinity of dwelling places, **topoi**, either occupied or awaiting tenants. These are colonized by migrants from previously established 'toposes' [**topos**, a place in space] or worlds, all going back ultimately to a single original center. The colonizing process is called 'planting' [they always use plant; you will plant another world; you will take the seeds down and plant; you will plant Adam there], and those spirits which bring their treasures to a new world are called 'Plants,' or more rarely 'seeds,' of their Father or 'Planter' in another world. Every planting goes out from the Treasure-house, either as the essential material elements or as the colonizers themselves who come from a sort of mustering area called the 'Treasure-house of Souls.'" Always there's that in-between place which the early Christians called the **refrigarium** or the **anapausus**, the place where you stop and rest between worlds, a sort of pressure chamber to accustomize yourself. When you came into this world, there was the birth shock; and when you go out, you'll be left in a pleasant garden (a greenhouse) to rest and collect your senses and get ready for the next step—get over the shock. Back in the old times with the ritual dramas, you had the greenhouse for that purpose. You pass from one act, one phase, to another. The actor goes to the greenhouse where you rest, refresh yourself, and get ready for the next strenuous act that is to follow. These things run throughout everything.

"With its 'planting' completed, a new world is in business, a new Treasury has been established from which new Sparks may go forth in all directions to start the process anew in ever new spaces; God wants every man to 'plant a planting' . . . This is a very interesting quotation, incidentally. It's from that second Gnostic work I mentioned before and Reymond and the **Gospel of Philip** (that's a good one, you know). He says, "God wants every man to 'plant a planting.' nay, he has promised that those who keep his Law may also become creators of worlds." Now that's a flat statement from the earliest gospel we know, even earlier than the **Gospel of Philip**, after the New Testament. That's the **Gospel of Thomas**. That's the **Gospel of Philip**. If you keep his law, you may also become creators of worlds. He wants you to be. "But keeping the Law requires following the divine pattern at every point; in taking the Treasure to a new world, the Sent One (who follows hard on the heels of the colonists) [He goes to teach them. The teacher is sent to teach Adam after he is in the world.] seeks nothing so much as

|p11

complete identity with the one who sent him; hence, from first to last one mind alone dominates the whole boundless complex." ("Call upon God in the name of the Son forever more.") But you call upon God, and God only, in the name of the Son. "Because each planting is completely dependent on its Treasure-house or home base, the system never breaks up into independent systems; in this patriarchal order all remains forever identified with the Father from whom all ultimately come forth."

Well, we here on earth are not aware of all this because we comprehend only what we are like. So that's quite a system they had. They didn't work it out. They had it going among the early Christian and Jewish societies. That's the cultural problem here. Now, the important thing to remember is that at all times we only see part of the picture. Of course, that's the weakness. Here's a very interesting quotation on that in this book. Some of you may have it now, *The Dancing Wu Li Masters*. It's required in Professor Garner's physics course. This is the situation, you see. "The general theory of relativity shows us that our minds follow different rules than the real world does. A rational mind, based on the impressions that it receives from its limited perspective, forms the structures which thereafter determine what it further will and will not accept freely." Everything that goes into your world, every structure, is determined by what you have already accepted of it, and you accepted that very early. That limits you very much, notice. "A rational mind [perfectly reasonable] based on the impressions that it receives from its limited perspective, forms structures [and you have to] which thereafter determine what it further will and will not accept freely. From that point on, regardless of how the real world actually operates [our thought has nothing to do with the real world from that point on; it's ours; this is the doctrine of anthropism] this rational mind, following its own self-imposed rules, tries to superimpose on the real world its own version of what must be." Every scientist, every artist, everybody does that. You impose upon the real world, whatever it is, your own version of what it must be in view of your experience of what has gone on. And your experience is very limited, so where does that get us? "The important thing is that we are very limited here in that regard," he says.

"The common denominator of all experience is the I that does the experiencing, you [this is physics he is talking about]. In short, what we experience is not external reality, but our interaction to it. This is a fundamental assumption of complementarity." Then he quotes Niels Bohr, "The necessity of a final renunciation of the classical idea of causality and radical revision of our attitude toward the problem of physical reality . . ." We must make a radical revision of our attitude toward physical reality here. What's happening then? "The special theory of relativity and quantum mechanics have propelled us into unimaginably expansive areas of reality, areas about which we literally had not one previous idea." It's all different from what we ever supposed before, so we must prepare ourselves for all sorts of shocks, and not resent it and dig in our heels because this is the structure we've already made. "Not one physicist, not even Max Planck himself [when he discovered the famous Planck constant which is so very important] wanted to accept the implications of Planck's discovery." And the great Heisenberg wrote about

|p12

this quantum revolution, "When new groups of phenomena compel changes in the pattern of thought, even the most eminent of physicists find immense difficulties [they don't want to change], for the demand for change in the thought pattern may engender the feeling that the ground is to be pulled out from under their feet. I believe the difficulties at this point can hardly be overestimated." You've got to pull yourself out into a wholly new situation. As Moses said, "Which thing I never had supposed." He starts out learning about reality he didn't know about before. "The powerful awareness lies dormant in these discoveries, an awareness of the hitherto unsuspected powers of the mind to mold reality rather than the other way around." Bacon said, You just observe and the phenomenon itself will tell you what to think and what to believe. The phenomenon itself will give you not only the theory, it will give you the facts. You just observe the facts and make no judgments. Keep an open mind, and you will see things as they are. That's the Baconian theory, and it sounds very quaint today. In this sense we still hear it from people who think they are detached, impersonal, cool, objective observers. They are not at all, but rather the other way around. "In this sense the philosophy of physics is becoming indistinguishable from the philosophy of Buddhism, which is the philosophy of enlightenment. Even though they are space-like separated, the state of the particle in area B depends on what the observer in area A decides to observe [what you decide to observe], that which he orients, his magnetic field." What you decide to look at is what you will see. You decide what the universe is going to be, to look at. And so it goes on and on. "Thus one is led to the new notion of unbroken wholeness [our dealing with just one system] which denies the classical idea of analyzability of the world into separately and independently existent parts." Well, this gets rather mysterious when you start talking that way, doesn't it? And so we get onto these problems of the physical world. This takes us to the geological problem. We talked a lot about cosmology, and the main thing is the geological problem.

The whole thing in geology is that you never begin at the beginning. You always come in after the show has been going on a long time. That's what Teilhard de Chardin showed. This is the *National Geographic* from last August. It gives a graphic picture of what the situation is here—where we come in. You follow the earth back. It goes back, back, back—goes through all these phases. Then the interesting thing to notice these billions of years ago is a thing that had never been noticed before. All of a sudden comes a mass extinction 650 million years ago. Then again 230 million years ago comes a mass extinction of everything that was there. Then 65 million years ago. That was the beauty; that's the one we learn about in the temple and in the Pearl of Great Price—that one between the Cretaceous and the Tertiary, 65 million years ago. Some of you may have seen Alvarez at Berkeley give a documentary last week on this very thing. At that time at least 95 percent of all life forms on earth were completely wiped out and had to be replaced by totally new forms. You can see why. Then at the bottom it has a very interesting thing. Today it says, "Man-induced extinction." That's where we are now. We're going to get another one of those mass extinctions. But it makes this interesting remark in the beginning. "Far more dynamic than ever imagined, our mother planet constantly renews her surface and changes her face in vast movements hidden in time from our short-lived

|p13

species." The whole business of old-fashioned evolution was just one steady, constant, unchanging rate; that accounted for everything. "Now space-age tools help explore the massive advances of crustal plates [notice, space-age tools; we must go into the outer universe to discover what's happening on home base] and the creation of new landforms as we discover a 'new' planet under our feet." (I've created a new world like unto the other worlds that were hitherto before Adam.) So Adam does find himself on a new world, but that doesn't mean there was nothing there before. Just as we find ourselves today on a new world. Some things may have held over, like the **coelacanthus**, or some freaks that shouldn't be found there at all. Cousteau is always blundering on things like living gastropods that had no business living after all those billions of years. These things we consider briefly, but they are given quite a play in the books of Moses and Abraham, and that's why it is right to consider them.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 15

I see they keep coming. Someday I might say something worth listening to. They want to be there to catch it. So far it's like fishing. They patiently wait with the line in the water. Someday, he'll say something.

Well now, we were talking about the new world, remember. The reason I bring *National Geographic* around is that they are light, easy to carry, and you can get copies of them. There are some better textbooks to be sure. We were talking about this particular fold and the scales on the back. It talks about various times in which there have been mass exterminations and comes down to this mass extermination, 65 million years ago. Here's one back here at 220, etc. They have taken place all along, and after a mass extermination . . . How mass are they? Oh, ninety percent, not a hundred percent. But the funny thing is that after each one takes place, new forms of life appear just as suddenly as the old ones disappeared, which is a very strange shift of things. And as it says here, what this amounts to, allowing for these mass exterminations, is that we have living creation of new landforms as we discover a new planet under our own feet. We're not living in the same planet the dinosaurs lived in at all, some of the same substratum or not.

We have a lot about that in the Pearl of Great Price, a good deal about it. This doesn't mean that it's a new earth, a new world. In Matthew 24, which is in the Pearl of Great Price, it gives us that proper version of it with the chronological order, etc., and the last verse of that says this. It has given us three times when the world comes to an end. It finally gives us the one in our own day, and it follows up by saying . . . (this is the one that follows immediately after the Book of Abraham, Writings of Joseph Smith, number one). The last verse says this, which is very significant, "And thus cometh the end of the wicked, according to the prophecy of Moses, saying: They shall be cut off from among the people; but the end of the earth is not yet, but by and by." He has three times said it is the end of the world, or the destruction of the wicked. Finally, we get to the last one in these last days, but that's not the end of the earth. It's the first time he uses that expression, end of the earth. The earth is something else. That will be, I'm not telling you when, it doesn't concern you now. ". . . but the end of the earth is not yet, but by and by," it says. So when we say these are the latter days and the last days (which they are), the last days of what? Well, they are not the last days of the earth, but they are the last days of the world.

What changes take place here? Well, I'd better dig up Otto H. Schindewolf here, if I have him. In the 1950s German paleontologists began to notice certain patterns, very distinct sharply marked patterns of extinction (it better be here too; I had it all laid out). In 1963 there was an interesting summary. The interesting thing about this (it's called neocatastrophism) is that the

|p2

earth has been destroyed by catastrophes. It's not the old catastrophism that Cuvier talked about, the Flood, etc. There have been various catastrophes, and neocatastrophe is here to stay. They mocked it at first (this article is from 1963), but now no longer. There's a great deal about it. In fact, you may see more about this in documentaries on KUED and KBYU than almost any other subject now, which is this neocatastrophism. This article I'm referring to particularly here is by Otto H. Schindewolf. He's not the one that invented it, but he made the first earth-shaking publication on the subject. It had already been noticed in 1959 by Stopano, but this is Schindewolf. It came out in the *Zeitschrift für der deutschen geologischen Gesellschaft* for 1963, volume 114. Now, this is the story he tells us: In the history of the world's organisms, especially in the animal kingdom, there have been drastic turning points from time to time. There has been on the one hand an almost total extinction of numerous species and at the same time the sudden emergence of totally difference species. That's a strange shift. This, of course, is in contradiction to Darwin's doctrine of gradual evolution, occurring by natural selection. Convinced neo-Darwinists, like Newell and Simpson, have now reneged and come over and are accepting this.

When I first came to BYU, George Gaylord Simpson was the "little tin god." Everything he said went. He was the straight Darwinist. Everybody lived by Simpson around here. But remember at that time they knew nothing about plate tectonics. We knew nothing about any of this stuff. Of course, no probes had been sent into space or anything like that. The whole picture has changed now. Well, this is the way he gives it to us, and that it happened suddenly. This is the thing. This sudden extermination began almost instantly, almost overnight, the same way, and then the reappearance of forms. He gives us some charts here; we don't go into them. Here he gives us a breakdown. He lists about forty different life forms. You will recognize some of them. This is in the Archeozoic which is the Cambrian, the Ordovician and Silurian. Here they are lined up. They go along very nicely, and they continue the line. Then all of a sudden, most of them disappear. These are recognized. They are the foraminifera, the radiolaria, and the radiolarian shirk. I remember I went on a geology expedition to Oxnard, California, to study foraminifera and radiolaria years ago. And the annelida, and around here you get the brachiopods and the trilobites, and all those things we don't have with us anymore. They were very abundant, but they disappeared. Then this goes into the Carboniferous which is the Mississippian, Pennsylvanian, and then Permian. Then what happens after you get to the Permian after all that Carboniferous? They all disappear. All the Carboniferous life forms disappear. In their place all these others appear. On the one side he has a line here. Everything goes up there and stops abruptly. Some of the things bleed over just a little tiny bit here, but not very many. And some of these begin a little earlier, but only one. They all begin all of a sudden when this one ends and that one begins in the Triassic and Jurassic. Then they carry over, the Jurassic, into the Cretaceous. Then comes the big break, the important one for us; that's between the Jurassic and Tertiary. That's here when all these forms disappear. All of them go and all of these new ones appear. There's no carrying over—an astounding thing. Well, what's going on here? This is not the picture we had of gradual, steady, gentle, constant, continual evolution in response to natural environment and survival of the fittest, which you hear so much about.

|p3

Now, what could have caused it? Well, in the 1940s they discovered the tektites around Australia first. You know what tektites are; they are little bits of glass, not volcanic glass, but little chunks of glass, usually small. They are shaped often like dumbbells, sometimes like little droplets. They were found in the sea, first in Australia, and then various other places. Here's the radiolaria, and here are the tektites. These are magnified. When they fell from the sky, they were in a molten condition. Naturally, they cooled off, and as they cooled their molecules lined up with the magnetic pole of the earth, which was not where it is today. The magnetic pole shifts around, and so we are able to date them. So these tektites were near Australia, and they are dated about 700 million years B.C. So that's the Southeast Asia. Now what could have caused it? Then the next one was West Africa. The next one is very important, the Nordlingen Rift. Then finally the Texas. These are the only places in the world where these are found, and they are always showered out in a particular direction. The Southeast Asia dates 700 million years. The West African one dates almost an even million years. The Nordlingen Rift is very interesting because we see all about them, where they came from. They are still older. Here is a space view of Nordlingen which is a town in south-central Germany. It was very important in the conflicts of the Reformation. Here it is. That's the big hole you see. It's a big hole twelve miles across. The town of Nordlingen is in it. You wouldn't notice it if it wasn't from space. It's this big hole. All the tektites scatter out from it. They go clear over into Moravia and Czechoslovakia, so it's called the Moravian tektites. They fan out in a particular order. This is the hole a meteorite made and the direction from which it came. It was a big meteorite, and it hit 14,600,000 years ago. Finally, the Texas one hit. That was the longest ago, 34,000,000.

When these hit, what happened? They gave a very strong jar to the earth. I might as well read from something here. Just this week there have been two documentaries on PBS on this very subject. What happened here? Alvarez and his son, two famous geologists, were doing some work in Gubbio in Italy (that's the famous Iguvium). The oldest Roman writings we have are the **Iguvine Tablets**. They come from the Arval, the Arbor and the Salian Brethren. These are ancient rites performed long before the days of Rome. They are very ancient stuff. But this is much older because when Brother Alvarez was working in there, he discovered between the Cretaceous and the Tertiary just a one inch line of iridium. Everything under the iridium belongs to the Cretaceous. These are dinosaurs here. After this there are none of them. They are just swarming here, and there are none of them here. So what happened? Something in between wiped them out. Here are the Cretaceous and the Tertiary. This is our new forms of life. Notice, how he lists the Tertiary as it turns to carnivores and birds and all the stuff we know today. They come there. But iridium is an element that is very rare on the earth, but it occurs in meteorites commonly. So what happened? Well, maybe a big meteorite struck the earth and showered iridium all over, iridium dust, among other things. It's in far higher percentage than it should be. But then they went elsewhere and found the same thing in Iceland. They found exactly the same sort of deposits in the same order and the same color (sort of yellowish brown) between these two in Montana. Throughout the whole world then, there

|p4

is a layer of iridium under which all life is extinguished and above which new forms of life appear. Well, what could have happened there?

Richard Muller at Berkeley noticed another thing. These extinctions occur with clocklike regularity geologically almost every 26 million years. Now, what could possibly account for that regularity? Why every 26 million years? He got into a big argument with the Alvarezs about this. But everybody is coming around now. It's the theory of Nemesis and the Oort Cloud. This sounds like science fiction, doesn't it, the monsters? What happened is that the sun has a dark companion star which in its orbit comes within a critical distance from the sun at a particular time. Or it runs into the Oort Cloud at a particular time—its orbit being every 26 million years. Every 26 million years everything starts getting stirred up, and the earth gets hit with a lot more meteorites than ordinarily. There is a patch of busted up matter out there called the Oort Cloud. It's supposed to be a sort of nursery for comets. We're hearing a lot about comets today with Halley's, etc. Comets come regularly, and every time this sun hits this Oort Cloud, it stirs things up and sends comets scattering in all directions. Many more than usual come toward the earth. The earth gets a regular shower of them every 26 million years. There's a better chance of getting hit, and so these big things come along and whack everything. When they hit the earth, what happens? Well, they jar it to its foundations. Here's the earth, and it is protected by a magnetic field. That protects it from the cosmic rays from outside and from the solar wind from inside, both of which have radioactive particles. They're dangerous. So this is the solar wind here. There is a place way out in space where they meet and cause a turbulent zone around the whole solar system.

When this comes and hits, what does it do? It shatters and breaks down the magnetic shield. You can see why it doesn't hold up in the North. You can see these ionized particles in the northern lights up here. That's why they get through because the shield goes in this form. Out there are the Van Allen belts and other things to protect it. When this gets very solidly whacked, what happens? At the beginning you have the earth's crust, which is only twenty miles thick; you have its mantle, and then you have two cores in the center. There's a molten area between them so that they don't turn at the same rate. That differential acts as a dynamo and sets up the magnetic field that protects the earth. But when this gets badly jarred, the liquid all "scubzes" up. The thing doesn't turn at a regular rate. The shield breaks down, and the rays get through. Notice the double action here. We should be reading some of these things now. What happens when these hit the earth? Well, tremendous amounts of dust and smoke start fires throughout the earth. It covers the earth with a veil of dust. The breakdown lasts for about a thousand years, but meantime the earth is covered with dust. This iridium one is the one that happened between the dinosaurs and us, 65 million years ago. When it breaks down, the dust and the smoke, especially the dust (and the meteoric dust as well), covers the earth for a period of time and causes most life to disappear. They figure that at a minimum 95 percent of all life forms were destroyed. It's the equivalent of five thousand kilotons of atom bombs. We have fifty thousand already to shoot off. So here comes our atomic winter which is very real.

|p5

How come the new forms of life appear so suddenly then? Well, what happens when you get these radioactive particles? What do they do to genes? What do they do to DNA? They cause spots, mutations, freaks, all sorts of things to appear. So all of a sudden you are going to have strange creatures coming out, a great variety of them. Then, I suppose, the natural selection gets to work and certain ones survive while others don't. But here you're going to have a whole new story coming along. These creatures appear very suddenly; they call them sports for that reason. They appear because there is nothing to protect them from these dangerous radioactive particles that we are cooking up so much in our own society.

Comets have built up the earth. It's the comets that do this. There is nothing you can do about it if they are going to hit the earth. Let's go to this one, Hoimar von Ditfurth. This book is not in the library. It's a very good one. This man is sort of the NBC man for the continent. He's in charge of all their scientific documentaries, etc. I have copied the relevant passages and chapters and you can get them on reserve. There is some interesting stuff here, but you can get this in plenty of other books; this is only a very convenient one. He says here, talking about the moon, "Meteors do frequently crash into the moon, and the resultant explosions really do hurl large quantities of lunar matter into space. This process has been going on for billions of years, so that by now the surface of our planet must be almost buried in lunar matter. You can pick up moon rocks anywhere you go. There can be no doubt that at some time in our lives each of us has held a moon rock in his hand. Unfortunately, we cannot tell the difference between earth rock and moon rock." Then he goes to the others. Now, this is a thing that is being taken very seriously today. Alvarez and the other boys are into this. We're talking about comets. "Their orbits may be two or three light years away from the sun [enormous orbits. Remember, a comet has two orbits. It's an elliptical thing that goes way out there.] At these remote points the comets are already traveling in the border of regions neighboring the solar system [almost outside the solar system] where they sometimes cross paths with comets from neighboring systems [they intermeet there]. At such times two comets may actually change orbits—that is each comet begins to orbit a new sun—thus a constant exchange of matter takes place at the border regions of the neighboring solar systems. When a comet approaches the center of its system, it falls under the influence of various massive bodies in the region, including its own sun. How fascinating to realize that the surface of our planet must be strewn with matter from other solar systems." Well, the more recent report here is that our earth is almost totally made up of matter brought to it by comets. That's Parley P. Pratt's old theory. Remember, he used to defend that. It might be interesting to listen to later on, but we won't have time.

Now here, "Each galaxy began to attract great masses of interstellar dust and meteoric material from all the other galaxies in the group." We said the last time that all the worlds share with each other, each partake of each other. They make a common course—this being the old Christian and Jewish doctrine dealing with this same thing. "So the cosmic debris streams out from galaxies and begins to form a bridge between them [we actually have a photograph of

|p6

that going on]. This matter [that is brought by comets] tears down and builds up all objects, providing new raw materials for new creation. This metabolism resembles the metabolic process of organic life, a new combination, a new creation." Oh, what a shocking thing to say! How unchristian. Haven't I heard the expression, "We have a new world, like unto the other worlds that were created." Every time something is said about delivering something to this world, a specification is made, like unto the other worlds. It's going to be the same matter and the same substance and follow the same pattern. This is nothing strange here. This is what we have been talking about all the time—this delivery among the worlds. This is made like unto other worlds, and as far as the matter is concerned, the same thing. This goes a long ways. "Astrospectographers who snapped a picture with illustrations 25 [it's in here] were not recording a unique event—the Milky Way containing matter of other Milky Ways. During the past few billion years, a certain quantity of extra-galactic matter [now we're going outside the galaxy] has continually filtered down to the surface of the earth from outside this galaxy." The picture he is talking about is this surprising picture showing exchanges between galaxies going on. It's really something. And remember, there are billions of stars counted, but there are more billions of galaxies. There are more galaxies than there are stars that have been counted—a hundred billion at the very least. Galaxies, mind you, and each one has an average of a hundred billion stars. So there is a lot of stuff out there. We have just recently almost doubled the expanse. We thought that was the end. It's not the end. But here they are swapping around with each other, and we are doing the same sort of thing. It's the same picture we get in the books of Abraham and Moses. Apparently, we are looking at an actual example of intergalactic exchange of matter, metabolism of the cosmos. Notice, "yonder is matter [the things you have to have]; let us organize it into a world like unto the other worlds." So we are following the pattern. "Yonder is matter, and there is space there."

Yesterday being a nice day (it's 70 degrees now, and everybody should be absent if they had any sense, including me) I went on a hike and I went up Indian Creek. Nobody knows about that. It's not far from here, a very short distance with a magnificent waterfall in it. Nobody knows about that either. I had been up late last October, and it was beautiful. I thought it would be nice to see the falls and see if they are really roaring now because they always run. They drain half the west side of Timp. What did I find? All around I saw irreducible rock—rock that's the same stuff as the planets, and it had been there a long time. But I hardly recognized the place. There were three avalanches. The first one covered the trail, but you could climb over it. It was snow. The second one was a "humdinger." It was huge boulders, huge rocks, trees all mashed up. It completely smashed and took out the trail, left nothing there. You have to climb over it. There was sort of a gorge. Then when you approach the falls, there is a perpetual trickle of water coming down. Just because of that little trickle, at the base of it was a huge snow slide. The water had caused it to come down. Well, what did we learn from that about the processes of the creation? The Lord has told us that first of all we start out with the waters, and they are very important—the darkness covering the waters. As the scripture says, "Darkness brooded over the face of the deep."

|p7

Is this sort of thing possible? Well, it certainly is. I hope I can find something here. As you know, we have been looking at the big satellites of other planets and seeing amazing things now. Here is the planet Io where seven active volcanoes have been seen in action. Nobody ever dreamed things would be like that out in dead space there. But the most interesting ones are the many planets that are covered with water. Here for example is Europa. The whole surface is covered with water, the same kind we have. And Saladis which is coated with ice and long crevasses, broad white marks. Antiona has water geysers that shoot up from it all the time (so much water around every place; it's an absolutely amazing thing). The biggest one of all is Ganymede here. We're talking about the moons of Saturn now. The interesting thing about Titan (there's an article here on Titan) is that it's raining there all the time. It never stops. It's covered first with a blue atmosphere, a blue sky. Under that it is raining methane. It's covered with methane all the time, and it's a sort of drizzle that sort of comes down. The gas on other planets can be ethane. I wouldn't want to light a match if I were there because that's the gas we use for house heating and all that sort of thing, the next step from methane. It is very organic. It's a hydrocarbon, C_2H_4 . Ethane is very elementary gas; very necessary. We find all these organic elements on these planets. The interesting thing about some of them is that they're perpetually raining right now. They have clouds, and some of them used to. Looking at Mars, we saw that it once was completely covered with clouds and had torrential rains which produced those rills all over the place that are so much like rills we take from the earth and from other planets (there are a few on the moon).

Here's a big boy. This is Titan. The outermost layer is this bluish transparent haze of organic carbon-based compounds. Below that is a thick layer of smog (it's getting almost like the earth), again organic compounds but of larger particles, characteristically red. Then fine methane sleet falls out of perpetually cloudy sky. Methane is closely related and acts just like water. It says here, "Since methane likely plays the same role as water does on earth, it can be solid, liquid or gas [just like water]." But on most of the big satellites (and some of these are bigger than the planet Mercury) it's water that comes down and covers them completely. But this fine methane sleet falls out of perpetually cloudy sky. "Jagged methane escarpments rise from a methane lake under a weak, obscured sun where full daylight may be comparable to full moonlight on earth." Well, now look at the picture we get here on earth. Darkness covers the face of the earth in the beginning. But we are told in Abraham 4:2 that to begin with there was nothing but earth, and then the rest had to come. But it was just rock like the rest of them, just silicon dioxide (SiO_2), just like all our rocks and sand. So yesterday, I saw these mountains and hills, and I saw the signs of plate tectonics. Of course, we didn't know about that before. Along here we have the subduction, all along the Wasatch Front, which causes an upthrust to come up. It heats the ground. Near the coast where it is even more active, it gives us things like St. Helens and that whole chain of volcanoes like open sores along the Cascade Range. These things are taking place here, and so what forms first of all out of this are the mountains and the hills because this is basic. This is the motion of the earth's plates and the motion of its surface. Then what comes next?

|p8

Great rivers and small streams. Those are the things that do the work, and that is what I saw yesterday. There are no great rivers around, but these small streams were breaking down the mountain. That big snow slide was caused by that innocent little trickle that goes down all the time. You could see plain enough among the strata (I think its Pennsylvania stuff there) how the water was seeping through everywhere.

I wouldn't advise you to picnic up there for awhile because there are some very dangerous overhanging rocks there. They were rumbling down while I was there. It's still happening. If you go up and spend the night at Emerald Lake on Timp, it's lots of fun. All night long you hear rumble, rumble—just rocks rolling all night long. If you look at the snow down there, it's all covered with litter of rock and dust coming down all night and all day long, especially when it freezes at night. Then in the morning it thaws out and the stuff is loosened up. When it freezes, naturally it expands and widens the cracks. The water melts from the snow, gets down in the cracks, and freezes overnight. When it freezes, it opens cracks wider and wider and down the stuff comes. It comes down all the time. So we have mountains and hills, great rivers and small streams, and that gives the face of the earth the characteristics it has. Those are the two big things, as you know—mountain building and erosion. Why? Well, we are told to give variety and beauty to the scene. Was all of this being done for my benefit? Well I'm glad I was thoughtful enough to go there. Otherwise, it would have been wasted. Nobody else was up there. So the Lord is tearing down this mountain just so I can enjoy the variety and beauty of the scene. That's legitimate. If you happen to be there, you can enjoy it. But this is another thing we must remember here all the time. It's for the benefit of others too. This pluralism we must keep insisting on; namely, that the earth is meant for a multiple purpose. We are told that. "I have commanded every form of life to multiply in its respective sphere and element [it has its place] that every form of life may fulfill the measure of its creation and have joy therein." I'm not the only one that's supposed to enjoy this. Others are supposed to enjoy it too. This whole thing is to be enjoyed by lots of people and lots of things. But the variety and beauty is a perfectly legitimate thing to have there if we are there to enjoy it.

It's like the miracles. Miracles are nearly always a matter of timing. The Red Sea often withdrew when the wind was in the right direction, but especially at that time there were lots of earthquakes. It was a very active time. The sea withdrew and then it came back again like a tsunami. It didn't have to come back much if it was a strong wind. It was those sand flats by the bitter lakes, and the Israelites walked over them. Pharaoh came along with heavy chariots with narrow wheels. They would sink into that as soon as the water came back. A foot or two would be enough to stall them hopelessly. They couldn't get out of there at all. It just happened to be at the right time; the Lord can see things coming. They crossed the Jordan the same way, the way it is described in Joshua. The waters were just a trickle. They were held back, and the children of Israel got by. Then suddenly the waters broke loose, and there was a great rush of mud, timbers, rocks, and trees. There was a natural dam up there and it broke and came down. Well, it's the timing that makes it a miracle, if you just happen to be there.

Not that the Lord said, "I'll do this for your benefit now," but if you can foresee all things. When you time things, it is a miracle. Not that there aren't other types of miracles, that things don't happen according to rules you don't understand. Brigham Young always insisted there was no such thing as a miracle. But you see the timing and the coordination of things is so important, so many things going on and the like. It is to give variety and beauty to the scene for our benefit as long as we are here—the same as we are told about the moon. We are told the moon is given to us to serve as the light by night. It does serve as the light by night and has many services for the human race. It doesn't say that's all it does. We mentioned before the claims of certain church fathers. John Chrysostom said that the sole purpose of the stars was to guide sailors at sea. There's no other purpose; therefore, why should there be life on other worlds? The stars have fulfilled their purpose if they just guide sailors at sea. Well, they do guide sailors at sea, but is that their only purpose? This is the thing we have to keep in mind here. So never forget this pluralism, this multiple use of the earth. It's not made for us alone. We are allowed to share it with God's other creatures, and we are told in the seventy-seventh chapter of the Doctrine and Covenants that other creatures have just as much right to the earth as we have. Not only that, but they have spirits and will be resurrected in their own world in their own time. We mustn't interfere with them in their proper places. We try to build our houses up in canyons where they have no business being, spend two million bucks—and smash, down goes the house. Of course, it serves us right. We have no business being up there. We can visit, but to take it over and want to possess everything is not right. Remember he tells us it was set apart for various creatures, each in its proper sphere and proper element.

Now the question comes, where do we hack in here? Where do we get in this picture? What about the seven thousand years? That's relevant. Our history is only a seven-thousand-year one. That all-important interface between the Cretaceous and the Tertiary. Now that the earth is formed, divided, and beautified, it doesn't have plants growing. That's the trouble. "Go down and place seeds on the earth of all kinds." Here's another thing. It's strange we don't have it in the library here, but I have put Xerox copies on reserve and I think you can get it at the Bookstore. It's a series of essays by Loren Eiseley, the famous paleontologist and biologist, called *The Star Thrower*. Here's a very good one on page 67. It has the title "How Flowers Changed the World." This is what happens: "A little while ago—about one hundred million years, as the geologist estimates time [now it's down to 65 million] . . . —flowers were not to be found anywhere on the five continents." They just appear suddenly overnight in this order: grass, flowers, shrubs, and trees, each bearing seed after its own kind, because their whole purpose is to bear seed. Before then you had spores. These are the first angiosperms, the first plants that have their seeds encapsulated. **Angio** means "little pot" in Greek. Inside is the seed which is very nourishing protein, so it gives rise to an entirely new breed of animals on the earth.

Well, let's hear what Brother Eiseley says about it, ". . . flowers were not to be found anywhere on the five continents. Wherever one might have looked, from the poles to the equator, one would have seen only the cold dark monotonous green of a world whose plant life

{p10

possessed no other color. Somewhere, just a short time before the close of the Age of the Reptiles [that's what we get here; that's our iridium layer. As I said, they are doing more of that all the time at Berkeley, Harvard and Princeton. People are working like mad on that.] there occurred a soundless, violent explosion. [Most of these things do not happen gradually and imperceptibly.] It lasted millions of years, but it was an explosion, nevertheless. It marked the emergence of the angiosperms, the flowering plants. Even the great evolutionist, Charles Darwin, called them 'an abominable mystery' because they appeared so suddenly and spread so fast."

And incidentally, the new time scales that are given are much shorter. Of course, it doesn't make any difference. If you are talking about a million years, you might as well say a hundred million years; you're outside of fundamentalism by that time. All you have to do is go beyond seven thousand and you are an abomination to the fundamentalists. But, of course, we preach that things were always going on. "There's no end to my works." Worlds have always been coming into existence, and as one world comes another passes away. "There is no end to my works or my words." So Darwin called these flowering plants "an abominable mystery" because they appeared so suddenly and spread so fast. Evolution does not mean revolution where things happen suddenly and violently. It's evolution where things unfold gradually, regularly, and almost imperceptibly. It doesn't go that way at all. It's a series of violent convulsions all along. So he called it an abominable mystery.

"Flowers changed the face of the planet. Without them, the world as we know—even man himself—would never have existed." So this part had to come next. You notice there is a succession and process in our story of the creation. We're told about the six main periods of creation. But things have to be done in a certain order. Now that the earth is formed and divided, it's time to put the plants on. But the animals aren't yet because they have to follow. "Francis Thompson, the English poet, once wrote that one could not pluck a flower without troubling a star. Intuitively, he had sensed like a naturalist the enormous interlinked complexity of life. Today we know that the appearance of flowers contained also the equally mystifying emergence of man. [Before that, under the layers we had the dinosaurs.] Tyrannosaurs, enormous bipedal caricatures of men, would stalk mindlessly across the sites of future cities [heartless and mindless] . . ." On the other hand, there has been a new big study by Adrian Desmond that says that the dinosaurs were probably very intelligent and furry creatures. We don't have the skin of dinosaurs anywhere. We have the skin of giant sloths found in caves in Nevada, but he says they might have been quite clever creatures, quite lovable creatures, these dinosaurs. We don't know, in other words. But they're not with us anymore. It was their world. Eiseley says, ". . . a cold-blooded world whose occupants were most active at noon day but torpid on chill nights, . . . Creatures without a high metabolic rate are slaves to weather. . . . A high metabolic rate, however, means a heavy intake of energy . . . The agile brain of warm-blooded birds and mammals demands a high oxygen consumption and food in concentrated forms . . . [they could only get it when there were grass, flowers, shrubs and trees], or the creatures cannot long sustain themselves. It was the rise of flowering plants that provided that

|p11

energy and changed the nature of the living world. Their appearance parallels in a quite surprising manner the rise of birds and mammals." They come after this has been provided, as you might expect.

Now the true flowers. "After a long period of hesitant evolutionary groping, they exploded upon the world with truly revolutionary violence. The event occurred in Cretaceous times at the close of the Age of the Reptiles." As we say, the end of the Cretaceous and the beginning of the Tertiary. That's exactly when it fits. This was published in 1978. Lots of things have been discovered since then, although it's only a short time ago. But he got the time right then. They hadn't discovered the iridium then. "Before the coming of the flowering plants, our own ancestral stock, the warm-blooded mammals, consisted of a few mousy little creatures . . . Neither the birds nor the mammals, however, were quite what they seemed. They were waiting for the Age of Flowers. They were waiting for what flowers, and with them the true encased seed, would bring." Before that "all is stiff, formal, upright and green, monotonously green. There is no grass as yet; there are no wide plains rolling in the sun, . . . [that has to come first] Nevertheless, the true flower, and the seed that it produced, was a profound innovation in the world of life. . . . But the seed, unlike the developing spore, is already a fully equipped embryonic plant packed in a little enclosed box stuffed full of nutritious food. Moreover, by featherdown attachments, as in the dandelion or milkweed seed, it can be wafted upward on the gusts or ride the wind for miles; or with hooks it can cling to bear's or rabbit's hide; or like some berries, it can be covered with juicy, attractive fruit to lure birds [that's what the fruit is for, to lure the animals who will take it abroad] pass undigested through their intestinal tracts, and be voided miles away."

They had ingenious ways of spreading themselves. You say it would take a trillion years to work that out by accident, trial and error. The thing is it happened suddenly, almost instantly. It is surprising. "Plants traveled as they had never traveled before. They got into strange environments, etc. . . . These fantastic little seeds, skipping and hopping and flying about the woods and valleys, brought with them amazing adaptability. They produced concentrated foods in a way the land had never seen before. . . . That food came from three sources, all produced by the reproductive system of flowering plants." There were the tantalizing nectars and pollens which attracted the insects. You had to have flowers. You have the grasses which were eaten by the ruminants; you have the flowers which are taken by the insects (bees and others); and you have the fruits which are eaten by the big animals like bears. We eat the fruits. What makes an apple? It's a pod for an apple seed. So the main purpose in producing all of these is that each shall bear seed after its own kind. That is the purpose of bringing forth grass, flowers, shrubs and trees, in that order. So he says, "These were the tantalizing nectars and pollens intended to draw insects for pollenizing purposes. . . . There were the juicy and enticing fruits to attract larger animals, and in which tough-coated seeds were concealed, as in the tomato, for example. Then, as if this were not enough, there was food in the actual seed itself, the food intended to nourish the embryo. All over the world, like hot corn in a popper, these incredible elaborations of the flowering plants kept exploding. In a movement that was almost

|p12

instantaneous, geologically speaking, the angiosperms had taken over the world. . . . The explosion was having its effect on animal life also. . . . The flowers bloomed and bloomed in ever larger and more spectacular varieties."

And what would you expect? First of all the "grass has a high silica content and demands a new type of very tough and resistant tooth enamel, but the seeds taken incidentally in the cropping of the grass are highly nutritious." So there were the great grazing herds upon the earth. But the first to occur were the great herbivores, namely the elephant of all things, because that's the carry-over; remember like tyrannosaurs. You had great animals that crossed the barrier there, and the mammoths were the first, a great variety of elephant-related creatures. He says here, "A new world had opened out for the warm-blooded mammals. Great herbivores like the mammoths [so first you have the elephant] horses and bison appeared. Skulking about them had arisen savage flesh-feeding carnivores. . ." What do you have when you have large grazing herds? Fierce carnivorous creatures, big cats (the lion and the tiger). Finally, you have the omnivorous bear who can eat anything. But this is the order they appear in: the mammoth, the lion, the tiger, the bear, the horse and all the other things. "Skulking about them had arisen savage flesh-feeding carnivores like the now extinct dire wolves and the saber-toothed tiger. . . . Their fierce energy was being maintained . . . by the concentrated energy of the angiosperms. [That's supporting the grazing herds who are supporting the carnivores.] That energy . . . was being accumulated and concentrated in the rich proteins and fats of the enormous game herds of the grasslands." And so it goes. Finally, we get to man, but he comes last of all. So this is an interesting thing. This is where we "hack in" then. It was necessary before the Tertiary beasts could occur to have these things happen in their proper order. And this is the order we get in our four accounts. There are traces of it in Genesis. It's very clear in Abraham and Moses, and most explicit in the temple.

Now it's time to go to the Pearl of Great Price specifically and to first Moses. Ah, what a book! We are going to talk about the great dramas, etc. The author of First Moses could claim to be the greatest literary genius of the modern world because he wrote the Book of Moses before they had discovered the Book of Enoch or any of it was known. This first chapter is the classic drama of every man. It's the fundamental drama. Moses isn't the first man to appear. We take Adam in the order he appears. When we get to Adam, where does he come in? Again, there are a lot of creatures running around that are going to look like men.

Oh, I must tell you about this first. Some while ago I gave a spiel called "Before Adam," which is on reserve. You can get this through F.A.R.M.S. at half price. Oh, it isn't half price anymore? Oh, the rascals. Well, F.A.R.M.S. has become corrupted like everybody else. Come up to 4012 in the library and you can take this and Xerox any particular pages that interest you. It's divided into separate sections.

This appearance of Adam and primitive man; that's another thing we have to take up. I see the time is up now. I guess we'd better talk about that the next time instead of going to First Moses.

|p13

What about primitive man? What about forms millions of years ago? What about the Olduvai Gorge? What about all those other creatures that were running around that looked so much like man? We begin, of course, with the Solo man. Whatever happened to the (you think of various ones) the Solutrean, the Aurignacian, the Magdalenian—all these cultures, all these people that lived long ago? They lived long before Adam. Well, what were they doing then? What is Adam's date? How is he related to them? These are questions we must face. After all, these things have to be accounted for. Does the scripture accommodate them? Does it leave room for them? Does it actually tell us about them if you only read it more carefully? Well, if you read it carefully, it tells us a lot more than we are willing to accept because nobody reads anything with an open mind. I already have a set and a prejudice when I read. Before you can fit anything into a pattern, you have to put it there. That's the wonderful work of Karl Popper on that subject that changed the thinking of so many scientists on that. You do not have facts here. We are not dealing with facts; we are dealing with hypotheses, and every one of them is tentative. Facts are few. The fossil I hold in my hand is a fact. The spectrum I see on the screen is a fact, but my interpretation of it is not a fact. That's just my interpretation unless you want to take it as a literary fact or something like that. We talk about facts. These rocks are facts; these bones are facts. They don't mean anything unless you interpret them, and you interpret them as you please. That's all there is to it. Two scientists had the same bones spread out on the table in front of them, and each used the same bones to prove the exact opposite. "These bones absolutely prove what I say." "No, these bones absolutely prove what I say." Well, the bones were real. They were there all right, but who are you to follow? No, it's something because it's this time schedule business. People worry about time. And then they are finding a lot about primitive man now. He walks around and all this sort of thing, millions of years ago. What happened to him? What happened to the Heidelberg man and the Windmill Hill and all that sort of thing? I guess we might as well consider that because there's a place in the scripture for that too.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 16

So today is something I've been waiting for eagerly, the first chapter of Moses, the first chapter of the first book. You will notice first of all the significance of that date, June 1830. What does 1830 signify to us? The Church was less than three months old at this time. And what does June 1830 mean? The month the Book of Mormon was published. This is as old as the Book of Mormon. That's a very significant thing. If you think the Reverend Solomon Spaulding wrote the Book of Mormon, who wrote the Book of Moses in that case? The Book of Mormon, we say, would take a good deal of revelation to produce. They say, "Oh, well, anybody could do that with a little help." At the same time he produced a very different type of book, which is the Book of Moses—equally marvelous, equally wonderful, equally impossible.

We are told here that it is a series of visions. Notice, the "Visions of Moses" (that's the title) as revealed to the Prophet Joseph in June 1830. And notice the title comes in here. "The words of God, which he spake unto Moses." What a very interesting beginning to have here. This is exactly the Egyptian word for scripture, "the words of God." Here's the symbol for God. It comes first, you see. It's pronounced **medu-netcher**. That's a staff. Then you have to have a little chickey here to show it's in the plural, give it an "oo" sound. Then you have to have a man with his hand in his mouth to show that he is speaking. Then you have to have three strokes to show that it is plural. You put the word **God** here, **netcher**, first for honorific transposition. That indicates God always comes first. Actually, it's read this way, and it means "the words of God." Every sacred Egyptian writing which is in black is in theory the words of God. The red part (the rubric), is the commentary of the scribe, the writer, the copyist—any explanation you want to put in, any stage directions or things like that. You will find this on the first page of *Gardiner's Grammar* if you want to see how it is to be rendered; namely, the words of God. Singular, not the words of the gods or something, but these are the words of God. They are inspired and revealed, the Egyptians believed.

And then the other part comes in. As we start out here, these aren't "the words of God, which he spake unto Moses at a time when Moses was caught up into an exceedingly high mountain." That's an explanation. The words of God begin, you notice, in the third verse. "Behold, I am the Lord God Almighty." All the rest would simply be in red ink. The Egyptians have this very easily solved. They write in stereo. You see the human element, and you see the divine element and the commentary so that you don't mix them up. It's very convenient to know, and it's very important because it shows us, among other things, that they considered writing a divine gift, a gift from heaven. It's purpose was to preserve the words which were given to the fathers in the beginning by revelation. So that's what we have here, the words of God, and we start reading the red print first. In this first verse we come to the high mountain.

| p2

Well, I decided this morning to play (I should have been doing something else) "Trivial Pursuit" with a mountain motif, and it turns out to be not so trivial (a very important thing). First of all, why are mountains important and significant? They have a great significance as we mentioned last time—upthrust of the earth's crust, things that begin. The mountain, of course, is near heaven, but it is also what? Literally near heaven? Well, it's up in the sky. You could say, "Well, that would be superstition." But what can you say that is literally true about a mountain. If you wanted to make contact with holier things, why would the top of an exceedingly high mountain be an advantage? Remember the brother of Jared is caught up into an exceedingly high mountain which is called **Shelem** because of its exceeding height. But what would be the advantage of being on an exceedingly high mountain? It's isolated and set apart. It's a pure place; it's not frequented often. It's removed, private, inaccessible, undefiled. If any place can be kept holy and undefiled, it would be that, because people don't visit it. They may go up there and leave their beer cans and their lunch remains. But if it's a very high mountain, they don't. They leave their names and flag or something like that to sort of sanctify the place. It's a holy sort of thing.

This is an advantage to it, but then it also has other particular functions. Looking at Timp right now, we find that it beckons to us. It commands attention as a reality. Remember what Sir Hillary and others have said. Why do you climb the mountains? "Because they are there." They are there and they are (to use the much overworked word) a challenge. But they combine these paradoxical elements. The mountain is the most visible and conspicuous thing around and yet it's the most inaccessible. You can see it from a longer distance and from more directions. The mountain is there. It dominates the scene, and yet it is inaccessible. This is a surprising thing.

You know the famous German poem, the dialog about the Jungfrau. The Jungfrau was only climbed quite recently, just in this century. There it was aloof and majestic, and yet everybody could see it. "Have you been climbed yet?" The Eiger and the Jungfrau carry on a conversation. It is most inaccessible yet most visible, so it invites us and calls our attention. You must realize there are such things as a disquieting phenomena. It's unsettling, yet it is thrilling and invites an attempt.

Now Petrarch (1304-1374) was the first great poet of the Renaissance. The Renaissance begins with Petrarch. To show the type of the Renaissance mind (that he was the typical mind, that he had a new point of view on things) he lived near the foot of the Alps and he couldn't resist going up to them. He started climbing them and looking around, and he started being thrilled by the sight. He suddenly realized that he shouldn't do that. To be delighted with worldly things, with nature, was a pagan thing. He checked himself, he says. He had to take out his copy of St. Augustine's *Confessions* and start reading on the spot lest he be carried away by the beauty of the view. Here is Renaissance man or modern man. He aspires beyond the "letter that killeth," and St. Augustine is supposed to rescue him from that.

|p3

But then in the Restoration poetry in England, you had the English garden, and everything had to be controlled, gentle, and civilized—the lawn and all this. Mountains were regarded as savage, hateful, and an abomination. The nature poet Shenstone made himself immortal by calling mountains "earth's dishonor and encumbering load." The idea was that the earth was smooth like a lawn and well-behaved until man sinned. Then because of the sin, the mountains were inflicted on the earth as great boils and bumps and unsightly things. "Earth's dishonor and encumbering load" to punish the earth for the sin when man fell. So they didn't think of it that way. It's an interesting thing here, as against the everlasting hills; they didn't believe they were everlasting either. But the mountain is a place of pilgrimage. Remember Isaiah 2:2, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." It's a place of pilgrimage and a place of attraction too. And the temple in Jerusalem was on the temple mountain, on Mt. Moriah. We find all the sacred places are the mountains, and they are very important here as the place of pilgrimage.

The first Christian pilgrims (and pagan for that matter) to go to Palestine to seek the Holy Land were mostly in the fourth century. It started out with a Bordeaux pilgrim, and then a lady called Etheria or Sylvia. She left us a minute account of her travels there. She was a rich Gallic woman, one of these dynamic ones. She was hell on wheels, a terrific old gal. She would sweep through, visit all the holy places, and terrify everybody by her magisterial authority. But the place they went to visit was the top of the Mount of the Ascension. They weren't going to the Holy Sepulcher. The goal of the pilgrim was to climb to the point (some thought it was the Mount of Olives) where the Lord had last left the earth, and there was the Lord's last footprint. There the pilgrim would go and look up to heaven with yearning for the time when the Lord was to come back. It tells us in Acts, Why stand ye looking up into heaven? He'll return in the same way he went up. So they went up and expected him to return. They climbed the mountain to see where the Lord had last been in contact with the human race and where he would make it again. And they did it with great yearning.

This idea of footprints on the mountains is very common. I should have put down here, but I forgot. Remember Adam's mountain in Ceylon (Sri Lanka)? In the center of the island is this vast sort of Monadnock with a footprint on it, the place where Adam landed when he came to this earth. It's the oldest pilgrimage there. Pilgrims come from all over. They cross Adam's bridge, which was formerly a land bridge from India to Ceylon. Then the idea is to climb and pull yourself up the mountain, and they do it. You can still see pictures in the **National Geographic** with chains, ropes and everything else. Originally, there was a hand rail that rotted away. They pulled themselves up.

There is an account of the iron rod from Jerusalem that led to the temple. That's grasping the iron rod. We're told that there used to be. Remember, before the top of the mountain was leveled off for the temple, it was much higher, and it was risky. When it was rainy and stormy (it was spring when people would have to go), it was hard to get up there, to follow the sacred trail up.

|p4

They still do that in Athens, going up to the Acropolis the same way—the sacred trail going up to the top of the mountain. So they had the handrail going up to help people. It was iron, but it rusted away. It was supplanted by wood, brass, and other things. But they always used the expression, for old or weak people or when it was dangerous and slippery, to get to the temple you had to hang onto the railing, "grasp the iron rod." This emerges in the Book of Mormon in a context which Joseph Smith couldn't have discovered or anybody in his time. We have these interesting things. Anyway, we have the mountain of Ceylon and Adam's mountain where Adam came to earth and Adam fell. It's quite a story. The Koran tells us the story when Adam fell. We won't go into that.

What about the guru on his mountain? We see in the cartoons in the *New Yorker*, etc., a person who climbs a high mountain to get to the guru. There are some studies on that. What would make a guru most at home on a high mountain, very uncomfortable and by himself? As you say, he's alone. He's a holy man in his own place. You have to make an effort to reach him. For one thing, we are talking about real mountains where gurus are. In the Himalayas the oxygen becomes very thin at the ten-thousand-foot elevation. The rule was in the Air Force that you put on your oxygen mask at ten thousand feet. Well, that isn't considered very high anymore. But your breath comes short on Timp before you get to the top there. The idea is that this thin oxygen, fasting, and altitude sickness (that's a very real thing) and exhaustion and cold produce hallucinations. Of course, they do. You get an unworldly feeling. You get carried away by the wind. I know lots of people who do. When we used to have the big hikes up Timp, people would get mountain sickness. They would get giddy and turn pale and have to sit down and pant. This is the best way to have visions, revelations, hallucinations, etc. So the guru sits up there breathing this thin oxygen which isn't enough to keep you going.

Then there's the story of the brother of Jared. This is a very important point in it. Remember, he said he talked with the Lord on an exceedingly high mountain. It was called **Shelem** because of its exceeding height. The original word of **Shelem**, **Shalom**, means "peace," but it originally meant "safe" (safety, security) because it was a high place. The **Shelem** was a high place. It's still the word for ladder: **silma**, **selma**, a **sullam** in Arabic. It's a very high elevation. The whole third chapter of the Book of Ether is the Lord speaking with Enoch on this high mountain called **Shelem** because of its exceeding height. He goes up there and molts out the stones and gets them all ready, but they won't shine. He knows from the story of Noah that they should shine because Noah had the **Zohar** in his ark. They were two stones that went in the ark of Noah that told him when it was day and night because they would shine. They shine by their own light. The story of the **Zohar** is a great one. There's a long story about that. We are told in the Book of Ether that they were built after the manner of Noah's ark. So the brother of Jared asks the Lord, What should I do to bring light in the arks because we are going to be dashed under the waves? There were terrible storms from the Ice Age storms, the great torrential vast winds. For 340 days the wind did never cease to blow. Anyway, what would they do? Well, he knew what to do. The Lord said to him, "Well, what would you do? You go figure it out for yourself." So without any further instructions, he went and made these

|p5

molten stones because we are told that Noah had two fine crystals just like that, clear as glass, and they shined in the dark. He was going to do the same thing, but there was one check. The stones wouldn't shine. And so he was humiliated. And then those marvelous passages, the most beautiful description of humility and repentance you can find anywhere in literature, is the way the brother of Jared addresses the Lord. He is absolutely flat. He is on his face. He is completely humiliated, and the things he says there are quite thrilling. But the thing is he climbs the mountain with these stones. He goes back to the top of the mountain, gets as far as he can to the top, then he holds up the stones and says this is where I get off; I can't go any further. The moral is that you do everything you can; then you ask the Lord to take over. That's what he does. It says he went to work. He worked exceedingly hard getting the stones out, melting them, etc. Then he toils up the mountain and gets to the top. Now, Lord, this is as far as I go. You must take over. He holds the stones up, and then the Lord comes down and touches them. It knocks him flat on his face again. All this is very dramatic, remarkable stuff. Joseph Smith at the age of twenty-four was cooking all this up out of nothing. It's quite a thing.

Then we have the Mount of Transfiguration in Matthew 17:2 and Mark 9:2, where the Lord is transfigured on an exceeding high mountain. And again remember, Peter was out of his head (let's build three temples), and he knew not what he was saying. Then we are told in Mark that they didn't know what was happening until they came to themselves. The Lord was shaking their shoulders and saying wake up, it's all over now. Then they woke up. We won't go into that, but again you see it was on the Mountain of the Transfiguration where Moses and Elijah came, and the Father came behind a cloud. Remember, it says he was sheltered by a cloud. Well, a high mountain is a place where you would find a cloud anyway.

But there are other mountains now. That's the one sense of a mountain, that place of contact, the holy place. But more significant even is the **jabal**, the **oreion**, etc. The Arabic word for mountain is **jabal**, and the plural is **jibal** which means range of mountains. It means borders. The very same thing happens in Greek. **To oros** is the mountain. **Ho oros** is the boundary or chain of mountains or range of mountains. It is the natural boundary, the range of mountains. And it's the same thing we have. Remember, Achilles says, I have no quarrel with the Trojans. I didn't want to come on this crazy expedition with you guys because many ranges of shadowy mountains lie between my land and theirs. They're in another world as far as I'm concerned. So we get the idea for the **oros**. If it's masculine **ho oros**, then it's a boundary. It's a limit, a boundary line, any kind of a fence or boundary. If it's **to oros** in the neuter, with a plural **oreia**, then it's a high mountain. But it's the same word, you notice, as the Hebrew word **har**. That's the word for mountain. In the Book of Mormon, the judge **Pahoran** means the "mountain man," an Egyptian name. The Russian word for mountain is **gora**. It means a range, but it is the limit of your visibility. In Egyptian this is very important because it is the **aakhut**, the boundary between the two worlds. It is extremely common. The names of so many Pharaohs use it. Akhenaton, the famous reformer, means the "solar disc on the mountain." You will see it all over when you go to the Ramses exhibit.

|p6

You will see the **aakhut** which means "the sun in the horizon." There are the two mountains, and then the sun is rising between them. And it is very important here. I'm going to read you something about it. Paul tells us that faith is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Well, this is the justification of faith. In the horizon you have the evidence of things not seen. Solid, tangible evidence (it's really there) of things that really exist that you can't see, and may never see. In fact, you can never see them because they are always beyond the horizon. But they are always there, and they are always real. There's a section here in this book. I don't know whether I should take up time with it, but I think it's quite to the point here. Why the Egyptians stuck to this crazy stuff (it seems to us) is that it was actually very real. These are real experiences with the nomad peoples. I know with the Hopis it's a very important thing to stand up at the second mesa. There are the cliffs of the second mesa just above the corn rocks in the cemetery there. It used to be back in the 1940s and '50s. They don't do it anymore; it's too bad. Things are getting lost after thousands of years. All the men and boys of the village would line up along the edge of the cliff and face the sun to see the first point of sunlight on the horizon. And they would pray to it.

This is from the Joseph Smith papyrus, "That he might enter the horizon along with his father Re (the sun)." "If the essence of cult and festival is transition, the rite of passage, succession of lives . . . [that's quoting a famous work by Mowinckel]." See, the **rite de passage**, you pass from one state of existence to another." That's what we are interested in more than anything else—transition, the rite of passage, and succession of lives. "Now the great exponent of such meaningful motion is the sun which rises and sets everyday." We quoted Catullus on that. "The sun sets and rises everyday, and it keeps up, and that's an example. But we, unfortunately, can't follow it," he says. The disc is directly observable under normal conditions only on the horizon. That's when you can see it clearly. The **Book of the Dead** says, "Thou passest over the sky. Every faith watches thee in thy course. Thou thyself are hidden from their gates . . ." except when you show yourself at dawn and at eventide. Then they can look at your disc, and they can see it. It turns red, and you can view the sun. Otherwise, you'd better look through smoked glasses.

This is from Erik Hornung, an Egyptologist and very good authority on this business: "The gate of heaven or the underworld between the earthly and the other- worldly spirits was from the earliest times localized in the **aakhut**." That is the seam or juncture, the **Nahtstelle**, the interface between the other world and this world. The sun has been invisible. It has been in the dark until now. And now it's coming into our particular sphere. Then you bid it good-bye. It must go somewhere else, and there must be somewhere else for it to go. So why should we think we have seen everything there is? This is the moral. ". . . in the **aakhut** in the East and West where heaven, earth, and underworld came into contact with each other and where intercourse between the spheres is possible." That's what happens. That's where the touching comes. "In passing the horizon the sun god and his ship both change their natures. . . . Thus one begins his journey through the hours of the night by standing on the threshold, the bank or the horizon, which is the door of his house [the middle chamber, the three main rooms, etc.]."

The word **aakhut** can designate either that particular spot on the skyline at which the first or last brilliant point of the sun's surface is visible, these being movable points [everyday they move along, you know] represented by the ancients as a series of gates or windows [you find more about that in the old **Book of Enoch** than anywhere else] or else it can be the region just below the horizon whose effulgent glory can be seen reflected in our own upper sky at dawn and twilight." Before the sun rises, you can see there's a lot of light. It must be in some place that's very brilliant down there. And after it sets, it goes into the warm, bright chambers of the West. Where has it gone? There must be something very pretty back there. So you start thinking about that.

According to Siegfried Schott in the **Pyramid Texts**, the inhabitants of the **aakhut** lived beyond the mountains of the eastern and western horizons, but this side of the underworld itself. They belong to the place of transition. "For those who travel, especially in the desert, the horizon is constant and visible proof of realities that may escape the city dweller and the farmer. The horizon at dusk and dawn is not a fade-out place. It's not a dim inter-region. It's as sharp as a razor." Here you can see it against the mountains. It's not something vague, something that fades out. But it's there and very real. So you want to go up to it and see what's on the other side. Well, there is something there after all. You were right in supposing there was something there, but you've still got a horizon in front of you. You haven't settled it. You haven't seen everything yet. The fact that it moves doesn't mean that it's not real. "It's a hard black line as real and intensely visible as anything could be. But when you pick a mark on the horizon and walk up to it, there is more beyond, another horizon. We discover that the horizon, the absolute limit of our vision (it's a real limit; you can see 14 or 15 miles) beyond which you cannot see, beyond which for us nothing exists, is only a relative thing after all. The absolute limit of our present visible world turns out to be only the threshold of another world beyond. Farmers and city dwellers unaware and suspicious of what lies beyond the safety of the oasis and the city walls are prone to existentialist philosophy and take a skeptical and gloomy view. . . . [There's nothing beyond, in other words. What lies beyond the present life?] But the nomad of the desert [who is always a pilgrim] can always believe there is something beyond because for him there always is something beyond.

One of the peculiar traits of Egyptian culture and belief is surprisingly enough an obsession with the idea of eternal progression. [Another nomad heritage, people that are always wandering.] They have always been drawn to distant horizons and spurned this present world as altogether too confining. The passage from world to world and from horizon to horizon is dramatized in the ordinances of the temple, which itself is called the horizon." It is the place where you experiment with these things. So we get this horizon idea. Incidentally, what if the sun isn't there? This is another interesting thing. The word for mountain without the sun is **dju** which means "danger, unknown territory, stay away, look out for it." The sun isn't there. The mountain shuts off a land beyond which might not be a very safe land. It might not be very healthy for you to visit. It means a treacherous, threatening, dangerous unknown. It's the common word for evil, **dju**, a threatening thing.

Now, you all know about pyramids and ziggurats. They are artificial mountains, and mountain rites take place there. They are specifically places of contact with the worlds above and below. The king every New Year's Eve would ascend to the top of the ziggurat in Babylon, and there he would cast the dice with 360 possibilities, one for each day of the year. If he was a Persian, he would draw the **baresma**. He would tell the fortunes, make the divinations for the year. There was a couch where the king would spend the night with the gods, just that one night, dealing with the matters of the eternities, finding out what the future of his people would be. In fact, there's a good book by G. Widengren on this doctrine among the Jews and the Christians called *The Sent One and the Heavenly Book*. The king goes up to the top of the mountain, or the chamber at the top of the temple, or the top of the pyramid and comes down with the heavenly book to show that he has been there. So the mountain of the Lord's house is the temple mountain. And the mountain of all is Sinai. That's a very dangerous mountain, as you know. It was divided off by a boundary. They set up a stone wall along the bottom of it, and any ordinary Israelite who stepped one inch beyond that would be struck dead. There was a high wall, and priesthood could go in there. Beyond that, others could go with Moses. He went up with Joshua. But to the top only Moses could go, and there he talked with the Lord. The mountain was covered with flame by night and with smoke by day, obviously a volcano, and it shook violently when Moses went up it (very dangerous). Fire came out, rocks fell down and smashed people. It was an active volcano. It is very clear from the Exodus description of the mountain. But they are also steps to heaven. There are various degrees of purity as you go up. A person who is so pure may go so far. Another may go so far. There are four different steps there. Finally, Moses can reach to the top and talk to the Lord. In this Moses is withdrawn. We are told here that this particular mountain is a sacred one and you're not supposed to know about it. Notice, the last verse of our first chapter here, "unto Moses in the mount the name of which shall not be known among the children of men." This is Moses and the Lord alone.

Then we have Psalm 121, "I will lift up my eyes to the mountains, [we say "the hills;" it's the same word, **har**, **heharim**] from whence cometh my help." The Lord is my help," etc. This is an interesting thing. Why would the help come from the mountains? That is explained very well in those wonderful verses of Isaiah which the Prophet Abinadi uses so effectively, Isaiah 52:7. Why does Abinadi repeat it five times in Mosiah 12:21, 15:15-18? "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of them that bear good tidings." Why does Abinadi keep throwing that at the corrupt priests of King Noah? This verse in Isaiah is interesting because it is the only time the word **navu** (Nauvoo) occurs, **ma-navu**. That's where we get Manavu Ward. It's the only time it uses the word Nauvoo for beautiful. "How beautiful upon the mountainside are the feet of him who brings good tidings." Literally, are the legs of the runner who brings good news and who causes us to hear that there is peace. And who is a bringer of what is good. It's doubled. "Who brings good tidings of good, . . ." it says in our King James Version. It seems redundant, but he wants that to be "brings good tidings of good news and causes us to hear about our salvation, our Savior." Same word as Jesus, **Yeshua**, (Josiah or Joshua). You can see what the point is here. Abinadi is announcing that from the other side of the mountain,

from the other world, comes the good news. This is revelation. It's the welcome messenger from the other world, the angel who brings us the gospel—who brings us the message of salvation, who brings us the message of peace which you don't find on this side of the mountain. So that's why he repeats, How welcome are the feet of the person who brings these. How different are the feet of Apollo rushing down to bring vengeance to a wicked people. The famous line from Homer: "And his coming was like the coming of night. He smote them because of their wickedness." But this is why; he's talking about angels coming from the other side. That's what this is, the feet of those on the mountain who bring good tidings. They come across the mountains, and you wait to see if they will come.

The first chapter of Moses is a primeval drama. It's an everyman drama. Another primeval drama that I've never mentioned in this connection before, but certainly should have, is *The Prometheus* of Aeschylus. It's the same type. This introduces us into a most remarkable setting and remarkable world. You know who Aeschylus is? He's the earliest, but we forget that the great Greek tragedians, along with Aristophanes, all lived at the same time. Everybody lived in one little bunch there. Just one generation produced them, everything we have been living on ever since. Aeschylus lived from 525 (the year the Persians took Egypt) to 456 B.C. He wrote *Prometheus Bound*, and you notice we have a famous poem in English, Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*. The word means "the prophet." **Theo** means to see ahead of time. He could foresee all things.

The *Prometheus Bound* is a marvelous drama. It is one of the seven by Aeschylus that survived. It doesn't take place on earth. It has nothing to do with cities or human affairs. There are no human characters in it at all, only one. It's a primeval drama. We find the hero in the beginning, as we find Moses here, on a high mountain. Remember, when the Lord talks to Moses, it's on the high mountain here. We find Prometheus on a high mountain, and he is being crucified because he is the savior of the human race. It's a long story. He tells us here what's going on. This is the third dispensation that he recalls. Way back in the beginning, it started out with Uranus and Gaea, the primal parents, and the starry heavens. There was a Council in Heaven among the Titans. Cronus consulted with his five brother Titans. He decided to overthrow his father and take the rule because he thought he was an important person. So there was the rebellion of Cronus against Uranus. You will notice strange echoes of things in here. They are all mixed up, and they are supposed to be. As a result of that, he is punished. They bind him in Tartarus. But one of the brother Titans is a very clever man, and that's Zeus. With the council and advice of Zeus, he is freed. He is liberated again and takes the throne. He's jealous and doesn't want anyone to succeed him. He eats up all his male children so he won't have any successor on the throne. But his wife Rhea plays a trick on him. He thinks he's eating three of his children, but she has given him three big rocks which he swallows. Thereby, she saves the lives of Zeus, Poseidon, and Pluto. Zeus is saved and Cronus is overthrown, so Zeus now becomes the king. Another succession, another overthrow, another Council in Heaven. How did Zeus do that? He did it with the help of Prometheus, the wise. Prometheus was one of the councilors in the Council in Heaven, and he told him how he could overthrow Cronus and rule.

|p10

Zeus overthrew Prometheus. Then they decided on the creation of the world. Zeus had contempt for the human race. They are weak. They are unable to survive. They are unfit to survive. They are poor, miserable creatures who don't deserve to survive. He planned to let them just die out, but Prometheus would have none of that. The great Prometheus made possible their survival by giving them fire so they were able to survive. This infuriated Zeus. In the opening scene Prometheus is being nailed to the rock. Either the chains or he is, but the torture goes along with it because of the famous eagle that preys on his liver as he is tied up there, which is not a comfortable situation. He's going through this torture, and in this position the play opens. It's on the highest and remotest mountain in the world in the top of the Caucasus. It sounds like our Book of Moses, only a very different sort of thing here.

We've been talking about earlier dispensations. The Prometheus drama, you will notice here just from what I've said, is full of scrambled motifs, especially suggesting the Book of Enoch. Where did Aeschylus get all these ideas? For one thing, his gross insult to Zeus? Prometheus says, "I've already seen two tyrants fall (Uranus and Cronus). The third dispensation is going to be the shortest and the evilest. It's going to fall the worst." He predicts that Zeus is going to fall. This is Zeus, the god of the high heavens, the most high god. How can you get away with this in a religious celebration in a sacred drama and put Zeus in that light? This wouldn't have been tolerated if it wasn't a bonafide tradition, of course. He says he has seen two destructions of the wicked and he prophesies a third coming up. This is the least glorious and the most calamitous of all the dispensations so far, and he says it is going to fall too. What's his position going to be? He predicts that a savior is going to come and save the human race. We go into all these motifs. They are all sort of mixed up here.

Aeschylus, who was a very pious man, takes liberties in telling the story. Of course, he does. Yet he needs to convey a true account of man's condition (this is what he is talking about) because traditions have become tangled up and broken up. We recognize them all over the place here. He must necessarily recompose or restructure, put together the elements in a way that makes the best sense to him. He is at perfect liberty to do so. There have been some interesting writings recently on the way the Egyptians did the very same thing. Anything that will convey the story in its most clear way. You get together the scraps and take your turn presenting them. All the great dramatists show great liberty, and yet they deal with absolute established and fixed themes. Everything is prescribed, but if you stay pious and want to explain things, you are justified in putting it in different lights. In other words what we have here is that he recomposes the elements in the most meaningful way to teach us the lesson, and this is what we call a myth. Is a myth bad? Is the Book of Mormon a myth? No it is not. It is history. Are the parables of Jesus myths? Well, these things really could take place. When he is talking about a certain man who did so and so, it's perfectly plausible. People do that all the time. For example, the lost penny. The wife lost a penny and looked desperately all over the house to find it. And the lost sheep. Well, this happens hundreds of times. There's no doubt that such things happen. I'm talking about a particular thing.

|p11

When we get to the Book of Mormon or the Pearl of Great Price, it's different from that because it names names and sets dates. It's a different sort of thing. It could have been myth and been quite healthy too. A few years ago they used to talk a lot about mythopoeic thinking. My old Professor Wilson used to talk about that. This was a bright idea in the 40s and 50s—that is thinking that makes up myths to explain the world and all that's in it. Henry Frankfort called it mythopoeic thinking. John Wilson calls it myth-making mentality. Today no one takes that seriously anymore. As Horning and others have shown us, mythopoeic is not a way of thinking, but simply a way of telling the story. You don't think that way; you tell the story. It's an interesting thing, in the Middle Ages (speaking about these pilgrims) among the relics they went to see were the various things told about in the parables. On display was the original penny that the woman was looking for. They would have all these things like that. There was the inn where the man stayed, and they would show you his bandages and all the rest. They made it very real. It could have been, but it wasn't a way of thinking. It was a way of telling a story. So the mythmaker says, "This is the way I tell the story to make it as clear as possible."

In the Book of Moses we find an astonishing wealth of these mythological motifs, a tremendous wealth. You'd be surprised. I think you can list well over a hundred major myths in there, the details that turned up in the oldest traditions of the race. They are scattered all through there. We find them scattered here and there in various plots and combinations in the mythology of all nations. We have the collection over in the library. It's on reference. You can see it anytime. There are all kinds of myths, and they all deal with the same sort of thing. This is the thing that came out with the patternism of the Cambridge School beginning with *The Golden Bough*. Sir James Frazer was able to show that you do not find an infinite number of myths and legends and practices throughout the world. You just find a few standard ones. By a few, I mean not an infinite number, but they are always the same. You always run into the same things everywhere else. You always keep saying, "Well, this is where I came in." But in the Book of Moses we find it neatly and consecutively arranged and put together. Here they tell a straight story. This is as near as you will ever get to the original story. There was an original. We remember, as I said before in the case of parables, that all history deals with characteristic and repeated events. All history is a parable. Just as poetry deals with a very small number of set themes. As Dr. Johnson showed, there are only so many plots you can have to a story. There's a limited number of plots possible. Or if you get the new comedy of *Plautus and Menander* or *Menander, Plautus, and Terrence* (the Romans take it over from the Greeks) with a set number of characters, you have the number of characters prescribed. With those particular characters, only certain things can take place. You have only a limited number of prescribed plots which have to be followed out. This is the way it is in this life.

But Albright pointed out in *The Christian Century*, one of the last things he wrote, that Mormonism is the only historical religion in the world today of our time. Originally, he points out, Christianity and Judaism were historical. When they talk about Moses and Abraham and tell the stories of the wandering of Israel, or whatever it might be; when they tell the stories

of the Lord and the apostles in the Acts, these are histories. These took place in times and events. In the first chapter of Luke, the angel came in the temple on a certain day, stood in a particular place, said certain things to a man. It tells us who his wife was, who his family was, the people waiting outside. He goes and visits Mary. It tells us where she lived—the street, the city, the room. There she was. It's historical. But as we have mentioned again and again so far (wasted the whole semester trying to make that one thing clear), the Christian world, the Jewish world, and the rest of them reject that. Literalism they don't accept. We have to have that here. That's what's so marvelous about the Book of Moses. It's going to be really here. These things really happen. The whole Book of Moses comes across as a message from the archaic world. Some of the chapters, especially six and seven, are written in a totally different language. It's a poetry you will not find in the Book of Mormon or Doctrine and Covenants or anywhere else. It's nature poetry, some gorgeously beautiful passages, but it's very characteristic of the archaic world. This peculiar idiom, quite different from that of the Book of Mormon, came from the press in the same month as the Book of Mormon. These passages are rich in metaphor. Here you are going to have metaphors. "Why do the heavens weep and send forth their tears as rain upon the mountains?" There's a nice balance to them, beautiful passages there. "The voice of the beasts was heard out of the wilderness. The rivers were turned from their courses. . . ." There is an extravagance about it, a lushness about it, that goes back to days that now we know correspond to days of geological extravagance. In the early days when I went to school, things didn't happen that way. They happened slowly. Nothing was picturesque; nothing could happen fast. Nothing could happen dramatically. Well, if there is anything I learned about the war, it's that it was unbelievably dramatic and picturesque. Hollywood can't even begin to approach what really happened, so it's an astonishing thing.

The first chapter is structured as a drama, and a good one. This is the simplest, directest way of carrying us back in time and placing us in a situation, a strange and distant situation, which would be very hard to grasp if it weren't placed in this most elementary and simple form. It is given to us as if it were a play. Moses' commentaries on the words of God together make a perfect presentation of the primary theme of the drama. It's the primary theme of drama, theology, philosophy, and science; namely, man's condition in the world. What is the human condition? And that is what we have here. There are other plays like it; the most famous are mystery plays or the old English play *Everyman*. The time is up now. We will begin with the first chapter of Moses next time, unless I think of something else to interrupt. This goes on indefinitely, doesn't it? But there are many things here. That's why Sunday School lessons are so maddening—22, 25, 34 chapters to a 40-minute lesson!

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 17

Well, now the subject is the first chapter of Moses, verses 2-8. And that is the Prologue in Heaven. Very important. Now here we have a surprising phenomenon. You notice in Moses 2 and 3 what it is. Moses is in the presence of God and he is being given his assignment. And we read in the first verse, however, that he had been caught up. So this is an ascension. There is a great branch of ancient literature that is called the ascension literature that has emerged recently. And we have lots of ascensions here. Some of the most interesting ascensions are in the Book of Mormon. Of course, 1 Nephi 1:11 and following. There is a very important ascension there, where he tells us. What is it? Is it heaven or earth or what? It is an exceeding high mountain and all the rest. It's right in the first chapter, right at the beginning of Nephi, because in the beginning we have a Prologue in Heaven, but in verse 11, they . . . I've got the wrong one here. Well let's look at 2 Nephi 4:25. That's another ascension. He says the same thing there so it's all right, I guess. I'm just making too many mistakes these days (these days indeed).

"And upon the wings of his spirit hath my body been carried away upon exceeding high mountains. And mine eyes have beheld great things, even too great for man; therefore I was bidden that I should not write them." (Oh, I see what I did. I put the dots in the wrong place.) It's 11:1, not 1:11 because the first chapter does have a real Prologue in Heaven, but if you look at the eleventh chapter of 1 Nephi in the first verse. "For it came to pass after I had desired to know these things that my father had seen [he had been carried away, too], and believing that the Lord was able to make them known to me, as I sat pondering in my heart I was caught away [using the same expression here used for Moses] in the Spirit of the Lord, yea, into an exceeding high mountain [well, did he imagine he saw it? Or did the spirit actually carry him? Notice in 2 Nephi, he said his body was carried up] which I had never before seen, and upon which I never had before set my foot. And the Spirit said unto me: Behold, what desirest thou?" (verse 2). So here is another ascension. It's not a transformation; it's an ascension. We talked about the mountain the last time.

Well, there are some other Prologues in Heaven, and they are important ones. The most famous one, of course, is in Job. I should have brought an Old Testament along. Job was first to be recognized as a drama. The first chapter of Moses is a drama here, and Job was recognized long ago as a drama. The use of the **waw**-conversive gives it away absolutely as a drama because of the stage directions in it. But the theme is Everyman. It starts out, "There was a man in the land of Uz, and his name was Job." It doesn't use a **waw**-conversive, very interesting. This is the narrative part; we haven't gotten to the drama part. This is just the introduction. "He was perfect and upright, **tam wayashar**. He feared the gods, and he kept away from sin." But notice that he is the man. He is the archetypal man. It starts, "There was a

|p2

man in the land of Uz, and he was the perfect, **tam**, man." He was representative. "He was upright. He walked straight in all things, fearing God and avoiding evil." So he's our character, and he has to go through all this suffering, as we all know from Job. So with this is archetypal man, beginning, in the sixth verse of the first chapter, already you have the Prologue in Heaven, where all the heavenly hosts are come together, and Satan comes among them with his challenge to God and says, "Have you seen my friend Job?" You know what the situation is. Satan comes before the Lord and he challenges him. The Lord says, Have you seen anyone like my servant Job? And Satan says, Yes, but he hasn't been really tried. You put him to a real trial and he'll turn against you. He'll denounce you (or renounce you). And the Lord says, No, all right, we'll give it a try. "We will allow Satan, our common enemy, to try man and to tempt him." So the Lord says, I will allow you to try and tempt him all the way, just so you spare his life, that's all.

Well, then you know what Job has to go through. And his friends come and comfort him in dramatic speeches. Incidentally, notice this is not a Bible text. Job is not an Israelite; he is a man of the East. And the three friends that come to him are Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite. Eliphaz is very interesting because the name is significant; it means "a soft liver." The Temanite means "of the south country, the pleasant country." It's used in the Songs of Solomon about the gentle winds that blow from the Teman. Bildad (**balada**, an Arabic root) means "far away, the man from a distance." Shuhite means "dwells in the lowlands, in the low valleys, in the low plains." And then there is Zophar, the Naamathite. Zophar means "vain, twittering, superficial." See, they all come to advise him and tell him what he should do. They are safe; they have it easy. They're easy livers, and notice these are tribes not mentioned in the Bible anywhere. They come from distant places. We're dealing with another culture now that is very old. And the Naamathite, **naam**, is "pleasant and beautiful, easy, soft going," and all that. So he has his easy-living friends, you might say, come to comfort him, and he gives them these various speeches. But they come from a different cycle, and this is explained later in the Book of Moses where these things come from.

The most famous of all of these dramas, however, is *Faust*, the most famous drama of modern times. From the discovery of manuscripts recently, we learn that Goethe started to write it before 1775. Nobody knows when. He was born in '49, right in the middle of the century. So he was quite young when he began it, and he didn't finish the second *Faust* until 1831. The second part was to be published after he was dead. How many years was that after the Church was founded? So Joseph Smith couldn't very well have used it, could he? Because it's so very close to this passage of Moses, I call attention to it here. It begins with the Prologue in Heaven. (I forgot the text. At least I remembered some of it; I'm glad of that. That would have slowed us down anyway. We have to get along here because of the time.) It begins with the Prologue in Heaven and the music of the spheres. It begins with a multiplicity of worlds, with the plurality of worlds here. It starts out: The endless old-age cycling of the spheres in which the sun has just completed a cycle. (Notice, it is the beginning of all things. It takes us back to the

cosmos; its cosmic.) In immemorial fashion the sun again sounds as it reaches a certain point. (It happens to be Easter. It happens to be the spring equinox in the play.) In cooperative rivalry with the brother spheres, it revolves with all the other spheres of the universe, and in this course it reaches its beginning. In its prescribed cycle, it comes back again to where it started and completes it with a roar of thunder. Then when it comes there, it brings renewed strength to everything. The sight of it brings strength to the angels, to all the forces. (Though it is unfathomable what it is, what the force and power is.) The incomprehensibly exalted creations are glorious as they were on the day of creation. We're right back to the new year again. So here's your old cosmic cycle which you're going to get throughout the literature. But it's not just that. You go back to the oldest monuments of the human race. It's an absolute obsession with the Egyptians. And this is a new development in Egyptian studies, this idea of the constant return as an earnest of our own resurrection—because all nature is renewed. So this is the opening chorus. And there is a Council in Heaven. And in reverse order, in order of their importance, the angels speak. First Raphael, then Gabriel, and then Michael. They all speak, each praising the glories of nature and the creation and the Lord. And then the Lord speaks. It's a hymn of creation. There's the angel chorus. They resume again. Then they all three sing together with a slight variation. The angels sing again the chorus of creation. Walter Otto was the great collector and coordinator of Classic literature. At the end of all his work, he wrote a book called **The Muses**, (which I think we have here) in which he shows what the word "poem" comes from. Poem is the creation song; it's the song that was sung on the day of creation. **Poiema** means "creation," really. **Poieo** is "to make," and **poiema** is the act of creating. When the creation was completed, then what happened? Well we get that from Job, again. The angels sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy at the sight of the creation of the new world that was created and was going forth. So here we have the creation song, and it's being sung here in Goethe's play. To start out, it is being sung by the angels here. "It has returned." And this poem, of course, is a chorus. The Greek play has a chorus. Well what does **chorus** mean? It's a ring dance; it's a circle. Same as our word curve; Latin: **curvus**; going around. The chorus sings, and the chorus of the muses sings the **poiema**, the creation song. Remember, the blind muses. Each one is in charge of describing and studying one department of the creation. So they all get together. When they sing together, it's the **poiema**, the song of the creation. It's a glorious thing. It's a round dance like the Egyptian maypole. And it's the music of the spheres and those things we have heard about in literature.

Well, then what happens? Immediately Satan enters in this one here, as in Job. His name is Mephistopheles. This indicates his role and assignment. Later when he appears to Faust in the chamber, Faust asks him what his assignment is. He says his only task is to destroy, to tear down. He must react. He can't act; he can only react. His business is entirely negative. And somebody has to have that role. It's an assignment, he says. He gives it as that because the word Mephistopheles, **mephis**, means "spite, evil, rancor." He wants to do as badly as he can. He's out to make mischief, but **opheles**, **opheleo** means "to do good, to help somebody, to help the plan along, to assist in things." So he plays a necessary role. Without him they are not

going to have any play or anything else. So Mephistopheles is the one, as he says, who always wants to do evil and only succeeds in doing good. Of course, it drives him wild. He can't win. I always compare him to the Road Runner and the Coyote. He has these fiendish, clever devices that always backfire. And so it is with Satan. We get this marvelous passage from the fourth chapter of Moses. It says, "Satan sought to destroy the world for he knew not the mind of God [Moses 4:6]." That, I think, is the most encouraging verse in all the scriptures. Satan seems to be getting the upper hand all the time, but he doesn't know the mind of God. There are a lot of things he doesn't know. That's reassuring because he seems to be ruling things, like that verse by Clarence Day. "Might and right are always fighting, In our youth it seems exciting, Right is always nearly winning, Might can hardly keep from grinning." Because might always wins in the end on this earth.

But Mephistopheles comes to report since God has been asking for reports. The angels come and report. He doesn't think so much of the way things are going on the earth. He says, "As in olden times, we used to be friends." This refers to the time when he was Lucifer. He says they met under friendlier circumstances, "but here I am again to report anyway, whether you want it or not." He's rather defiant here. He cannot go out and visit other worlds. He has been cast down and confined to this world where "little man is the little god, and thinks he rules things." He says man would be better off if he didn't have a memory of his divine origin because it despoils him. He starts pushing people off the sidewalks; he thinks he has it made, etc. "Man is rational," says Goethe, "but he acts like an animal." So this is the challenge to God: Is the creation a success? Is the plan for the human race working out at all, or is it a terrible bungle? What do you say to this? With Goethe the main purpose of the play is to banish religion from the scene. He doesn't want that in it at all. He was a marvelous man. When he was very young, he saw through philosophy, wouldn't have anything to do with that. He wanted to get down to the most solid information he could. He went into all branches of the sciences. He was a universal mind, one of the great thinkers of all time. But he sums it up in this play that he worked on for so many years. He had worked on this play so much. This brings his thought together. During his middle years when he was with Herder, it was a very literary period. Then Herder acquainted him with Schiller and they became friends. And then the Weimar period when he came so close to Shakespeare and to Homer and the Greeks, etc. He brings all these elements in. He is aware of all these things, and he sees that they fit in somewhere.

The Lord says to Satan here, "You're always the accuser, aren't you? Can't you ever say anything good about anybody? You never do." Satan is the accuser, and what is the Greek word for accuser? It's **diabolos**, "devil." **Diaboleo** is "to accuse somebody." As the **Talmud** says, he never accuses falsely. When he accuses, he accuses rightly; but that doesn't make him saintly. People do wrong, but you have no business being the accuser. Remember, Satan is the accuser of his fellow man. Four things we must never do. One of them is accuse. Never accuse because that will block you off from the ways of repentance which you need. **Diabolos** is, of course, our word for the devil. You from the Bay region know about Mount Diablo.

|p5

The **diabolos** is the devil, the accuser. Remember in the scriptures he is called "the accuser of his brethren." And Adam in replying to him says, "The Lord judge thee. I will not bring a ringing accusation against thee." As Brigham Young says, I do not accuse Satan. He is doing his job manfully. He's filling his mission as he is supposed to do. I'm not going to accuse him. I'm going to accuse myself when I fall short. He is there as the accuser. His business is to foul things up. He says to the Lord, things aren't going well on earth. The human race is not doing too well. And he challenges God to a wager that he can tempt man and make him fall, just as in Job. The Lord says, All right, he's in your hands again. "We will allow our common enemy to tempt man." And then the test begins and the opening scene. We'll have to get back to Moses to see how closely this follows now. But first we might as well see where this leads us.

That's the prologue. This is in heaven. It's brilliant; its light. Then the curtain rises (I hope you've read the first chapter) and it's dark. The whole first act is called **Nacht**; it's night. He finds himself in a dark chamber, in a dark tower at midnight. Nothing could be darker, and his spirit is absolutely black. He has reached the end of his rope. He says there's no joy in it. The whole thing is a farce. He says, "I've studied things. I've learned everything, and where does it get me? I'm no more clever than I ever was, no sharper than I ever was. After all that study, where has it got me? [Then he reflects on his way of life.] You call that living. No dog would live longer like this. I'm not going to put up with it anymore." And he sees nothing but hard times ahead. He's completely disillusioned. Also he's very poor, and he's ignored though he's the most famous man in the world, Dr. Faustus. There was a real Dr. Faustus in the sixteenth century. Some attribute the invention of printing to him. Only a magician could have done that.

There's Marlowe's **Dr. Faustus** with the same theme of redemption and the like. If you've read Marlowe's Faustus, "See how Christ's blood streams through the firmament; one drop of it will save me. Oh my Christ." He goes through the same thing that this Faust goes through. He turns to his hermetic books. He's going to apply to magic just to satisfy himself. He sees no future in anything. The world doesn't interest him. He's lost all that: I don't have to savor sour sweat, things that I don't know; that I might see all truth and the sources of all things, and not just fool around with terminology for the rest of my life the way they do in the schools. That's what happened to the young Clement in the schools. He said he went to all the doctors, and all they did was talk about words and argue with each other in terms of terminology. So that's the world, and it's all so silly. From a hermetic book he summons up a spirit. In Marlowe's *Faust*, it isn't Satan that guides him through. It's a familiar spirit with whom Satan puts him in touch. The same sort of thing happens here, but he decides on suicide. He's going to end it. He uses the hermetic book to call up the spirit, but "no dice." It's all the more discouraging, and he decides on suicide. Just as he puts the poison to his lips, the dawn comes and he hears an Easter chorus. It's Easter, the spring equinox. It's the return of the sun as the opening chorus said. The sun has come back again, and it's new life. He says, "I'm back on earth again." He's going to give it another try. It seems that the Easter chorus sings (wouldn't you know it) of the

|p6

resurrection. But again that's one thing he can't take. That's one thing the doctors of the church couldn't take. St. Augustine said an afterlife, yes; but resurrection, that's absurd (St. Augustine mind you).

"Resurrection," he says, "for those who pass the test." Then in that famous line he says, "Well, I get the message. It's marvelous, this marvelous Easter message." In Europe, especially in Germany, Easter is the big thing. It's the great festival of the year. "I hear the message, but I just can't believe it [that's all that's wrong with it]." So Faust takes an Easter walk and is followed home by a black poodle which follows him into the room and becomes a rather sinister object. This may go back to Andrew of Constantinople. They used to use poodles for divination. Andrew was famous in the tenth century for having a talking dog. And that electrified the world then, Andrew's talking dog.

Then he tries more conjuring, and Satan appears. He tells him his name and his office—that he is the destroyer. He does not act but he reacts and he is always against something. Then Faust says, "What's the deal?" And Mephisto says, "I am going to make a deal with you. I serve you here. You serve me there." Now that's the famous pact with the devil. That comes later on in our Book of Moses. It's very vividly set forth, better than anywhere else. Faust accepts. Moses does not accept, as you know. So we are back to the Prologue, and we get to Moses' calling here. And again, let me refer you to another great Prologue that begins a story; namely, the opening episode of the Book of Mormon is the Prologue in Heaven. We sometimes overlook that. In the first chapter we begin with the eighth verse. The first part is the **Colophon**, Nephi summing up his situation and the situation of the world at that time. Then he gets to his story and his own family, about his father. In verse seven he returns to his own house at Jerusalem and things begin. Now things start moving. This is the revelation to Lehi's dispensation. "And being thus overcome with the Spirit, he was carried away in a vision [he gets carried away; here's an ascension again] even that he saw the heavens open, [he sees the heavens open, and this is the ascension to heaven] and he thought he saw God sitting upon his throne. . . ." There is the theme. The heavenly hosts are assembled around God on his throne. But you notice that it's put as a vision (he thought he saw God). It was as if he experienced it because he is going way back in time. This is the Council in Heaven at the foundation of the earth you are beginning to see.

Let's not forget the **Shabako Stone** there. Let's not forget the **Enuma Elish**, but especially the **Memphite Theology** where the oldest record of the human race tells us about this Council in Heaven. And here we have it again. ". . . he thought he saw God sitting upon his throne surrounded with numerous concourses of angels. . ." A concourse is a circle. Of course "numerous concourses" means circles within circles and reminds you of dancing. And what were they doing? Surrounded means "all around." It's the angel chorus ". . . in the attitude of singing and praising their God." It was a choral dance. "And it came to pass that he saw one descending out of the midst of heaven, and he beheld that his luster was above that of the sun at noon-day."

|p7

Now he saw the various spirits assigned to their work on earth, and they are descending on their various missions. He sees the Twelve come down and the Lord. Now this was all planned at that time. This hadn't happened yet and this is what makes Nephi rejoice. He sees that it is going to be all right. He sees the Plan of Salvation. "And he also saw twelve others following him, and their brightness did exceed that of the stars in the firmament."

Notice the cosmic element here, too: the stars of the firmament and all of the rest of it. "And they came down and went forth upon the face of the earth; and the first came and stood before my father and gave unto him a book, . . ." As in John, The Revelation of John. The giving of the book, the bitter book that you eat; the eating of the book, the book that tastes like honey or the book that tastes like wormwood. The eating of the book is a very important element. In fact, G. Widengren, the Swede, has written a book on that subject (a book about a book). This book is important. ". . . and bade him that he should read. And it came to pass that he did read and was filled with the Spirit of the Lord." Notice, what is this imagery? What world are we in? First he told him to eat the book, and didn't eat it but he read it. But he is filled with the spirit of the Lord. "And he read, saying: Wo, wo, unto Jerusalem, for I have seen thine abominations! . . . that it should be destroyed and the inhabitants thereof; . . . when my father had read and seen many great and marvelous things, he did exclaim many things unto the Lord; such as: [typical Egyptian phrase: such as to say the following] Great and marvelous are thy works, [Now this sounds like the Creation Hymn, doesn't it? "Thy incomprehensible, exalted works are glorious as on the day of creation." He says it here.] O Lord, God Almighty! Thy throne is high in the heavens and thy power and goodness and mercy are over all the inhabitants of the earth; and because thou art merciful, thou wilt not suffer those who come unto thee to perish! And after this manner was the language of my father in the praising of his God; . . ." Notice, he says I'm just giving you my own version: "after this manner." This is not a direct quote. This is the sort of thing. We're dealing with types and images, and you can shift them around. This is formulaic literature, which is perfectly fair because these things will lead no one astray. ". . . for his soul did rejoice, and his whole heart was filled, because of the things which he had seen, yea, which the Lord had shown unto him. And now I, Nephi, do not make a full account of the things which my father hath written . . ." So here we have the Prologue in Heaven again beginning the great Book of Mormon. And we fit it in the plan. We have mentioned the third chapter of Abraham before. That is the Council in Heaven very clearly, from verse 22 to verse 28 (a pretty long account of it). Abraham 3:22 "Now the Lord had shown unto me, Abraham, the intelligences that were organized before the world was; and among all these there were many of the noble and great ones."

Oh, I remember another important one. In the *Odyssey* there is a marvelous one. The **Odyssey** begins with the Council in Heaven. It gives a brief account. As Job begins, "This is the upright and perfect man," the *Odyssey* begins, "Tell me, muse, about the man." The first word is "the man" who had to suffer so much and go through so much seeking to save his soul and to bring his fellowmen through as best he could, because he was a magnanimous spirit.

|p8

But why couldn't he do it and what went wrong? Well, I tell you. So it begins already at about the 16th or 18th line (right at the beginning of the *Odyssey*), where it says that the most high God, the Father of gods and men, called an assembly of all the gods in heaven to meet in the palace at Olympus in the high halls above. And they all came, except Poseidon. He takes the role of Satan. He holds back. Incidentally, the word **Shaytan** (Satan) means "the one who holds back, the one who lies in ambush." **Shatana** means "to hold back;" **Shaytan** is a person who lies in ambush, who holds back, who will not cooperate. And Poseidon didn't come.

Another famous one, right out of **Faust**, the most famous epic of the Middle Ages, was **Reynard the Fox**: And it was at the spring equinox, when everything was green. The bush and the trees were covered with the first green leaves. It was a marvelous time. Noble, the king, had sent his criers out to summon all the animals to his presence (to celebrate the creation) that they would come at his command. All the animals great and small, came, except Reynard the Fox. He had done so many wicked things that he didn't dare appear before the king at court (but he does appear).

And then we have others. There is the marvelous one in the *Lokasenna*. That's one of the great eddas where the courts all meet and Loki comes. Loki is Satan. He comes and defies God and all the rest of the gods with his refusal to cooperate. So it's a very common image that you will get throughout the world. Notice that Reynard the Fox is both sly and curious, and yet he's very intelligent and very clever. And like Loki, he is dangerous. And so we have this in the *Odyssey*. The opening speech is that of Zeus himself. God, the father of men, spoke, "Oh how men blame the gods for all their misfortunes and all that comes upon them because it's only their own foolishness, their own pride and their own stubbornness and refusal to repent that brings all their troubles on them. They suffer more than they need to suffer." Down on earth meantime Odysseus is being held back in the cave by a very charming enchantress, Calypso. That is a marvelous story about his being held back there. Well, anyway this is a universal theme.

Question: Is there an etymological connection between **Shaytan** and **Poseidon**? **Poteidon** is a very interesting word that has been analyzed by Curtius and others. That's the old way with a t instead of an s (just like in Attic you put a t, where in the other Greek dialects you put an s). So it's **Poteidon**, the **potos** of the underworld. He's the **gaieokhon**, the earthshaker. It means the possessor of the underworld, the earthshaker. And he comes in here. When Satan departs from Moses, he lets out a great cry and the earth shakes. Well, Poseidon's regular epithet in Homer is **gaieokhos**, which means the "possessor of the earth—he who rules this earth." But it is nearly always translated (probably wrongly) as earthshaker. He's both the earth shaker and the earth holder. If he holds it, he shakes it. So it goes back to the common thing, that he is of this earth, under the earth. And, of course, he is Plutos and he is wealth, too. This comes in.

Let's see this marvelous section here. We're leaving the good part out. Sections 1-9 is the Prologue, and it is most wonderful, just like the Council in Heaven. This is where we fit in.

This is the plan. Abraham: 3:23 "God saw these souls that they were good, and he stood in the midst of them [He's surrounded on all sides] and he said: These I will make my rulers; for he stood among those that were spirits, and he saw that they were good; and he said unto me: Abraham thou art one of them; thou wast chosen before thou wast born. And there stood one among them that was like unto God, and he said unto those who were with him: We will go down, . . ." They are discussing the plan. And what happens? Satan steps up and makes his challenge here. "And the Lord said: Whom shall I send? And one answered like unto the Son of Man: Here am I, send me. And another answered and said: Here am I send me. And the Lord said: I will send the first. And the second was angry, and kept not his first estate, and, at that day, many followed after him." So here we have the revolt again, just as we had Horus and Seth in the presence of Ptah in the beginning of the Memphis **Shabako** text. So here we go. The Lord speaks to Moses and he gives him his name, which is Endless. All we know God by is epithets, things describing him. The Koran says there are 95 names of God. They are not names; they are epithets. Every name is an epithet. It's something that describes a character. If you are Rufus, it means you are red headed. If you are Curtis, it means you are short, etc. There's nobody here whose name doesn't actually mean something. We should go down the roll.

In Moses 1:3 God says, "My name is Endless." Notice it is capitalized in our books, and it should be. If you ask the rabbis what is the ultimate name you can call Him by, it's still an epithet, but it is **En Sof**. It means "who has no end." The **Sof** is the limit, the boundary. But there is no boundary, he tells us. Either in space or in time he is unlimited, so is that not endless? So he is the **En Sof**. "Endless is my name." Again, the importance of the name; we saw that. "There is no end to my works or my words." The works and words come out in all of these things. They must go together because the works mean nothing unless they are communicated, unless they are shared. ". . . for I am without beginning of days or end of years; . . ." Notice, that is time. Right across in verse six it says: ". . . there is no God beside me and all things are present with me, . . ." That means present in place and present in time. If I can be there, it's present; if it's right now, it's present. Remember we use the very same terms for time as we do for space. We don't use absent the same way, but the present is whatever is here. You can never make the statement "I am not here." And you can never make the statement "It is not now." Both statements are always false because you are always here and you are always now. Nobody else is here, and no other time is now when you perceive it. Strange paradoxes, aren't they? He says, ". . . I am the Lord God Almighty, and Endless is my name, for I am without beginning of days or end of years; and is not this endless?" Meaning no limits. Now here comes the second one. He has introduced himself. In ancient literature, when a god describes himself, it's called an **aretology**. And this is a typical **aretology**. When someone else describes him and praises him, that's an **aclamatio**. That's an acclamation or a **laus**. **Laudis** is praises. **Arete** is "virtue, quality." The high qualities and virtues of a person are **arete**. **Aretology** is proclaiming your particular office, calling, function, etc. The most famous of them all is the "I am Isis" from the Egyptians, which the Greeks took over. "I am Isis," and then she describes herself.

|p10

This is an **aretology**. He says, ". . . I am the Lord God Almighty, and Endless is my name; for I am without beginning of days or end of years; . . ." And then he tells Moses how he is related to Him (why I am bothering to tell you this, why I am bothering to talk to you?). Remember, the brother of Jared says, "He talked to me in all humility as one man to another." Now that's what humility is. It is not bowing the knee in the presence of overwhelming superiority, power or glory. Anybody can do that. But it is recognizing that other creatures, small, very unimportant creatures, are just as good as you are and are on an equal basis with you. That's what humility is. You are listening and you put yourself on the level with them. So the brother of Jared, says, "He talked with me as one man to another in all humility." It was humility for the Lord, and it was humility for the brother of Jared, too. You notice how he was smitten down when he held up the rocks.

Then the Lord says to Moses, "And behold, thou art my son; . . ." After the **aretology**, He says, this is where you come in: you are my son. In the **Gospel of Philip** it says an astonishing thing. It says, do you want to know what God is? A horse begets a horse, a dog begets a dog, a bull begets a bull. What does a god beget, if a god has a son? What can it possibly be except a god? This is the problem here. If you are the son of such a being, there is a lot of explaining to do here. And, therefore, you're qualified and I'm going to show you a few things. ". . . look and I will show thee the workmanship of mine hands; but not all, for my works are without end, [There is your **En Sof** again. His works are without end. His presence is without end. His knowledge is without end. Everything about him is without end.] and also my words. [Remember that the works and the words always go together. The words are to communicate and the works are what's done, but it doesn't happen in a vacuum.] for they never cease [they go on and on—spaceless, timeless]. Wherefore no man can behold all my works, except he behold all my glory; . . ." So his works are his glory to behold. Remember that he says, "This is my work and my glory." My work is my glory. That is what it is: to share this with others to bring about the immortality of man. "Wherefore no man can behold all my works, except he behold all my glory; and no man can behold all my glory, and afterwards remain in the flesh on the earth." Then: Why am I telling you this? Because I have work for you to do. I am going to give you an assignment. The Prophet Joseph says every one of us received an assignment before he came here. You'd better find out what it is and do it. "And I have a work for thee, Moses, my son; and thou art in the similitude of mine Only Begotten; [Now not only is he His son, but in the similitude and the likeness as the Son is in the similitude of the Father. He is in the likeness of the Only Begotten.] and mine Only Begotten is and shall be the Savior for he is full of grace and truth. [That is very interesting because He refers to the Book of Ether 3:8-9. We won't go into that.] but there is no God beside me, . . ." (verse 6). It tells us later on in the Book of Moses that he is commanded to "call upon God in the name of the Son forevermore." He says to call upon God and God only, but always in the name of the Son. He is full of grace and truth, and of course those are the qualities. How do you define grace? That's **charis**; that's everything good. **Charis** is your attitude toward others, toward everything else. It is an attitude of complete love. It is related to our word **cheer** and the Latin, **gratia** which means "thanks, grace," etc. We just described Mephistopheles as all negative, all willing

{p11

to destroy. This is the absolute opposite of that. There is no shadow of that in it at all. Full of grace and truth—nothing false, nothing deceiving, nothing phony. Whereas Satan, on the other hand, is the one who loves and makes a lie. He was a liar in the beginning. He is the deceiver as well as **Apollyon**, "the Destroyer." He works by trickery and by lies. He is called "the father of lies." And this is the opposite. The Lord is full of grace and truth. So to what point do we repent in this life, or any other life? Repent until you are full of grace and truth. So I think we all need some repentance. Don't call upon anyone else to repent until you have repented. That will be when you are full of grace and truth. That's a long ways off for some people. We can't even conceive of what that would be like, but that is the object. That's what we are after.

I'm going to limit you to this one thing because I have one assignment, the Lord says. We focus on the thing we are supposed to do. ". . . for thou art in the world, and now I show it unto thee." I will show you the world you are in. We mentioned this before, the anthropic principle. Where you are determines the way everything will appear to you and be to you because you have to act from that point. You don't see everything. You don't move in all directions, and you don't know what's behind you at this very moment. "And it came to pass that Moses looked, and beheld the world upon which he was created, and Moses beheld the world and the ends thereof, and all the children of men which are, and which were created; of the same he greatly marveled and wondered" (verse 8). That's the end of the Prologue. Then the lights go down and the stage is darkened. As in *Faust* and as in *Job* we see our hero. In the *Odyssey* he is in a cave. Odysseus is imprisoned in a crystal cave under the ground by Calypso. Her name means the one who hides you, the hidden one, the dark one, the witch. So we are getting these heroes all in the same position. As soon as we leave the Prologue in Heaven, we find them in the dark. The presence of God withdrew from Moses, and his glory was not on Moses. The lights go down. As he was left unto himself, he fell to the earth. Remember, Joseph Smith says, "I found myself lying on my back. It was some time before I could regain my strength." It's the same thing here. "And it came to pass that it was for the space of many hours before Moses did again receive his natural strength like unto man; . . ." So as the play opens we have Moses lying there in the dark and dreary world, all alone and out cold, the picture of helplessness; he has reached the bottom. You can't go lower than this. Well, this is a fine way to begin your career on earth, a fine way to launch. How auspicious a beginning is this? As he begins to receive his natural strength, he pulls himself together and he says to himself this great truth, "Now, for this cause I know that man is nothing, which thing I never had supposed." "Oh, human race how I esteem you as nothing," as the Greek chorus says. "How I estimate you as equal to exactly nothing," it says (I'll have to look it up. I can't remember the play). The Greek tragedy is man's condition on earth, what's going on, how he gets himself into it, and how he gets out of it. But Moses says this, "Now, for this cause I know that man is nothing, which thing I never had supposed" (verse 10). He has seen what is up there, and he has seen what is down here. Man is on earth where he was created.

Incidentally, in *Oedipus Rex* you get that. When Tiresius, the seer, comes on the stage, the first thing he does, he looks. He is blind but he faces the Athenian audience and says, "All of you

|p12

know nothing, so don't fool yourself." Nobody will understand Tiresius since he is a seer and a prophet.

But here is the contrast. If he is nothing, then how about being so close to God. "But now mine own eyes have beheld God; but not my natural, but my spiritual eyes, for my natural eyes could not have beheld; . . ." Are we trying to escape the issue here by calling it spiritual? No, the spiritual packs a greater energy than the physical. Spirit is a form of energy, just as faith, love and joy are forms of energy. It's a real and substantial thing. The spirit is one of the real forces. We'll say a form of energy and let it go at that. ". . . for I should have withered and died in his presence; but his glory was upon me; and I beheld his face, for I was transfigured before him." He was carried up and he was in the presence of God. He was on another level, in another energy zone, and he could do it. As he says here, ". . . not my natural, but my spiritual eyes, for my natural eyes could not have beheld; . . . I was transfigured before him" (verse 11). That's the transfiguration on the mountain.

That's the end of that act. A new scene is when a new character enters. Now, the play begins because you have to have an antagonist and a protagonist in a play. Now Satan enters the scene. Notice, when the hero is at his lowest, when he is the most helpless, that is the time that Satan strikes (when he gets him at the greatest possible disadvantage). Satan does not play fair. He going to make all the disruption possible. He can unbalance you. He can destabilize governments and things like that. He likes to take advantage and destroy and knock down. Nothing is to be gained by that anywhere, even though it's the wicked you are fighting. But here, ". . . when Moses had said these words, Satan came tempting him saying: Moses, son of man, worship me."

Here he takes advantage of him in his weakness. This happens. Faust is in the dark ready to commit suicide, and Satan appears to him there.* It's the same thing with Job. The tempters, his companions, come to him then. But remember, it is Satan who is exerting his power over Job. The Lord said to Satan in the beginning, I've put him in your hand, but spare his life. So Satan is doing it. This is a stock drama. Since it starts out by **ish** and **andra**, (**aner**), "the man," that means everybody. We are to think of ourselves respectively as that. The man is **Adam**; **ish** and **enosh** too. **Ben enosh** is a man. The word **Enoch** and the word **enosh** are the same. It's all mixed up together, but we are identified with these things. See how these flow together and this language is trying to convey something to us. But there's quite a difference in the gospel the way it is given to us by the Prophet. He is going to show us finally what the reality is behind this after the human race has dabbled around for thousands of years. And Goethe worked at it. He sweat blood trying to find out would it really make sense, and ended up on a rather sour and negative note, which we don't need to. When was the first *Faust* first performed? He started in 1775, and 1808 was when he finished it. So I doubt that Joseph Smith could have used it for this. I doubt if he did use it. The second *Faust* didn't come until 1831, and this was published in 1830.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 18

We have to go very fast and just touch high points, but you will notice that every verse we come to in the Pearl of Great Price raises questions, legitimate questions which would take some time to answer, mostly. Now we have got to Moses 1:12. We find Moses flat and helpless. This is the time we see that Satan chooses to attack him. The result is a **stichomythia**. Now we are going to get a combat. We know now throughout the entire world in ancient times from the very beginning at the year rite of the renewal of the world (we will see this is a renewal of the world) there was a combat with the powers of darkness. The king overcame and was crowned for another cycle, proving by his victory that he was worthy to rule. He had overcome the powers of death and darkness. Well, there's a great deal on that, more on that than anything else, I guess. But here we come to the combat, and it is between Moses and Satan. Satan came tempting him, saying, "Moses, worship me." Moses must be tempted. Remember, that was the understanding here. So from twelve on we have the **stichomythia**. **Stichos** is the word for "verse," and **mythia** is the throwing back and forth of rival speeches and verses. Before a duel between the heroes of the kings, there is a long preliminary exchange of insults that goes on. This is a regular part of heroic literature. It's part of the epic milieu that belongs to barbaric ages, surprising as it is. A typical example I just remembered this morning.

When I was ten years old, I remember I memorized a stichomythia from Walter Scott. Terrible poetry, so we will skip it. But the amazing thing is that the stichomythia has been revived in our own day. You see it, and it is barbaric. It is savage, and it is depraved. Namely, in the wrestling business. Half the battle are the insults they sling at each other. You recount why you are fighting, how badly you were injured, how you were cheated on the last bout, and what you are going to do to the guy this time. Well, that's stichomythia. They take up half the time swapping these insults and challenges and grinding their teeth. They do it in an artificial phony voice, as you know. Everybody has to growl most savagely. That's a stichomythia, and it's a very important part of ancient drama. There's a lot of it in Shakespeare's king plays. The first part of *Henry IV* opens with a stichomythia.

So here we are. Notice Satan speaks first. "Moses, son of man, worship me." He's going to be the king. It's a contest for who shall be king, and it turns out that Moses is to be king. This thing is between Moses and Satan here, not between God and Satan. God never fights Satan at any time. All He has to do is snap His fingers. That takes care of Satan. He has only the power that he is allowed to have. Moses looks on Satan and gives him the cold shoulder. He gives Satan a very bad time here, but you will see what Satan does to him. Moses says, ". . . For behold, I am a son of God, in the similitude of his Only Begotten; and where is thy glory, that I should worship thee?" He sees no glory here and says, why should I worship you?

|p2

He's a fake. Remember, glory cannot be faked. It's a very interesting thing. We try to do that with special effects, etc., but they always fall flat. They are always disappointing. It's better not to try that, to try to imitate the glory of heaven, whether it's in a Sistine Chapel or anywhere else. It just won't work. But Moses says, ". . . where is thy glory, that I should worship thee?" (verse 13). Now he rubs it in. He really gets to the point here. "For behold, I could not look upon God, except his glory should come upon me, and I were strengthened before him. But I can look upon thee in the natural man [then he taunts him]. Is it not so, surely [asking for a reply]? Blessed be the name of my God, for his Spirit hath not altogether withdrawn from me, . . ."

Moses is down on the earth now. He's flat; he's out cold. He is in a dismal state, but he still trails clouds of glory. You still have the intimations of immortality. You still have the **anamnesis** that Plato talks about, the memory that you cannot banish, the fact that there was a former glory. You can't remember what it was, but you remember that there was such a thing. He says, ". . . his Spirit hath not altogether withdrawn from me [and that's why he can tell the difference], or else where is thy glory, for it is darkness unto me?" Immitation glory is darkness; it's sad. The glory of a merry-go-round, or the glory of Las Vegas, all that light, all that neon glitter. Is that your idea of glory? That's not very glorious. It's the opposite; it's very sad, isn't it. "And I can judge between thee and God; for God said unto me: Worship God, for him only shalt thou serve." He couldn't be fooled, so he then rebukes Satan and tries to cast him out. It doesn't work, like when the apostles tried to cast him out and failed to do so. "This one comes not out," says the Lord, "save with fasting and prayer." So he says, ". . . Satan, deceive me not; [it won't work] for God said unto me: Thou art after the similitude of mine Only Begotten. [And this was the claim, of course, that Satan was making.] And he also gave me commandments when he called unto me out of the burning bush, saying: Call upon God in the name of mine Only Begotten, and worship me." Here we have the first mention of it: "Call upon God in the name of the Son forever more."

"And again Moses said: I will not cease to call upon God, . . ." Moses is like Adam. Notice they follow the same formula. Adam was seeking ever greater light and knowledge. In the second verse of the Book of Abraham, as he opens there, Abraham says, As one who sought for light and knowledge and for greater light and knowledge. He wants more and more. Moses says, I have more and I haven't finished my dealings with the Lord; I have nothing to expect from you. ". . . I have other things to inquire of him: for his glory has been upon me, wherefore I can judge between him and thee. Depart hence, Satan." So he tries to cast him out here, but Satan counterattacks now. Stichomythia wouldn't be a contest without going back and forth. When Moses says these words, Satan decides on a frontal attack. He sees his ruse is no good. He has failed to impress Moses, so he casts off the mask and gets nasty. He's going to make a direct frontal attack. He won't do that unless you have seen through his ruses. Otherwise, he works by trickery. He's a sly gentleman, as Joseph Smith says. He was a liar from the beginning and a great deceiver. He is very experienced. He doesn't often have to use the direct approach, but he uses it here. And it's too much for Moses.

|p3

" . . . Satan cried with a loud voice, and rent upon the earth, and commanded, saying . . . " He's not showing very great dignity or anything else. He loses his self-control. He cries, screams, tears on the earth and says, "I am the Only Begotten, worship me." You'd think Moses wouldn't fall for anything as obvious as that, but he's a terrible figure. As we will see in the **Apocalypse of Abraham**, the same thing happens with Abraham when Satan comes. Michael appears and says, Don't argue with him because he is more clever than you are. He has a powerful mind. He'll trick you every time. Let me dismiss him. Then Michael casts him out when Abraham is sacrificed. Well, Moses is terrified. He's petrified so he loses and collapses now. He would be completely lost if it wasn't for something. "And it came to pass that Moses began to fear exceedingly; [He is already giving way. That's lack of faith. As soon as you lack faith, then you are already down.] and as he began to fear, he saw the bitterness of hell. . . ." (verse 20). He went right down to the bitterness of hell. That's the sort of thing you have with schizophrenia. It's utter terror, which is the worst hell you can possibly have, worse than any physical suffering you could go through.

But with his last ounce of strength, he makes an effort, calls upon God and receives strength (so you can get more and return). He's down and out, and he goes down to hell now. He cries out of the depths. This is the **de profundis**. That's the 130th Psalm, that famous one. The Psalms are the royal hymns, many of them for the coronation and the rivalry. They had to do with the contest. "Why do the Gentiles rage?" And there's all the fighting that goes on. "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord" [the **de profundis**]. The king is down; he is out. He calls unto the Lord. The Lord rescues him, and then he is restored and he is on the throne again because he has not been overcome by the powers of the darkness. That's what happens here again. Then he says, "Depart from me, Satan, for this one God only will I worship, which is the God of glory [notice how often they mention glory here]." Now it is Satan's turn to cry. Now he begins to shake. He was shaking already with rage and out of control. Now, he has nothing to offer. He trembles and the earth shakes, as we mentioned the last time. The Greeks called him **gaieokhos**, "the earth shaker." He was called "the earth shaker." Moses receives more strength (he is building up) and calls upon God, saying: "In the name of the Only Begotten, depart hence, Satan." So he casts out Satan in the name of the Son. ". . . Satan cried with a loud voice with weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth, and he departed hence, even from the presence of Moses, ..." A tragic figure, he cannot take a subordinate role. He wants to be the first one.

Question: The first time he tried to cast him out, did he do it in the name of the Only Begotten? No, it doesn't mention it, but this one works. He got enough strength to build up again. Now, we have to move on, avoiding technicalities, but some are important. Now we come to the **entr'acte**. Verse 23 is between the acts, an **entr'acte**. It is a commentary by the lectern priest (the Egyptians would call him the **keri-hep**), the priest who reads and recites what's here. This is the part in red ink. Black ink has been the sacred words, the sacred drama. Now we come to the red ink which is a commentary and stage directions. "And now of this thing Moses bore record; [see, Moses isn't even writing this] but because of wickedness it is not had among the children of men." Moses is the great communicator.

|p4

He comes through here. Now, comes the next act. He has won; he is in victory. He has to be recognized and crowned. This is the coronation that follows the combat. This is a very interesting thing here. We get the same basic combat, the Egyptian combat, in the Book of Abraham with Facsimiles one, two and three. (I should mention this just in passing: In Facsimile No. 1 Abraham is helpless and bound to an altar. With his last breath, he is calling for aid. The angel of the Lord comes, but the voice of the Lord speaks and he is delivered. In the second one he is passing through the heavens and is shown the heavens. That's Figure 2, a very important one. In the third one (Figure 3) Abraham is sitting on the throne. He is the one who should because he has overcome on the altar. Well, what's he doing on the altar? Why shouldn't the king be there? The king always chose a substitute instead. The substitute had to be foreigner, a noble, and either blond or red headed. Abraham was chosen for it, so he gets to sit on the throne too. That's Egyptian custom, but we get it right here. This is the famous year drama. It first came out with the so-called Cambridge School, just since 1930. I remember when I was in graduate school, they would throw you out the door if you mentioned this. It's accepted by everyone now.)

". . . when Satan had departed from the presence of Moses, that Moses lifted up his eyes unto heaven, being filled with the Holy Ghost, which beareth record of the Father and the Son; . . ." (verse 24). He is carried up. In the Book of Abraham and in the Abraham story, Abraham is carried up to heaven again by the Holy Ghost, sees God on his throne, and talks with him. It's as if you are there yourself calling upon the name of God. So he does behold his glory again. (This is back to heaven, but it is in between now.) The lights go up, Moses is in glory. Is this a return to heaven or is it halfway? Remember, the mountain. It's as high as you can go, I suppose. But he sees the glory of God which was upon him. Then he heard a voice announcing that he is the victor. He is recognized, and he is the king. ". . . Blessed art thou, Moses, for I, the Almighty, have chosen thee, [he has been elected] and thou shalt be made stronger than many waters; . . ." What many waters was Moses stronger than? Remember, when they passed through the Red Sea, the waters of death. And also the waters of Marah. They were dying of thirst in the wilderness. Moses struck the rock with his staff, and the waters of Marah (the waters of complaint, bitterness) came out. They had been complaining and sinning; that's why they were dying of thirst. The waters gushed forth and saved them. So Moses is stronger than many waters. Notice, he raises his staff. The Lord says, Raise your staff and the waters of the Red Sea will return. The wind blows; the sea comes up and it swamps the chariots of Pharaoh. And the same thing happens again. He strikes the rock with his staff. Joshua does the very same thing when they get to the Jordan. Moses doesn't lead them across the Jordan, but Joshua does. It's at flood, and they can't get across. Joshua backs up the waters. The stuff had piled up behind a dam; and when the dam broke, it came down with a rush of dirty water, mud, sand, trees, and everything else. But again, he raised his staff. So this follows a very distinct pattern. I have published at least a hundred examples of this royal drama taking place.

". . . for they shall obey thy command as if thou wert God." Moses is going to act in the place of God on earth. He is God's representative, and he has the priesthood to act for God.

!p5

We say the divine kingship. This is where it is rooted. You act as if you are God. Then he says here, "And lo, I am with thee [as long as I am with you, then you can act for me] even unto the end of thy days; for thou shalt deliver my people from bondage, . . ." They are not Moses' people. You will deliver my people, but it's just as if you were me, the Lord says. (As if thou wert God, thou shalt deliver my people.)" So you are taking my place. You have proven this because of your faith. You have proven faithful, so now you are qualified for this great work. So this is the work to which he is being called. "And lo, I am with thee, even unto the end of thy days; for thou shalt deliver my people from bondage, even Israel my chosen." Notice, he is starting up, I have chosen thee, and you shall lead Israel, my chosen. Then Moses receives the assignment. This is the end of that scene. He receives the assignment in heaven now as he did before. Now, we see what he is going to do. He is supposed to lead the chosen people. He is supposed to establish a new dispensation. In Egypt all this time, they had been cut off from the Lord for four hundred years. And he is shown his field of labor.

We said before that every one of these verses is relevant, and you should ask a question about every one. Do you have an assignment? Do you know what is your field of labor? Joseph Smith said we all received them before. What keys do we have? What indication do we have? What help do we have to decide whether we have anything to do or not? What do we receive when we are quite young? A patriarchal blessing. I got mine when I was ten years old. Then I lost it. I memorized it, however. Then because I had lost it, I got one after I came to Provo many many years later. They just matched like a glove, though they were very unusual. Well, most people's are, actually, if you analyze them carefully. They are very formulaic. It's like priming the pump, you see. You have to get going. There's a lot of this in scripture, repeated lines, etc. While the patriarch gets the spirit, he recites certain formulas and concentrates on certain things. Then the ideas start to flow. The revelation starts to come. But don't be surprised if there is a lot of formula, a lot of repetition, in patriarchal blessings. There should be because they are following the patriarchal pattern. So Moses receives his assignment. And he sees all the earth, not a particle he didn't see. Does that mean he saw every individual proton and electron? No, he saw every type of particle (it means that). He saw all the particles it was made of. He knew its construction completely. That's just a guess, of course. And he saw all the people ". . . and he discerned them by the Spirit of God; and their numbers were great, even numberless as the sand upon the sea shore" [verse 28]. I just read yesterday an Egyptian text that used for the first time a thing I've never seen before, "Heavy, heavy beyond measure, heavy even as the sands of the sea shore." I hadn't seen that one. As many as the sands, but as heavy as the sands is a different one.

"And he beheld many lands; and each land was called earth [at that time the world was divided into separate lands, not in contact with each other at all, separate earths; of course, **eretz** is the Hebrew word for all of them], and there were inhabitants on the face thereof. And it came to pass that Moses called upon God, . . ." And now he asks the famous epic question. At the beginning of the epic poem, the poet asks the muse or the Lord to tell him what it is all about, to give him the whole picture.

|p6

The *Iliad* out (I'm mixing it up with the *Odyssey* here; I'm always doing these things these days; working on this Egyptian stuff gets me all mixed up): "From what original cause and origin did all this come? In the very first thing of all, how did this tragedy arise?" It's the struggle of man. In the next one it's going to be Odysseus; in this one it's Achilles. How did this all begin and why? Which god was responsible for this? The answer is, of course, that it was man's own wickedness. But the will of god was being fulfilled. He was behind it all. So you get that. And then in the *Aeneid*, the great Latin one:, "Recall to my mind, muse, [he's calling the holy muse, as Milton does, you see] what god was offended? What divine principle had been trespassed against that should bring all this trouble to a man so excellent as Aeneas?" Why did he have to suffer? The whole thing is about the godlike Aeneas, how he has to suffer so many things. He had to go through so many pains and labors, be cast into so many terrible situations and the like, just like Odysseus. So you begin with this question: What's it all about and why? Our Milton is the same way: "Tell me, for heaven hides nothing from thy view, nor the expanse of hell. Who in the beginning led our first parents to such foul revolt?" Who was it? What brought all this trouble on? They always begin with, why is there all this trouble? Why do we have to go through all this? So this is the same thing. Only Moses asks the most sweeping question of all when he says, "Tell me, I pray thee, why these things are so, and by what thou madest them?" And he is rebuked for it. He is given a proper answer. This is the sort of question we like to talk about in elders quorum, but we are wasting our time because the Lord says, That's not for you now, and it won't be for quite awhile. And the glory of the Lord was upon Moses, and God talked with him face to face and said to him: "For mine own purpose have I made these things. Here is wisdom and it remaineth in me. [Does that answer your question?] And by the word of my power, have I created them, which is mine Only Begotten Son, who is full of grace and truth." Then he does tell him worlds without number, etc. They can't be measured to man, so there's no reason in trying to explain or number them to you; it would be a waste of time. And "for mine own purpose" again ". . . and by the Son I created them, which is mine Only Begotten. And the first man of all men have I called Adam, which is many [that is the meaning of the Egyptian word Adam]." Rudolf Anthes has proven that. Adam means all that's gone before and all that comes after. Like Eve, which means everybody, "because she is the mother of all living."

". . . For behold, there are many worlds that have passed away by the word of my power. And there are many that now stand, and innumerable are they unto men, but all things are numbered unto me, for they are mine and I know them." Then Moses says, All right, I see it now. Tell me just about this world, and I will be content. What the Lord tells him in verse 31 following is that there is more to it than you can ever know. Take care of your sector of the front and leave the rest alone. That's all you can handle. It's assigned to you because you can handle it, and at present it is all you can handle. That's all for anybody. You have a particular assignment. You fill it to the full and then it will expand, but don't ask for more. Don't ask to command the whole front. You may not know what is going on in your sector; nobody else may know either, but it is very important not to take things in hand and start giving orders. We have no business doing that.

|p7

And so he says, ". . . O God, and tell me concerning this earth, and the inhabitants thereof, and also the heavens, and then thy servant will be content." He is willing to settle for just this earth (modest man), so he accepts.

Notice that then the Lord goes on and repeats again that this world has to be understood in its setting, in its proper perspective, in its larger picture along with the other worlds. We have seen that again and again. We start out by putting the earth itself in its perspective, which requires a much larger picture actually. It does require an awareness of Moses' own limited scope. He has to be made aware of that by being shown the big picture and also the nature of the earth and the creation. He has to be given an idea of the plan, that he is not the only one. So he settles for that. Starting with verse 40 is the end part. This is a very important part of Moses' assignment, to keep the record. We owe more records to Moses than anyone else. It's recognized quite widely now that the "little Genesis" was really originally a book of Abraham. Moses has just re-edited the story of the creation we find in Moses in the Old Testament. It is a re-edition from an older book of Abraham. It's interesting. He hands on, and he puts it all together. There are going to be other editions.

The classic study of how these things are handed down and re-edited and commentated as they go (as all documents are) is the Book of Mormon. We have this build-up of many records with comments by the builders. So he tells here, this is it. ". . . I will speak unto thee concerning this earth upon which thou standest; . . ." That's the formula he uses so often with Abraham too. This is the earth that concerns you. Does that make you clear now? And you write the things I speak. These things are to be recorded because I can't talk to everybody. I'm not going to. They can't qualify; they can't abide my glory. You are to be the recorder (and he is). And this is the reason: "And in a day when the children of men shall esteem my words as naught and take many of them from the book which thou shalt write [and this is what has happened because they are coming back now; we are finding all sorts of things], behold, I will raise up another like unto thee; and they shall be had again among the children of men—among as many as shall believe." But these are to be kept secret it tells us in the last verse. The record is not to be given to everybody. It wouldn't be appreciated, and it is a special blessing. But Moses was to hand it down, and this is the way apocrypha and apocalyptic are handed down. This is the real meaning of apocrypha: a thing that has been "kept under wraps." Apocalyptic is another form of the same word. It is only revealed to those who are ready to receive it. Of course, it is the same in any subject really. You are not going to profit by going into some class that's ten years ahead of what you should be doing. You won't know what they talking about. You have to take things as they go. It's the same thing with the scriptures. They are revealed to the children of men when they are ready to receive them and they are ready to believe them. Notice this last verse, 42, they have actually put in parentheses to show that it is in red ink. Parentheses are our red ink, aren't they, our rubrics? "These words were spoken unto Moses in the mount, . . ." You don't know which mount so don't argue about that. It's a good thing not to know. Probably way up north there. Now they are spoken unto you. This is to the Prophet Joseph. He is another like unto him who is raised up. But there were others

|p8

after who did the same thing. The prophets had such revelations. ". . . Show them not unto any except them that believe. Even so. Amen."

Now we come to the second chapter, which we skip. This is repeated in Abraham, and it is in Genesis and it's in the temple too. It's the creation story. We have discussed it in this thing called "Before Adam." There are copies of this on reserve. You can look it up over there and see another approach to the creation thing. Though there are some questions that have been asked by people here that we should come into. They come in chapter two, where we are dealing with the creation of man, with primitive man, etc. I have underlined in red in my book here all the passages that are not found in the Bible. This is a very substantial addition to the Biblical account. This says, (Moses 3:4) "And now, behold, I say unto you that these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created, . . ." That's very interesting. In the Bible it says "of the heavens," and here it says, "of heaven and earth" because every earth has its heaven. ". . . when they were created, in the day that I, the Lord God, made the heaven and the earth; . . ." So notice this: the generations of the heavens and earth in the day when he made it.

Now the fifth chapter of Genesis starts out saying, "This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, . . ." That's at a different level. That's another creation. That's another story; we get to that later. It doesn't say created him. It says called apart, blessed him, and gave him a name. We get to that next time. But these are the generations of heaven. Notice, generation (an organic process) generates and begets. We are dealing with stages and episodes. We have mentioned this before. One generation leads to the next. The whole thing comes in distinct and discreet acts. You don't get it all, as the Lord told Moses. Notice, the generations of heaven and earth. The generation, that is the organic process, the stages or episodes, the generations by which it comes. This whole scene, this whole chapter, is the most baffling thing about the creation story. It distinctly tells us about two creations. Genesis does too. "It had not yet rained upon the earth [a spiritual creation]." What are we going to do about that? Well, here we see again (and this shouldn't bother us at all) that the whole thing is on a different level from the generations of Adam which begin in chapter five. So it's not the idea of just one act, one creation, everything all at once. It doesn't happen in one flash, instantaneously and simultaneously, not at all. It is spread out all over the place.

Now there are some other questions. ". . . For I the Lord God created all things of which I have spoken [in chapter two], spiritually, before they were naturally upon the face of the earth. . . ." So that is another level. But this verse seven has bothered lots of people, this "first flesh." He was made of the dust of the ground. So he is of this earth, the same elements that every other planet is made of. ". . . 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." This is the first complete union between the spirit and the earth here. But when you look up in the big Hebrew lexicon as to what the word "flesh" means (the first flesh, as it says in the Bible),

|p9

you find that the primary meaning of **basar** is "flesh" as opposed to bone. Flesh can only belong to an animal which also has bones. We never refer to the flesh of microorganisms. We don't think of them as flesh. We don't call them flesh, though they're made of the same stuff the rest of us are. As it says, flesh has to be an animal that has bones, at least. That's the first definition. Then it says in the bodies of man and beasts (Genesis 2:21); hence, it means the body as opposed to **nefesh**, the spirit. **Nefesh** means the breath of life. We say, the spirit and body are the soul of man. They combine and make the soul, and that's the way it goes. But the flesh part of it is the part that's opposed to the **nefesh**. But it's the human flesh again. The second meaning is the figurative, meaning "first, a human being." **Basar** is specifically a human being, the first flesh meaning the first human being, a mortal (2 Chronicles 32:8), or the human arm, the arm of flesh. Therefore, it's a word for being mortal or weak—the weakness of the flesh. "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." And the second meaning referring to all mankind, mankind in general. So he was the first of mankind. These are the meanings of **basar**, and you can't be dogmatic and say that he's the first living cell on earth, or something like that. Would you call the first monocellular organism flesh? Then it can mean blood relation, flesh and blood, etc. But Moses here in this verse gives us the definition of flesh in which sense it is to be used. He says it is "the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also." So when I say the first flesh, we mean the first man. That's what we mean by first flesh. We mean it in that sense.

What light does the Pearl of Great Price throw on primitive man? Here we have a recent article (*National Geographic*, November 1985) with this hologram picture of the skull of this little "Taung child" they call it. It's supposed to be two million years old. It has some nice diagrams, and here's one that unfolds and shows the development of skeletons and the like, supposedly. They put the skeletons together in this order. This is talked about in this "Before Adam" thing. I brought it up pretty well to date. But it says, "stepping on the road to humanity." Now, the whole question that comes up is namely when does he step across the line that makes him a man? Only when he steps across that line can he be called an Adam or human. This was the subject of the big conference in 1979 at Nairobi when all the paleontologists in the world got together and thought about the question, when can you say it's a man and when can you say it isn't? There are dozens of different specimens running around now that look like humans, but we know they aren't. When is he starting to be a man? I think there is a comment here about the Nairobi conference. "Last September, 150 of the world's leading paleontologists met at the Eighth Pan African Congress of Prehistory and Quaternary Studies in Nairobi. The main issue discussed was what is the definition of **homo**. Or if you are speaking in Hebrew, what is the definition of **Adam**?" **Ha-Adam** is the regular Hebrew word today for man. It's the only one used (**Adam** and **enosh**). What is the definition of **homo**? How do you know a true man when you see him? Well, he looks like a man. Again, there are creatures in the zoo that look like men. Then quoting one of them, "In recent years the old concept of a single steadily evolving lineage from ape to man has been completely replaced by at least three [possibly more] different forms of early man evolving simultaneously in Africa. Which one is the true man?"

|p10

Quite recently, a new development has come in there, and it's a very important one too. The point is though, he's there all of a sudden by definition. It's like the argument: Some people say the world is round, and some people say the world is flat. The truth must lie somewhere in between. You're not being scientific or playing safe when you say that. It's the same way here. You didn't gradually become a man. You were either one or you weren't. This is the point. This is being brought out now in studies being made with primates and speech. It's very intense and exhaustive. People like George Schaller and Jane Goodall (the gorilla girl). They didn't do the language so much. The English people are really taken with that because Darwin started that. It's an interesting thing.

There's a good book by Popper and Eccles on this. All the last part of his life, Darwin gave up the bone structure and that sort of thing, because they are so much alike anyway. But it was on psychology, on intelligence and speech. This was the test, and this proved the gradual evolution of the human being in the patterns of thought that he would trace out in animals. As you get to higher and higher species, then you get mental processes nearer and nearer to ours. Well, in a recent study by Popper and Eccles, they find it just isn't so. Others are commenting on that. All that has done is to deepen the gulf as it had never been expected before because there are two types of language. One is specific and the other is ideas.

I brought along an article by John Eccles who is a great authority on the brain. He got the Noble Prize for his work on the brain. He has been working with these animal brains all his days, and he reaches this conclusion. "The baby practices language and gradually works itself, especially through language, into an amazing world it finds itself in. But there are two kinds. The baby's language, at least to start with, is pragmatic. That is it learns to ask for desirables (food and comfort, being taken for a walk, and all of those things) which apes can ask for too. But soon the baby starts to ask a different kinds of questions, such as: What is going on outside? Why are they doing that? and What is this for? That makes the difference between pragmatic language and mathetic language." That's the word he invented that I'm trying to think of. Incidentally, two years ago John Eccles spent quite some time on the campus here. A number of our people are corresponding with him. Curtis Wright has kept up quite a lively correspondence with Eccles on this subject.

"What's going on outside? Why are they doing that?" That makes the difference between pragmatic language and mathetic language. Mathetic language is our means of finding our way into the world, of recognizing our world, and of realizing the tremendous experience of becoming a cultured human being. A chimpanzee never does that at all. [This surprises me because I always thought they were getting closer and closer together, but they are not really.] All the teaching of language to chimpanzees shows more clearly than anything else that chimpanzees miss altogether the human quality of mathetic language. They can use language only for desirables." Then I want to mention the studies of Popper on this. So this is another gap, and it has just emerged within the last two or three years. They thought they were on the

|p11

right track, and it led them in the wrong direction. This is one thing in which we are quite unique. But the point is you are there or you are not there. You either have a man or you don't have a man. You don't have in-betweens of all kinds, and the gulf has deepened.

Now, how many Adams are there? You can think of them. I've got ten here. There was a Council in Heaven; but before the council, Adam was on hand because he was summoned to the council. Jehovah, Michael; their attention is called and a program is suggested to them by Elohim. Elohim, of course, is the Council of the Gods, as we learn in the Book of Abraham. That's what the word **Elohim** means; it's plural. You can't get away from it. That's the way it is referred to throughout the Book of Abraham. Before the council there was Adam there. We don't know how long he has been there, a very long time you can be sure, but they are not measuring time our way. The second Adam is when he joins the council and we've seen a lot about that. The Council in Heaven is when they plan the earth, its plan, its purpose etc. And Michael (he is not Adam yet) is very active in that. Then he goes down as a building inspector. He visits the earth from time to time to see how it is going. He is on the building committee. He and Jehovah go down and visit the earth from time to time then come back and report. According to some of the early Church fathers, this is where he gets his name Adam, from **Adamantinos**. **Adamantine** means "diamond." The word diamond comes from Adamantinos. **Damao** is "to break, to crush, to destroy." **Adamanto** means it cannot be destroyed. That negates it. Adam means "to be indestructible." It's the same as our word **dam**, to stamp down. The word is **damno** in Greek. It means to injure in any way or to hold down. That can't be done to Adam in his original state. They say when he visited the earth during its construction, it was not a safe place to be. You had to be **Adamantinos** or you'd never get away from it. There were tremendous temperatures, whirling dust storms, and all the rest. It was in formation. So there's the **Adamantinos**, the indestructible building inspector.

Then he comes down and changes his name; personality and everything else—wipes out everything and becomes as a little child. He receives a new name and is now Adam. He is now man; he is now on this earth. Of course, **Adam** means "red earth," and it means all those other things. We have a lot of names for Adam. We may mention them later on. This is one of the most important periods of all. This is the one that accounts for that time when he was a primitive and all that. We go on here for now. Then he wakes again. He wakes from a sleep and is blanked out like a little child, and then he goes to sleep again. He wakes up and marries Eve under the covenant. That's number five. That's before they enter the Garden of Eden. In the next phase he enters the Garden of Eden and is an immortal being. He's in paradise now. He's a food gatherer, but he hasn't fallen. He's a spiritual being and would live forever. "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat." We cannot conceive of what it was like there in Eden except that it was infinitely delightful. He could have gone on forever without it being boring. But he does leave Eden and ends up in a totally different world. He's outcast, just like Moses in the beginning here. He's flat. There are very dramatic early Christian and Jewish accounts about how Adam, after he was cast out of the garden, found himself desperate. He didn't think the sun would ever rise again. He'd sinned; he was cast out. He was in a dark

|p12

and dreary world. He despaired of ever being forgiven or of ever living. We are told when he was cast out of Eden, his life became shorter and he became smaller in stature. So he's another one, but he doesn't stay that way. Because he has been following the rules, an angel comes to visit him. Not an angel, but angels (we are told three men in the literature) come and start instructing him. He hears the voice of the Lord, but the angels visit him and bring books and instructions and tell him what he is to do to get back into the presence of God. He now enters the covenant and becomes one of the fold. He becomes one who is receiving instructions and is on the way back to salvation, a very different state from what he was before he received that. In receiving the covenants and receiving the signs and tokens from the angels, he receives a new name too. This is an important thing. (That's eight.)

Then he dies, of course. According to all accounts, like the very famous "Harrowing of Hell," the earliest Christian account we have of what happens after, he goes down and preaches to the spirits in prison, his children whom he is going to deliver. That doesn't just go back to the "Harrowing of Hell" in the fifth century, which became the standard mystery drama of the Middle Ages. It was dramatized on a stage in front of the cathedral at Easter time when the Lord goes down and delivers the children of Adam who are being held below. But it is Adam who leads out the parade of his children. As we mentioned before, way back in the **Apocalypse of Abraham** there's the same thing. When Abraham reaches the other side, the first thing he does is look up Michael. He has a great feeling for the human race. He wants to save all of them. He doesn't want these people to be lost. He says, "I don't want any of them to be lost. I can't bear thinking about it." So he and Michael get together and go to Elohim and petition him for permission to establish a system of work or ordinances by which all these fallen people may be redeemed. That's very old. It goes back to the first or second century at least.

But then the most interesting is these verses 19 and 20. People ask about primitive man, etc. Remember it's timeless. We are told in Abraham 5:13 here, ". . . Now I, Abraham, saw that it was after the Lord's time, which was after the time of Kolob, for as yet [he's talking about the time that they were cast out of the garden] the Gods had not appointed unto Adam his reckoning." It was not reckoning time, so you are wasting time talking about years and periods here. But this is a very important state of things. This gives us a little vignette on another type of world. "And out of the ground I, the Lord God, formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; . . ." And Adam was formed out of the ground too. He is the same substance that they are. The Lord has commanded that they should come to Adam to see what he would call them. During this period Adam lives on a genial level with the animals. He gets along famously with them. And they are also living souls. They don't speak his language, but they are in his community. On the pragmatic level you can exchange signals with animals very well. ". . . 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" (Moses 3:19). Notice, this is a program of awareness, of getting acquainted. Adam gets acquainted with all the other creatures in the world because it is a multiple-use world we are living on. They have a right to it as much

!p13

as anybody else, as we read in the Doctrine and Covenants. So he gives names. Levi-Strauss' great work shows that the naming and classifying of animals reaches a point of sophistication among the so-called primitives far excelling that which any anthropologist or even biologist ever dreamed up. They really know the animals they are talking about, and they know how to classify them. You must read Claude Levi-Strauss' great work on that.

But as for Adam, there was not found a helpmeet for him. Well, what is he doing alone? He has no helpmeet. The word "helpmeet" is a very important one. It's spelled various ways. It's the same as "meet," "mate," "match." It means "equal." When you have a game, you don't have a match unless the two sides are equal. The person who is on the team with you is a mate. When you come together, you have a meet. All these words are together. You and your mates come together for a meet, for a match. But it is always with equals. It's always working together and cooperating. It's very interesting. It's still kept here in its old English form as "helpmeet," which is quite right.

But what is he doing all this time then? Remember, he is a little child. According to the Hebrew tradition, which is very early and very widely testified, he had a wife at this time, and she was **Lilith**. She represents promiscuity. She didn't like Adam. She did everything she could to keep him from entering into the covenant and marrying in the covenant. Eve wasn't around then. Her name means "night," **Layla**. Way back in the **Alphabet of Rabbi Aqiba**, a very early writing, we are told about her. She was his mate, but she stands for everything that is promiscuous. She doesn't want to get married, but she wants to play around; that's Lilith. Adam was living in an animal state of innocence. He had become as a little child. I guess he would be a pushover for Lilith. But she is a sinister character because she is irresponsible. She is married to him and she has children, but she doesn't want to be responsible for them, or anything like that. She is regarded as the woman who tries to do everything she can to prevent marriage, to prevent childbirth, and to kill babies in their cribs. That's Lilith. There are all sorts of early charms from Babylon and elsewhere against Lilith to keep her from her shenanigans. She's a rather important figure. She represents the sort of sexual license we have in the world today—the anything goes, just have fun. But don't feel under any obligations, and whatever you do, don't enter into any covenants because that will bind you. She does everything she can to frustrate marriage and to keep Adam from it. There are all sorts of stories told about her and her sons. She represents the old matriarchy too. But there is this gap because he hasn't been married yet.

And then there is another deep sleep. He woke from a deep sleep in the first place when he woke up being Adam after being Michael. And now he goes into another deep sleep. Then he wakes up and finds Eve there. Now it's time to be properly married. This life ends with another sleep. Notice, it says a deep sleep, a passage. He marries Eve in the covenant, verse 22 following. They are very close, as close as you can get here. The rib in Arabic is the **urka** or **silka**. It is the expression for anything as close to you as a thing can possibly be.

|p14

What can get closer to your side than your rib. Your rib is your side. You might be able to get along without it, but the rib is about as close to a person as you can get. It is a usage. The metaphor is used in language: As close as my rib and as intimate. It means "bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh," as intimate as you can be.

Now we come to the fourth chapter. How are you going to explain the Fall and the problem of evil? Of course, you begin with Satan. He's the one that loused it all up. He's the one that's responsible. Naturally, we begin with an account of how he got started, so we are back in the Council in Heaven again. We don't dramatize it again, but here it is. You will find it in Revelation 12:3-4 and 7. The only references we have to the fall of Satan, his rebellion and casting out of heaven, are in the New Testament in Revelation. There are many accounts in the apocryphal writings, especially the Coptic writing called the **Abaton**. You will also find it in Luke 10:17-20. Those are the only mentions you find in the Bible. They can stand analyzing too. There are some very interesting things about them. I had hoped to get onto that today, but if we keep moving fast we may cover some ground.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 19

Well, it's lucky for me we have the greatest of all chapters today. I have to give a talk tonight and another one tomorrow. I've taken every known kind of antibiotic and antihistamine. I don't know whether I'm coming or going. But fortunately we have a chapter for which everybody can be held responsible. It's one of the really great documents in religious history. It goes along with the first chapter of Moses, the first chapter of the Book of Mormon, and section 76 of the Doctrine and Covenants. It's one of the great ones, one of the most instructive documents in the world. Nothing can help you out so much and answer more questions than this fifth chapter of Moses. It's a pretty long one too, you notice. I'm just going to go through it and marvel.

As it starts out, Adam and Eve have left the Garden of Eden. There is a great literature about the conditions of things under which they lived when they left it—the darkness they found themselves in. They had been cast out into another world, into another life. Life became short and miserable, and Adam didn't know whether he would ever get out of it again. The lights went out. When he saw the sun go down, he had no assurance the sun would ever rise again. He was utterly depressed. Then he comes and receives the instruction from the angel that tells him he doesn't have to remain there, it doesn't have to be that way. But at first, it is a lone and dreary world. Being driven out, he began to till the earth and have dominion over the beasts. Notice the distinction there. The King James Version translates that word **kavash** "to subdue," so he has to subdue everything. It's his prerogative to go out and slaughter anything he wants to because he is the lord and master of the earth. But it doesn't say that at all. My father believed that firmly. But properly translated, the word **kavash** means "to hoe, to till the earth," but "to have dominion over the beasts." Well, dominion is lordship, to be a **dominus**, to be a lord (I will make you lord over all things; I will give you dominion and make you lord over all things on the face of the earth). The lord is the **hlafweard**, the "loaf ward," the keeper of the loaf, the ward. A ward is a guardian, a keeper.

To have dominion is the Latin word to be a **dominus**. The **domus** is the "house." The **dominus** is the lord who is the master of the house and is responsible for all the creatures in the house. Just as the **hlafweard**, the "loaf ward" is the one to see to it that all family, all connections, all members of the estate, all dependents are properly fed and cared for. The same with the **dominus**. He has charge of the **domus**. At the end of the comedy [we get this still back in Aristophanes], he invites all the world to come and feast at his board. As the **dominus**, that's his obligation. We think of it as a license to exterminate. You are made lord of everything. You are given dominion and made responsible. You till the earth. **Kavash** is "subdue" all right.

|p2

Well, of course, you till the earth, but over the creatures you have dominion. And "to eat his bread by the sweat of his brow." He is the bread maker. This is a very important doctrine of the Ebionites and other early Christian sects that wheat is the food of fallen man. They would not eat wheat because it was forbidden. It was the sign of falling. As we say, Wheat is for man in his fallen condition. Wheat is for a semi-arid area. It's to be cultivated by the sweat of the brow. It's a staple for man. It's the one he must work to produce. When he is outcast, he lives on wheat. When he was in the garden, he was a fruit gatherer. He lived on whatsoever trees from which he would freely eat. The gathering of fruits and berries is a pleasant sort of thing. But this is wheat; this is an economy. This ties him down to the earth. And by the sweat of his brow he has to live now. He is cast out into a semi-arid area. He was in a lush garden, but when he goes out, he has to hump just to keep alive. The sweat of his brow is no mere a figure of speech because he is in a land of thistles and all sorts of noxious weeds, semi-arid plants. You have to cultivate if you are going to get anywhere. Briars, thorns, weeds. As Tennyson says, "Wearying in a land of sand and thorns." So here is Adam, and it's not a happy life, particularly. And his wife did labor with him. The same word is used for both of them. It was his curse that he would have to labor all the days of his life to bring forth from the earth. Exactly the same word is used for Eve. She would have to labor to bring forth offspring. Nevertheless, her life would be spared. They both have the same labor. Eve is under no worse a curse than Adam is. He is under the same. So they begin to have families and multiply and replenish the earth, which had been the commandment. The Lord had commanded all creatures, every form of life, to fulfill the measure of its existence and have joy therein, and also to reproduce, multiply and replenish the earth. This is before we get Cain and Abel. They begin to multiply, and, as you know, populations multiply very fast when there is nothing to restrain them. It's an astonishing thing. The population of Egypt has gone up and down phenomenally. Central America, the same thing, up and down. One generation would be eight or nine million; the next in the thirties or forties. My friend Woodrow Bora has spent his life studying population statistics in Central America. It's amazing how rapidly they grow. We find the same thing now. We find so many species, like the sea otter, that are almost completely exterminated. As soon as they are given protection, they just come back like that. You find them all over the place. It's a funny thing. Give animals half a chance and they will replenish the earth.

So they began to replenish the earth. They divided two and two. You notice they are not practicing polygamy here. They divide two and two. As you know from statistics, the birth rates are about equal for male and female in various species. So they divide two and two in the land to tend flocks and also beget sons and daughters. You notice that Adam had lived with the beasts, and now they are pastoral. Pastoral and agricultural always go together. We used to think there was originally a pastoral phase, and then they went into an agricultural phase, etc. That's not so at all. Everything shows a difference today. The two go together from the first, and they go naturally. You begin first with the hunting phase, and then with a pastoral phase, and then with agriculture. But you have all three together wherever you go. If you hunt the animals, you are herding them actually. If you are following the herds, you get to know each

|p3

other. There are many examples of that. You pick up the strays, the calves, etc. They become family pets. You hunt and you also herd, and at the same time you get whatever kind of vegetation you need: fruits and vegetables, grains wherever you can pick them up.

They called on the name of the Lord, and they heard his voice. That's interesting. He wasn't with them anymore. They could hear his voice speaking from the garden, but they saw him not. They were shut out from his presence, but the link was there. This is what the rabbis call the **bath-kol**. The **bath-kol** is the "echo." Literally, it means the "daughter of the voice." After the last prophets, the rabbis didn't get inspiration, but they did have the **bath-kol**. They could hear the voice. They could hear the echo. You could have inspiration, intuition, etc. (not face to face anymore, but the **bath-kol**). Adam and Eve were cut off from his presence, but they had the **bath-kol**.

Now he gives them commandments. He gives them the law of God. He gives them the law of obedience. He gives them the law of sacrifice, and he gives them the law of the gospel in this column here, which they follow. They are starting on the way back now. The newly discovered **Apocryphon of John** (there are three of them) will tell you that it was three messengers that were sent to instruct them. The Mandaean literature will tell you that the messengers that came to instruct Adam and Eve were the apostles who later became the pillars of the Church (Peter, James and John). They came and instructed Adam and Eve in the garden. But here they are the "sent ones." He gave commandments that they should worship the Lord their God and should offer firstlings. The first thing is "that they should worship the Lord their God." Worship, **weorthscipe**, means to hold in highest value. It means "to call upon" here, to esteem Him above everything else. ". . . And should offer the firstlings of their flocks, . . ." Notice, sacrifice goes right with it. They are commanded to sacrifice (no explanation given yet) the firstlings of their flocks for an offering unto the Lord. ". . . And Adam was obedient unto the commandments of the Lord." So there you get it. Here's the law of God, and the law of obedience goes with it. He was obedient. He showed his obedience by practicing the law of sacrifice, offering the firstlings of his flocks. It doesn't mention here the firstlings of the fields. They don't come yet. You know why it had to be the flocks, the animals (because it was the shedding of blood). This is a similitude of the blood of the Only Begotten. Then the shedding of blood ceased with the Law of Moses. So here we get those three laws all bound together. The first things that bind Adam are that he should worship God, and that he should be obedient by making the offering. Then come the "sent ones" to teach him after many days. He kept this up; he was true and faithful. You receive no testimony until after the trial of your faith. "After many days an angel of the Lord appeared unto Adam, saying . . ." At last we getting that one religion.

Remember, we had that light-dark-light business (preexistence, existence, and hereafter; past, present, and future). You get a religion which is light all the way. There was light in the preexistence. They are going to have light now, and light hereafter, rather than darkness in all three. It's the only one we have because conventional Christianity and Judaism don't allow for a preexistence.

|p4

So they stuck with it. Every word is significant in this chapter. "And after many days, an angel of the Lord appeared unto Adam, saying: Why dost thou offer sacrifices unto the Lord? . . ." He is being tested, you see. He is not to remain in the old doldrums. He could go on doing this forever, but the Lord doesn't play cat and mouse with you. He doesn't keep you waiting forever. Give your test sufficient time, enough to show your integrity, and you will get your answer (sometimes very true). We say the Lord keeps us waiting for the promises of the Second Coming. We wait, and wait, and wait. I was just talking with someone about this yesterday. I remember my great grandfather very well. He was twenty-two years old when the Prophet was killed. That hasn't been a long time. We haven't waited forever and ever. And look what has happened. Just take any ten years of that period and history has moved at the speed of an express train. Things have gone very fast. The time has not been long. Recall the things you have seen in your own life, a complete change of the world, the utter shifting of the scene in our own day. We don't realize it. Our memories are short, but you just go back a little ways and what a difference the picture is.

The Lord doesn't keep him waiting, but after many days the angel appears and asks him why he does it. He says he doesn't know. He's just fulfilling the law of obedience, that's all, by making sacrifice. Then the angel spake and told him what it was. The atoning sacrifice is universal. ". . . This thing is a similitude of the sacrifice of the Only Begotten of the Father, which is full of grace and truth." This is the sacrifice. It always ends with the epithet: "the Only Begotten, full of grace and truth." That covers absolutely everything, doesn't it? Grace: Nothing negative, nothing bad, nothing against him, no self-interest, no aspirations, no competitive spirit; pure grace, pure love and truth. Nothing faked about it, no special effects here, no tricks, nothing held back at all. It's the real thing all the way. He is full of grace and truth. "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 forevermore." This perpetual repentance is a very interesting thing. Of course, we do that all the time. We can only call upon God correctly if we repent. We must repent and call upon him forevermore. You can see why. To repent means putting yourself in the condition of repentance, of recognition of your unworthiness. How long are you unworthy? How long do you need to repent? We are told until you are full of grace and truth. When you are **full** of grace and truth, then maybe you might not need to repent anymore. But I think that's quite awhile before any of us will be full of grace and truth. One person needs it just as badly as another. If we repent, we are approaching him honestly. If we don't, we're not approaching him honestly. If we think we are adequate in asking him for these things, then it's going to be rather shallow. We are deceiving ourselves, and he is not to be deceived. He is full of grace and truth. When you repent, you have to get yourself into the mood for that.

"Wherefore, thou shalt do all that thou doest in the name of the Son, . . ." Notice, all these words are magnificent, like this phrase here. I think of Eduard Meyer who spoke very broken English in the German school. He said, "We have to reject these writings of Joseph Smith. They are very wonderful, but they are written in such crude, primitive English. These people

must have been an uneducated lot. It's typical frontier hysteria." That was Eduard Meyer. Of course, the English is perfect here because it says exactly what it wants to. "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 forevermore." Who do we call on when we pray? One person and one person only. We call upon God, but always in the name of the Son. This puts us into the picture. Everybody gets into the act. That is God's desire. We didn't emphasize enough those two verses, 38 and 39, at the end of First Moses, where he says, ". . . there is no end to my works, neither to my words. . . . For behold, this is my work and my glory—to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man." It is to spread it around, to share the glory. Glory is shared intelligence, and it's to be shared here. Here's the way we get in on it. Repent and call upon God in the name of the Son forevermore. Now, you see, we are going to get the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. We are told if he yields to temptation, they will send a sacrifice for him. This is provided. This is explained here. "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 [You notice the Holy Ghost says, "I am the Only Begotten." Well, he is bearing record; that's his business to bear record of the Father and the Son from the beginning.] ". . . henceforth and forever, that as thou hast fallen thou mayest be redeemed, and all mankind [but not automatically], even as many as will." (Not if you don't want to; not if it's against your will.) In Moses 4:4 it says, "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." If you want to follow someone else, that's your prerogative. We have the law of free agency here. That's what we are being tested for, after all.

". . . henceforth and forever, that as thou hast fallen thou mayest be redeemed, and all mankind, even as many as will." He has fallen but can be redeemed. Of course, this is the good news. This is the gospel. We have Adam fallen here as Moses was in the first chapter (down, hopeless, out). But the good news is that it doesn't have to end here. You can go back again. "And return again to our presence and with us partake of eternal life and exaltation." We call this the gospel, **evangelion**, the good news. Notice how they rejoice at the good news which they receive. "And in that day Adam blessed God and was filled, and began to prophesy concerning all the families of the earth, . . ." How can you bless God? Does he need blessing? Does he ask you for a blessing? A blessing can go in both ways. A blessing is full approval and full acceptance of another. Well, lots of people don't accept God. They don't approve of God all the way, or they would accept him. **Bless** has a double etymology. One says it's from the Old English word, **blotsian**, connected with our word **blood**. To make a blood sacrifice; to bless in that sense. But bless is also connected with the word **bliss**, a complete approval. (There's the eschatology of **bliss** and the eschatology of **woe**.) It's a complete approval, a complete acceptance when you bless God. So people can bless each other. You can bless your father or your mother as well as they can bless you. So he blessed God "and was filled, and began to prophesy concerning all the families of the earth [these are the fathers], saying: Blessed be the name of God, for because of my transgression my eyes are opened, . . ."

|p6

What were his eyes opened to? All sorts of things. They have eaten the fruit already and their eyes were opened. They became what the Old Testament calls **piqeahk**. A **piqeahk** is a person whose eyes are open, and he sees things that other people don't see. Laman and Lemuel accused their father of being a visionary man. That's the way it is nearly always rendered in the Bible. A visionary man is a **piqeahk**. Like the attendants of Elisha who see the horses there when other people can't see them, you see things that really are there but others can't see them. There is such a condition. But this is not what he refers to. When they ate the fruit, they became **piqeahk**. Their eyes were opened; they saw themselves in a different world. They saw things they had never seen before. They were in a totally different ambience. Here because of his transgression, his eyes are open to his vulnerability. His eyes are open to his condition now. He knew he was in a bad condition, but his eyes were opened to the real situation. There is a whole series of eye openings here. Moses said, ". . . Now for this cause I know that man is nothing which thing I never had supposed." He had come down to this earth. His eyes were opened, and he realized how low he could get. That had never occurred to him. His eyes were opened again. Then it says, "He lifted up his eyes, and again he saw God on his throne." So we see different things that are there or that aren't. ". . . Because of my transgression my eyes are opened, . . ." Just ten years ago they said it was absolutely impossible to create such a thing as a hologram. I showed you that thing in the front of the *National Geographic* last time. That was a hologram. You could see right around this skull very nicely. That's impossible on a two dimensional surface. You can't do that. But you can do it. When you go into some new phase, your eyes are opened. So be ready for all sorts of surprises.

And now here is the gospel. ". . . and in this life I shall have joy, and again in the flesh I shall see God." This is like Job. So in this life he has joy as well as in the others. This life is usually darkness. "And Eve, his wife, heard all these things [she is in on everything, of course] and was glad, saying: Were it not for our transgression [she points this out] 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" (verse 11). The law of obedience is established here. So this is the gospel. This is the good news that you do not have to take a beating all the time. In this life you can have joy. No matter what happens, you can be happy about it. It is all perfectly lovely, and everything is all right. "And Adam and Eve blessed the name of God [they are completely happy, blissful], and they made all things known unto their sons and their daughters." They began to preach the gospel right then and there. And it doesn't take. Immediately, Satan strikes back again (here we go). He comes among them speaking very insolently. Why should a mere statement such as, "I am also a son of God; believe it not," cause them to believe it not, just like that? ". . . And men began from that time forth to be carnal, sensual, and devilish." Many people have protested to the communistic doctrine that men are by nature carnal, sensual, and devilish. We are; we know plenty of that. But it was from that time on when they began to love Satan more than God. They began to take that way. Then you get carnal, sensual and devilish. Question: After the Fall is this the only way to return to the Father's presence? Answer: What other way would you suggest? There isn't any.

|p7

This really develops into something now. Satan comes among them. We have seen his insolence. He comes to Moses and gets turned aside there. He doesn't get very far. He says that he is also a son of God. Notice, that is his appeal, that he is a son of God. Satan never speaks against God in this book ("I've said nothing about Father"). He's all for the gospel. He is all for saving people. In the Council in Heaven he wanted them saved too, and he wanted to do the saving. There are lots of people that way, that want to do the right thing as long as they are in charge. But if they are not in charge, all government is then just an evil. When they are in charge, they run everything. "And Satan came among them saying: I am also a son of God; . . ." He doesn't say, I'm the devil and I'm against God. You'd better join me. And he commands them. When he appeared, his first step was to make a command, speak outright. He wants to be worshipped. That's what he wanted in the first place. (Give me that honor.) So he commands them, as he commanded Moses, saying "believe it not." ". . . and they believed it not, and they loved Satan more than God; . . ."

Now you know some cases of people who have had that reaction. Somebody comes along and says, "Don't believe it," so they don't believe it. I know lots of them. All it took was somebody to say "don't believe it." They want that to happen. They are triggered to receive that because of the amount of discipline that's required if you accept it. Remember, after many days an angel of the Lord appeared and asked, Why do you obey? He was following the law of obedience. That's a strenuous thing. It requires some concentration. You can't keep a celestial order on earth without working at it all the time, and it's strenuous. In Fourth Nephi you see how the people got tired of it. They thought it was just not worth the trouble. It was easier going back to the old way and becoming competitive and teaching their children to hold the Lamanite children in contempt, etc. This was the easy thing to do. So people are just waiting. Right now there's this salamander business. On the silliest pretext people will leave the Church, which means they were just waiting for something to give them what they think is a good reason. All he had to do was say, believe it not, and they didn't believe it, "and they loved Satan more than God." You notice we are not necessarily carnal, sensual and devilish. You become that way if you start acting that way. ". . . And men began from that time forth to be carnal, sensual, and devilish." The reaction is the doctrine of the two ways. "And the Lord God called upon men by the Holy Ghost everywhere and commanded them that they should repent." There's the rub too. Who wants to be told to repent? You are not going to get votes by telling people to repent, but by telling them that everything is wonderful. "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" (verse 15). This is the law that set the doctrine of the two ways. We got it way back in the **Shabako Stone**, way back in the beginning there.

Adam and Eve keep at it now. Incidentally, with verse 16 here you begin chapter four in Genesis. That follows along, but there are quite a few additions here. They ceased not to call upon God. "And Adam knew Eve, his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain, . . ." Now she bares Cain after all this that has been going on. Now Cain is born. You can see the logic of that enigmatic statement in the Bible where she says, "I have gotten a man from the Lord."

|p8

You think of Cain as a very blessed and special person. They thought he was. They expected great things of him. They expected that he would turn the tide. Everything had gone against Adam and Eve. Many of their posterity were not repenting. They continued, and when they begot Cain, Eve said, "I have gotten a man from the Lord; wherefore he may not reject his words. . . ." There was hope that Cain would be the right one, that he wouldn't reject the words. He would put things back on the track. But he didn't. He was a failure. ". . . But behold, Cain hearkened not, saying: Who is the Lord that I should know him?" Just like Korihor and the Sophists. So the hopes for Cain were blasted. Now you are going to get the two brothers. This is a very common theme. You notice in the Old Testament Jacob and Esau, Joseph and his brethren. Rendel Harris wrote an important book on the subject of the twins in ancient lore, in ancient religion (the rivalry between the two twins). It is always the younger twin or second born who receives the kingdom, instead of the older. The younger is declared the first born in the **Shabako Stone**. It was Horus, not Seth, but Horus who was declared to be the first born, the opener of the womb. As a matter of fact it's a technicality. Jacob was not younger than Esau at all. Jacob was a clever little guy. He was always doing clever tricks. But he held a firm grip on Esau's heel when they were born. So there were not two deliveries. The womb was not opened twice. Esau came out, and Jacob came out right with him. He didn't let go of that heel. He was hanging on. That's where he got the name Jacob, the little rascal. He was always doing tricks like that. So you can't say that he was second born because a birth is an opening of the womb. (That's the Egyptian term for it, **wepshet**, the opening of the womb.) And Horus was an opener of the womb right along with Seth. Technical point here, to be debated by the doctors for weeks. "And she again conceived and bare his brother Abel. And Abel hearkened unto the voice of the Lord. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground."

Now we come to the epic of Cain. He is a very important person because we talk about the problem of evil in the world. This tells us a lot of the story. "And Cain loved Satan more than God. And Satan commanded him, saying: Make an offering unto the Lord." Satan is counterfeiting the ordinances. Notice again, he says, "Make an offering unto the Lord." He doesn't say, make an offering unto me, or make an offering unto devils. He says, "Make an offering unto the Lord." He claims to be running the gospel on earth. He claims to be running the Church. It's a command again. There's a trick behind this; of course, there is. And it went on. "In the process of time" means this took some time. It didn't just happen all in one day. It may be a drama, but it represents a long passage of time. ". . . Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord." Well, that's fair enough. First fruits go along with the firstlings of the flock. What was wrong with that? "And Abel he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof [as commanded in Leviticus and Deuteronomy to offer the fat, which was considered the best]. And the Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering; But unto Cain, and to his offering, he had not respect. . . ." Why not? Well, of course he couldn't. Why was Cain making the offering? Because Satan had commanded him to. It wasn't because he loved the Lord. It says he loved Satan more than God, so when Satan told him to do something, he obeyed Satan. He wasn't doing it for the Lord's benefit or as

respect to the Lord, but receiving a command from Satan, he made the offering to the Lord. Would the Lord accept it under those circumstances? He receives only offerings that are made to him at his command, as Adam gave it. Adam followed the law of obedience. Cain is being obedient too, but not following the law of God. He is following the law of Satan, not the law of God in his obedience. He's being obedient to Satan because he loves him more than God. So each trait is important here. In verse 18 it says, "And Cain loved Satan more than God. . . ." When Satan commanded him to do something, he did it, even though it was making an offering to the Lord, whom he liked much less. Abel's, of course, was accepted. Satan had planned it the whole way. He knew that the Lord could not and would not receive this offering that Cain made. And he knew that making the offering unto the Lord would have that exact effect. It was a devilish thing for him to do. He is getting Cain in very deeply now. He commanded him to make the only offering which he knew could not be accepted.

So Cain is going to be furious now. (Why is my offering not accepted and Abel's is accepted?) That is the way the wicked justify themselves. The Lord had no respect for the offering that Cain brought. We know that Cain had rejected him. He said, "Who is the Lord that I should know [worship] him?" He refuses to worship the Lord. He only brings him the offering, as I say, because Satan told him to. The sacrifice is not his idea. Satan put him up to it. Satan knew this all along, and it pleased him. This is exactly as he had planned it to happen. Cain was very "wroth." Notice, he is Mephistopheles. He is a good Mephisto here, isn't he? He schemed the whole thing; it's going to end up in good. Of course, Cain was furious because Cain was one of these touchy people. He is proud in his vanity. ". . . and his countenance fell. And the Lord said unto Cain: Why art thou wroth?"

The Lord counsels him and speaks with him very kindly, very gently, with much long suffering, you will notice. Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. The Lord said unto Cain, Why are you so upset? If you do well you will be as much accepted as Abel or anyone else. As he says here, "If thou doest well, thou shalt be accepted. . . ." In the King James Old Testament it is, "If thou doest well, wilt thou not be accepted?" He puts it to him as a rhetorical question: You'll be accepted if you do all right, won't you? (sa'at being the word to accept). But if you do not well—then he doesn't say, now you will be damned on the spot and wiped out because you didn't do right, but he says, you are running a risk. You're at risk if you start doing that sort of thing. "Sin lieth at the door [it's not far away]." If you are going to keep up with this sort of thing, you are in real trouble. Satan desireth to have thee. Don't you understand this? It's just a trick of Satan. He wants to trap you here. "Satan desireth to have thee [and the only way to escape is to follow my command, not his command] and except thou shalt hearken unto my commandments, [I will let him have his way; you have your agency] I will deliver thee up, and it shall be unto thee according to his desire. And thou shalt rule over him." This is it again. In Moses 4:4 it says, "And he became Satan, yea, even the devil, the father of all lies, [all tricks] to deceive and to blind men, and to lead them captive at his will, even as many as would not hearken unto my voice." You hearken to God's voice or you are in Satan's power. "All who do not live up to their covenants will be in my power." That's the provision that has been made. You have the one choice or the other. But then this remarkable statement.

|p10

Remember Faust and the others. "And thou shalt rule over him." What was the deal that Faust made with the devil, the famous pact with the devil? Satan said, I will serve you and give you anything you want while you are on this earth, but after that you serve me. But as long as their pact endures for this earth, "thou shalt rule over him." Cain will have power over Satan. Satan will serve him and do anything he wants as long as he is here. But after that, look out. This is what will happen.

Cain becomes the stock figure of the pact with the devil. There's Jabez Stone and the others. You all know the story of "The Devil and Daniel Webster." We mentioned that before. It's the same thing. He makes the pact. Old Scratch will give him anything he wants, and so he makes him rich. And what Satan offers Cain here is money. You can have anything in this world for money, he says. That will see you through to get anything you want. So we will see how he persuades Cain to follow him. Moses and Adam rejected the project, but Cain accepts it. "For from this time forth thou shalt be the father of his lies; . . ." He is going to cultivate lies and deceptions. Remember, he was a liar from the beginning. The whole thing is fake. He is claiming that this is the gospel. He is claiming this is salvation—that this will give you happiness, satisfaction and everything; and it's all phony. ". . . thou shalt be called Perdition." **Perdition** means lost. It means losing something that you had. It means one fallen from high estate. You can't be Perdition; you can't be lost unless you were found. And you can't be fallen unless you were high, fallen from high estate. **Perditio** means that which is lost. "Nine days [as Milton says] he fell in hideous ruin and combustion down, down, down." You have to be high. He was among the highest in heaven up there, and down he fell. That means perdition, the one who is lost and fallen and gone (too bad). . . . for thou wast also before the world." This refers back to the time in the Council in Heaven, in glory. Satan is not going to say, you brought me into this world and put me in this terrible jam, and I had nothing to say about it. Oh no, you were in the preexistence too. You were high up there because you are perdition now. ". . . for thou wast also before the world." You had your preexistence and your chance, and all the rest of it. He has his **anamnesis** too, as Plato would have said. "And it shall be said in time to come—[and this is the theme that all these evils that come into the world really go back to Cain and follow in a single tradition] That these abominations were had from Cain; for he rejected the greater counsel which was had from God [this is what happened: the two plans were put forward, and he rejected God's counsel or plan]; and this is a cursing, which I will put upon thee, except thou repent."

It's still not too late. This is the gospel of repentance. As long as you are in this earth, you can still repent. As long as we are in this earth, there is no one who doesn't need to repent. As long as you are here, it's not too late to repent. The door is open to everyone here. We mustn't judge people and divide them into the good guys and the bad guys. As Ezekiel says in chapter eighteen, it's never too late. However wicked the bad guys have been all their days, they can still repent and become the righteous. And however righteous the good guys have been all their days, they can still fall and become the wicked. The door is open right to the end. Never, never claim that you are saved. No one is saved here (beyond sinning). And again, no

|p11

one is damned. You are not damned on this earth. You are damned in the judgment in the hereafter. And you are not saved on this earth. You are in between and you are being tested. Therefore, this life became, as Nephi says, a time of probation. It's still not too late, so what did Cain do? The Lord is protesting kindly, giving him the situation very clearly, and Cain turns on his heel and stomps out in wrath. He's a character, you see. Pride was the first thing. Cain is wroth, and says he isn't going to listen to any more. It's getting through to him, and he won't stand it. It's his choice, so he turns around and stalks out of it. "And Cain was wroth, and listened not any more to the voice of the Lord, [imagine walking out on God himself; that would be something] neither to Abel, his brother, who walked in holiness before the Lord." Obviously, Abel protested, and they talked together a lot and discussed the gospel. He wouldn't listen to Abel, and he wouldn't listen to the Lord himself. What do you do when your children act that way? Well, all Adam and his wife could do was to mourn before the Lord because of Cain and his brethren. He was followed by the others. Remember, Eve said, Now we will have someone who will turn the tide. He will be obedient. "We've gotten a man of the Lord." But he didn't. The wicked continued wicked. He walked out with his brethren, and all they could do was mourn about it. Adam didn't really know what was going on. Cain is very careful to make sure he doesn't find out what's going on.

Question: What made her think that Cain was of the Lord when he was born? Answer: He was a glorious person, like Satan himself. Why would Cain be special among all the others? We don't know, but the name is very interesting. He was very special and Abel was very special. We get these periods, these acts, these scenes. This opens a new scene. Cain and Abel, two new people that weren't there before. Cain is a very rich and significant name. Abel is usually taken to mean "mourning," the lost opportunity. **Hevel** means "a mourning." Of course, he was the one who was sacrificed. Now, Cain gets busy. He gets married, and the wives and brothers form their coalitions, their cliques. They all think alike in this. He takes one of his brothers' daughters to wife. It was not Abel's daughter. We say, Well, it must have been Abel's daughter or one of his sisters. But brothers' is correctly plural genitive-possessive here. He had more than one brother. He took one of his many brothers' daughters to wife, and they loved Satan more than God.

Now, Satan is going to organize this thing and get it going. He's going to put it under control and make it effective. He is going to take over the world. He has been imitating everything in the gospel all the way through, and perverting it all the way through. Everything is done in the name of God and salvation. His original plan was to save them all. Now, it is the mockery of the ordinances of the endowment, which he takes him through. It's mockery and it's reverse. ". . . Swear unto me by thy throat, and if thou tell it thou shalt die; and swear thy brethren by their heads, and by the living God, [Notice again, who do they swear by? By the living God. They don't swear by anybody else.] that they tell it not [the main thing here is secrecy]; for if they tell it, they shall surely die; and this that thy father may not know it; . . ." He doesn't want Adam to know about this because Adam is the head of the Church. Adam is the one in charge of the ordinances and all the rest. He doesn't want Adam to know what he

|p12

has been faking and what he has been doing here. He must not know that ordinances have been perverted, or he would put a stop to it. ". . . and this that thy father may not know it; [you do this] and this day I will deliver thy brother Abel into thine hands."

So the arrangements are all made here. Notice, we are told back here in verse 23, "thou shalt rule over him." Cain rules over Satan for this life, not the other way around. And sure enough, in verse 30 here, "And Satan sware unto Cain that he would do according to his commands. . . ." So Satan swears to obey Cain here, to do anything Cain wants. Do anything you want: That's the famous pact with the devil. You can have it all, and I will see that you get it. And I'll tell you how to get now, he says. "And all these things were done in secret." Well, you can be sure of that. "And Cain said: Truly I am Mahan, the master of this great secret, . . ." This is a very interesting etymology here. The word **secret** is **sirra** in Arabic; the eighth form of the verb, **mustirra**, means "to hold a secret, to keep a secret." It's the same as the Greek word **sathra** for secret. The Egyptian word is **seshet**; **meseshet** is "to hold a secret." **Sether** is the Hebrew word for keeping a secret (the master of the secret). So this word **master** may not be our word master at all, but **master** means "keeper of secret," and **Mahan** means "great." In any language **maha** means "great." In Arabic, English, Greek, Sanscrit, or anything **maha** means "great." Words like **magnus**, mighty, might, many, **maharaja**; anything that's big is **ma**. So this could mean Master Mahan, the "great secret keeper." (It could be; this is just a suggestion here.) So he got the master's degree, the master of this great secret. This was the secret: converting life into property. You can do it. All great acquisitions of property and gain are based on the **taking** of life, human and other life. You can't escape it. "Wherefore Cain was called Master Mahan, and he gloried in his wickedness" (verse 31). As I say, all great enterprises are going to put life at risk and take it.

He goes into the field and talks to his brother Abel. They had talked often about this. "And it came to pass that while they were in the field, Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him." The usual story is that they were a couple of adolescents, and one in a fit of pique bashed the other over the head (that's the conventional story). They debate among the fathers of the church. Some say they were something like 13 and 15 years old. Others say 20 and 25. Here they were not only grown men, but Cain knew exactly what he was doing. He had been plotting and scheming all along. We are told in verse 50 of this chapter that Cain slew his brother Abel for the sake of getting gain. In the Doctrine and Covenants we are told that he slew him by a conspiracy. He had been conspiring and planning it for a long time. It was deception. He overwhelmed him here. And he was not ashamed at all. "And Cain gloried in that which he had done, saying: I am free; surely the flocks of my brother falleth into my hands."

Satan promised Cain what he had promised Adam before: You can have anything in this world for money. In those days they didn't have money. Well, money actually goes back to geese here. The words for money we have here are, remember, ". . . surely his flocks fall into my hands." So we have **flocks**, **fee**, Old English **feoh**, and German **Vieh**, meaning cattle or flocks of all kinds.

| p13

The Arabic word for flocks is **ghanam**, which is our word **gain**. That is where we get our word **gain** from. It is flocks of sheep. **Ghaniy** is "to be rich." The land **Ghana** means "rich land." A **ghaniuun** is a rich person (plural **aghniyau**). That's the way you measured it. They still do in Africa. It devastates the country we are told now.

What he was after was his wealth. He says, ". . . surely the flocks of my brother falleth into my hands. And the Lord said unto Cain: Where is Abel, thy brother? And he said: I know not. Am I my brother's keeper?" (verse 34). We are told again here that he had it all planned out. There was a conspiracy which was worked out, and he got what Satan had promised him, power and gain. He's on the way to success in this world. Cain then becomes a real epic and tragic figure of real stature, the big show. Now I have to rush like a crazy man.

Question: What does the name Cain mean? Answer: It means a traveling smith or metal worker.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 20

Even though the time is limited, we must linger on this theme for a little while because it takes a huge bite out of history. It covers more ground than anything else. We've got to know it. If it was missing, as it is from other religions, the gospel story would be far from complete, a very serious defect. So we were on Moses 5:35. "And the Lord said: What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother cries unto me from the ground." So the purpose of the earth is what? It's to sustain and support life. That's its purpose during our test here, during our time on earth. Every creature is supposed to have its time, but the purpose of the earth is to sustain and support life. Anything that destroys life prematurely is against the purposes for which it was constructed, and the earth is offended. That negates its whole purpose.

". . . The voice of thy brother's blood cries unto me from the ground. And now thou shalt be cursed from the earth which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand." He still has a right to life. He has not yet finished his course. Yet the earth has a responsibility. What Cain has done by murder is why it's such a terrible crime to curtail life. So the earth has "opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood." As a result the earth is not going to give you anything. You have taken life from it; now it will not return life to you. The earth will not yield her strength when you till it. Remember, he was a tiller of the earth. "When thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength. . . ." So he is going to become a nomad and a wanderer. He is not agrarian anymore. He is going to become nomadic and he does. He goes to the land of the nomads because he can't farm anymore. There are such people in the earth, as you know. All civilizations that last are rooted in the soil. But as you read in "The Deserted Village," "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey, where wealth accumulates and men decay." "This is the deserted village when people leave the land. This is going to happen, and Cain represents another civilization entirely, you notice. He goes off and founds a city. They go into the metal work business. He is a wanderer, and he becomes a type. "And Cain said unto the Lord [now, as you might suppose, Cain is the one who has been injured]: Satan tempted me because of my brother's flocks. . . ."

The thing to do is not to resist temptation but to avoid it. That's the best way of dealing with it. But you notice it was because of the flocks—he was greedy. He coveted his property as we were told before. He murdered his brother Abel, it tells us in Moses 5:50, for the sake of getting gain. Cain slew his brother Abel for the sake of getting gain. He couldn't resist. That's what Satan had promised him—that you can murder and get gain. That's the big theme, that you can convert life into property. So he couldn't resist. He knew the tricks. He thought he could get away with it. (Also, I was mad because you favored him.) Well, you know why that was. This had all been planned by Satan. ". . . And I was wroth also; for his offering thou didst accept and not mine; my punishment is greater than I can bear."

|p2

The Lord still has compassion. He puts a mark on Cain so that he will be saved. "Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the Lord, and from thy face shall I be hid. . . ." He now becomes an outlaw. The worst penalty you can possibly have is to be driven from the face of the Lord. You will no longer be facing in that direction. You will no longer have much to look forward to if you are driven from the face of the Lord. God will be an alien to him. He has alienated himself. He has cut himself off. Remember that verse where he turns on his heel and walks out. "And Cain was wroth, and listened not any more to the voice of the Lord, . . . [I am through. All right, if that's the way you want it.]" He carries that all the way through. ". . . and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; . . ." He has become an outlaw now. He has taken life, and he can't claim the law's protection because he not only has broken it, but he has taken it into his own hands and taken life on his own. The first rule the Lord gives, as it says in the Book of Ether, is that "God will not that man should shed blood, but has in all things forbidden it since the beginning of man." That's a general order that applies at all times. He has in all things forbidden it since the beginning of man. Cain has broken the rule now. ". . . and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that he that findeth me will slay me, . . ." That's the status of the outlaw in ancient and medieval societies. A person who was outlawed had no law to protect him, so anyone who found him was perfectly free to kill him. He had no protection. To whom could he flee? Who was his protector? He had no lord to champion him. He couldn't go to the courts because he was outlawed. He had not the protection of the king's highway or the three days' protection. He had nothing. So he said, anyone that finds me will be perfectly free to kill me because of my iniquities. He has a bad reputation. His name is known for evil now. Anywhere he goes he is going to be at great risk. What can he do? It's a terrible thing. ". . . for these things are not hid from the Lord."

But the Lord says to him, the fact that one person kills doesn't justify you in killing him. You do not correct the taking of life by the taking of life. This doesn't give anyone else the right to kill. So anyone who kills Cain will be avenged seven fold. Otherwise, people will start the rule of vendetta, and that never ends. Then you'll get northern Ireland, and you'll get the Philippines, or Lebanon. It's the Arabic rule of the raid, of the revenge. You get the Jukes and the Kallikacks, the feuding of Kentucky. And the famous border ballads in Percy's relics, the Douglasses and the Percys. They feud for generations and generations, and when does it end? When they are both wiped out. That's your Book of Mormon theme. It ends the same way with the Jaredites and the Nephites, with extermination. This is the old Asiatic theme. It's a very old and very well established theme. So the Lord says this is not going to happen. You don't have a right to do that. "Vengeance is mine saith the Lord; I will repay," he says in the Book of Mormon. It was because the armies of the Nephites went up against the Lamanites that they began to be smitten. The Lord had strictly forbidden it no matter how badly they had been offended. Once you play that game there is no end. As soon as there is a murder committed on both sides, then there is no stopping because each side says, "Ah, you did something to us. Isn't that terrible." This goes on forever. Cain was an outlaw and a vicious person, but the Lord said, ". . . Whosoever slayeth thee, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And I the

|p3

Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him." We say it was a curse. No, it was so he wouldn't be killed, to mark him. Now we come to this very interesting thing. "And Cain was shut out from the presence of the Lord, and with his wife and many of his brethren [a large troupe of migration; they go forth now. These are the Cainites] dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden." **Nod** means to move back and forth. **Nud** is the same word in Hebrew. What do you do when you move back and forth? Well, you migrate. You are a people that have no settled position. The migrants and nomads of central Asia tour and follow the grass with the seasons. They are always on the march. Or the Arabs with their camels. These nomadic peoples live in the land of Nod, which means migrating or nomadism. The basic meaning is not to stay in one position, but to go this way, then this way, and then this way. In summer you go up to the summer pasture. In winter you go down to the winter pasture. So he went to the land of Nod east of Eden, and that's where they are going to live for the rest of their days.

There is a great tradition about the mark on Cain. In Peter Matthiessen's book on the Himalayas, he writes an interesting thing. There's also a massive work on this by Robert Eisler. Unfortunately, I've loaned it to somebody here on the campus and wasn't able to bring it with me today. It's just as well because it would use up too much time. But it's these Cainites that wander. Cain, **Qayin**, is the wandering smith in Arabic, Hebrew, and Aramaic. A **qayin** is a blacksmith. He blackens his face professionally because he works at the forge. This is a mark of his profession, the blackened face. It advertises his profession, and he wanders. You find these, and they are great metal workers, as we will see Cain's descendants are. Their rites are secret, and they intermarry. You think of the Gypsies, of course. The Gypsies belong to that particular class of people. They are always wandering. We don't see Gypsies as much as we used to. There used to be a lot of them. When I grew up in the Northwest, we had Gypsies with us all the time. They would park in the back lot, and they were remarkable people. They were the Romany. **Gypsy** is related to **Egyptian**, but they spoke a language very close to Sanskrit. Maybe you have read George H. Borrow's **Lavengro**. That used to be required reading from everybody. It is about the boy who grew up among the Gypsies and learned the Gypsy language and secrets. They have Gypsy princes. For us they are rather a sinister people. They live to themselves, and they don't hesitate to steal or anything like that because that's legitimate. They can't make a living. The earth will not yield. They cannot plant because they say it won't grow if they do. They tell fortunes and have all sorts of insights. They can really tell them too. I've had some beautiful fortunes told, and they hit it "right on the button."

Peter Matthiessen writes here, "The new porters are dirt-colored men in dirty rags and small black caps carrying the curved Ghurka hatchet-knife called **Kukry**. They are not interested in the telescope. Most are the Kammy people." We say Gypsy means Egypt, but **Kammy** is the word for **Egypt** too, and it means "black." That's why we usually say that the name for Egypt (**Kemi** written with a crocodile's tail) comes from the "black land." Whether it does or not, it comes from the black people too. It is also written with a thunderbolt where it is read not **Kemi**

|p4

but **Kham**, the people of **Ham**. So these are called the black people of the blacksmith cast. ". . . Soot-faced familiars of the smelting fire and of the iron stolen from the rock, feared and despised as black magicians by primitive people throughout Eurasia and Africa since the beginning of this dark age of iron." These people have always been wandering there. You will find them, and they are very interesting people. Nobody knows the source of their wealth. As I say, they take what they want.

Once we were held up for half a day. It was in 1964 when they were having lots of trouble between the Arabs and Jews, and Nasser was stirring up a great deal of trouble in Palestine. We were stopped on the border between Jordan and Syria. They had a little checking station and would check the people that passed by. Along would come a poor old camel driver or somebody with a donkey. He would be all bedraggled, with long whiskers and rags, dirty, etc. This being customs, the soldiers would insist that he unroll the bundles he had on his camels and show what he had. You would gasp to see what came out of those bundles. There were the most elegant silks and satins and jewelry, gold plate and silver, all sorts of things. You'd wonder where they picked up this loot. These were rich men, but you would never guess if you looked at them. They looked utterly dismal. Well, this is the tribe of Cain, of **Kemet**, and they wander around like this.

Now we get to the Cainites, and they become a regular people. It's a way of life. There's going to be another line too, and we are given the line here of the Cainites. "And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bare Enoch, . . ." (I thought Enoch was a holy man.) Well, this was another Enoch who went and built a city. The first city builder was Enoch. Then to him was born Irad (not Jared). I think the best thing to do is to follow the fourth chapter of Genesis here. Let's do that. We get the Lamech story there. First we have Adam, and then Cain, and then Enoch. He bore Irad. Now **Irada** is not the same as Jared. It looks like it, but it is spelled quite differently. It means the "shy person," the person who holds back and is withdrawn, who is unsure of himself. These people don't have complimentary names. It's a very interesting thing. Then Irad begot **Mehujael**. **Mahijael** and **Mehujael** both mean the same thing. They mean a person who has been smitten by God with a disease of some sort. The basic root **meha** means to have a chronic disease. Usually, **Mehujael** means smitten by God. That means you have had divine smiting. You're paralyzed. It's a word for paralytic. Irad is the shy withdrawn person, a person who can't circulate in society. **Mehujael** is a person who has been smitten with palsy, polio, or something like that. Uncomplimentary names. The next person was **Methusael**. It sounds like **Methuselah**, but it isn't. The reason I'm putting this on is that the Sethites (the sons of Seth) run in seven lines with almost the same names. But they are read differently as if you were punning on them, like twin names. This is a typical trick. The Egyptians do it all the time. So **Mehujael** begat **Methusael** which means "the one who has been prayed for." This is a more complimentary name. It means one who has been prayed for or one who prays, one who supplicates. Then he begets Lamech. All this is building up to the story of Lamech, which is a very sad name. So here are the seven. Lamech means destruction, loss, perdition. His name shall be perdition. So these aren't very flattering names in this particular family.

|p5

Lamech took two wives. Now we will get to the story that I was so interested in, but first I must give you an introduction. It's very important. Here is a book that just came out. It's a later edition. Marija Gimbutas's *The Gods and Goddesses of Old Europe*. It deals with the old European civilization. We have been talking about the Egyptians and the Greeks and all that sort of thing. This is much older. This is where it all comes from, as a matter of fact. You can trace one from the other. Here are maps showing where the old civilization is. Notice, it begins in the Balkans up here. It goes down into the Aegean later on and across into Egypt. The interesting thing is that it says the gods and goddesses of Europe from 6500 to 3500 B.C. That was the time when they flourished. They were much older than that. There are over 30,000 artifacts from this particular civilization, but 6500 to 3500 was when it flourished. Around 6500 was its peak. That's 3,000 years older than the Egyptians. It is 3400, according to Emery, when the Egyptians suddenly move in and you get a new civilization. They start full blast with the writing and everything else. These people have writing; they have everything at 6500 B.C. This is really knocking things over. Moreover it can be traced back. There are some pictures of temples and shrines and pottery. (It's very well illustrated.) The grotesque masked figures are made that way on purpose. There is some sculpture which shows that they were quite skillful. When they wanted to, they could make perfectly good figurines. But these things are deliberately shown as grotesque and masked. They are dancers and they play various roles in a drama. Here is the mother goddess in her various forms and how she compares with the Aegean. That's the one on the cover on the front. This is much older than anything we ever heard of. You say, what about your primitive people and primitive civilization? Well, this fits into the picture. The concluding chapter will show us what we are talking about here just briefly. What are these figures? They had all sorts of ornaments fixed on them. Here is a mating scene (male and female) called the Juwelnitsa lovers. It's possibly the portrayal of the ritual connected with the sacred marriage. That's what we are getting here in Lamech. We are going to get this marriage business and what goes on there.

To get the general picture we have to see this institution which is so very important. We'll call it the **panegyris** here. **Pan** means "everybody," and **gyris** means "a gyroscope," around in a circle. This is when everybody meets in the big circle, the cosmic circle. "In ancient times at holy shrines, each believed to mark the exact center of the universe [this is the situation], represented as the point at which the four quarters of the earth converge [the navel of the earth, always written with the **quadrata** like this when it is represented; Indians and everybody have that sign] one might have seen assembled at the new year [always at the new year; we've had this motif before] the moment of creation, the beginning and ending of time, vast concourses of people would come together." That's what you have at Stonehenge and Avebury and well over a thousand ancient megalithic centers scattered all over Europe. They are also in Asia. There are lots of them in Palestine. ". . . vast concourses of people, each thought to represent the entire human race in the presence of all its ancestors and gods. A visitor to any of these festivals would have found a market or fair in progress. Why? The natural outcome of bringing people together from wide areas in large numbers. The temple of the place functions as an

exchange or bank. He could have witnessed ritual contests—foot and horse and wagon races, and odd kinds of wrestling."

They still have the **glima** here. Spanish Fork is the oldest Icelandic settlement in America. It's older even than Winnipeg. There were five wards there in which they still spoke Icelandic when I came to Provo. They hold their annual festival here, and they have the **glima**. That's a ritual form of wrestling. It's belt wrestling. We find this in the earliest glyphs. We have lots of pictures of this ritual **glima** wrestling from Egypt, from the Old Kingdom and the Middle Kingdom. It's very common, and sometimes it took a pretty deadly form. In the **K'sen** we have it mentioned that way. You would get hold of the other person's belt and throw him over. But the Icelandic custom (they didn't do it this way here) is to grab the other person's belt, and they had short knives. You couldn't let go of the belt, and you tried to do as much damage as you could with the knife. It was a pretty gory affair. There were races because they had to pick the winner. And there were choral competitions and the famous Troy game, beauty contests, etc. The **kallisteia** because they had to pick the queen as well.

". . . He would note that all came to the celebration as pilgrims, often traversing immense distances." Pilgrim roads are the oldest marks we have. We have pilgrim roads in England going back to 4500 B.C. Flying over them, you can still see them from the air because they are marked by standing stones along there. They all converge together on Avebury which was built about 4500 B.C. I used to fly over that twice a week at least. We could see where all the roads would converge from vast distances in all directions on the Kennet mounds where the king was buried. There is this vast processional way with these huge stones and then this enormous circle. They have made it a national park. It is a tremendous layout. ". . . They often traversed immense distances over prehistoric sacred roads and dwelt during the festival in booths of green boughs. [All this was done in Israel too, you will notice in the Bible.] What would most command the visitors' attention to the great assembly would be the main event. [This is what we are getting at now, the famous ritual year drama for the glorification of the king.] In most versions of the year drama, the king wages combat with his dark adversary of the underworld, emerging victorious after a temporary defeat. [We already had that with Moses and Faust and the rest. When you begin, your hero is overcome. He is beaten.] He emerges finally after temporary defeat in his duel with death to be acclaimed in a single mighty chorus." Remember, Moses is acclaimed. When he is victor, the Lord says, You have won. I will make you stronger than many waters. You will lead my people. So he is to be king. ". . . mighty chorus as worthy and recognized ruler of the new age. The new year was the birthday of the human race, and its rites dramatized the creation of the world. All who would be found in the Book of Life opened at the creation of the world [the book is very important] must necessarily attend." If you didn't, you were banished for three years from the kingdom. You became an outlaw then if you didn't come to the presence of the king when you were summoned by the royal **herör**. There's a famous saga called the *Orvar-Odds Saga*. You must be summoned and if you don't come, then you will be banished from the kingdom. You have no rights whatever for three years. "There were coronation and royal marriage rites accompanied by a ritual

representation of the sowing or begetting of the human race, and the whole celebration wound up in a mighty feast in which the king as the lord of abundance gave earnest of his capacity to supply his children with all the good things of the earth. The stuff for the feast was supplied by the feasters themselves for no one came to worship the king without bringing his tithes and first fruits."

This is well documented in footnotes here, but I have information on well over a hundred such places. It lists all the things they did, comparing and matching them. This is the pattern that emerges. That's patternism. That's what we have here. If they left this out, there would be a huge gap. The Bible gives us just two verses on it, but the Book of Moses gives us a beautiful rundown on what was going on and what the situation was. So let's see what the Bible tells us. There are just these two verses here in the Lamech story, Genesis 4:19-24. **Lamech** means "lamentation, destruction, sadness," etc. He took two women to wife. One of them was called Adah. Sometimes they end it with **h**, and sometimes they don't. The other one was Zillah. **Adah** means "the beautiful, the adored one." It means she is "all got up." It means both masked and adorned, completely glorified. The words **zinnah** and **Zion** are the same thing. They mean adorned, beautiful—not only beautiful herself but heavily made up for the whole event. Adah is the gorgeous one. Zillah has the double meaning in all Semitic languages. **Zil** means an image, a counter image or a shade, or dark haired (**zillun**, a shadow; **nazlun**, shadowing; a likeness, an image, **mazalla**, **zalla**, a reflection). So she is the other one. There is going to be a competition here. We are going to have an antiphonal chorus. They have these chorals to choose the king. With the antiphonal chorus, one chorus sings to the other one. We have that in the Book of Samuel and in Chronicles. They represent the competition of the maidens. This is very important too. You get this in the corn dances of the Hopis. They divide them up the same way. This is good old Adah and Zillah. (We might as well get through with this part of it.) Adah bore two sons and one was **Jabal**. We have that Jabal, and it should be Yabal, which is quite different. Jabal would be a different thing entirely. But in Hebrew it is **ya** here, so it's Yabal. Our word **jubilee** comes from it. It means "to sing, to rejoice, to jubilate" and the like. He was the father of all those who practice **tofesh**, which means "to strike an instrument." The **kinnor** is any stringed instrument.

One thing about the nomads is that they practiced the nomadic arts which are portable. Not architecture or sculpture or painting or even pottery, but what is it? It's weaving, singing, and musical instruments. They all come out of Asia, and they are the instruments of nomads. It's the same thing here. Way back from the Middle Kingdom there is the famous Jabesh who is shown coming into Egypt from Palestine on a donkey with his little kids and his wives. They are all dragging along. One is playing a harp, and they are singing. These nomads walk along and play a harp because you can carry a harp with you. You notice the bards were wandering singers. They would go from court to court. They didn't settle down. So music is one of the most portable of arts. **Tofesh** is to strike an instrument. The words **kinnor**, **zither**, and **guitar** are related. The **ugav** is the bagpipe, the oldest of all wind instruments. You find bagpipes in Crete in ancient times. Of course, you find them in Scotland; you find them in Ireland. The Greeks had them.

!p8

Bagpipes are extremely ancient instruments. They were common in England earlier. **Ugav** also means accompanying for a dance, dance instrument. So here we have the culture. So the traveling rock bands are part of Cain's people. They are a very important part. They are mentioned quite a lot. The kind of music they have is not contemplative, but it's wild, frenzied and exciting.

But how about Zillah? She bore Tubal-cain. That's that word **cain** again. **Tubal** is a derived form of **Yubal**. There are two interpretations. **Qayin** means a "spear, a sharp instrument, a sword or a dagger." Cain is also a smith. Nobody knows what the Tubal means, but it is related to Yubal. Tubal-cain was the great smith it says in Macaulay's famous rhyme on the subject.

Tubal-cain, the man of might,
In days when the earth was young;
The fierce sparks sprang from his anvil bright,
And the strokes of his hammer rung;
The mighty Tubal-cain.

He was the mighty smith, and it says he was that. He was the teacher of all those who **kharehsh**, which means "to smelt" or "to carve." The basic meaning is "to carve or engrave." It means to form bronze and iron. It comes at a very early time. And his sister was called **Naamah**, which means "delightful, beautiful, lovely." That's a good name finally.

Now we come to series of quatrains here because there is a drama. There are two choruses, site opposite. The earlier versions of the Old Testament didn't put it that way, but that's the way it should be because the lines match each other. You have these two choruses singing together. This chorus business is rather an important one. There's the chorus of the light and the dark, the antiphonal here. The earliest lyric poet of the Greeks was Alcman who left the maiden songs. It was in the days when Sparta was the cultural center and not Athens, way back in the eighth century. For the maiden songs, they divide up into two choruses and sing to choose the queen. It's at the new year, but it has to be at dawn. In the maiden songs, the two choruses are the colts and the doves. They are rivals to each other. They run a foot race at dawn. The winner of the foot race is chosen, and then they sing the choruses about each other. One is Hagesichora whose hair is like spun gold, and the other is a dark one who is equally beautiful. This rivalry goes between. There is always the light one and dark one here. You get that a great deal. You get it in the **Canticles** of King Solomon. "I am black but comely." You have that in **Canticles** or **The Song of Solomon**. It's the love song. You have the two choruses singing for the king, and the one says, "I am black but comely." You get that one all the time.

You also have Miriam and the Ethiopian. When Moses went up on the mount, the Hebrews started to celebrate this in his absence. He rebuked them for it. They set up the golden calf and divided into choruses, and they made fun of Moses' wife Zipporah because she was an Ethiopian. They say she was black. That is why, we are told, when Moses came back in a rage

Miriam was smitten. (So you make fun of blackness; we'll make you white.) She looked and she had become white as a leper, white as snow. The Lord healed her later on, but as a rebuke for having made fun of the dark one she is made whiter than she ever wanted to be. Then we get Sarah and Hagar. Remember Hagar was a dark Egyptian woman. We are told in many traditions that Sarah was a raving blond. There was that rivalry between them. There's Abuzaid and the rest. A very famous story from the high priests of Memphis, **Si-Osiris**, tells about the rivalry with the two choruses (the black woman of the South). It's the **Si-Osiris** and the son of the Ethiopian. They are rivals, and their mothers put them onto each other. You will find this all over the place, and that's what we are finding here, the antiphonal chorus.

Then we get this contest now. This is what they sing in the contest. We are going to follow Genesis 4:23. "And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, . . ." Now he recites this, and notice each line is a parallelism; he repeats the same thing twice each time. He says, "Hear you [two of them] my voice, oh wives of Lamech." In the second half of the verse, he says, "And give ear to what I say." Well, listen to me and give ear are the same thing. These next two lines are all we are told of the story. We are told a lot more that is very important in the Book of Moses. This is the key. "I have sacrificed a man for wounding me." It's a ritual contest. The King James has it all cockeyed because they have the subjective genesis as the objective genesis. This is a major crux in Semitic grammar, and the Arabs never stop arguing about it. The killing of Zide. Does that mean Zide did the killing or Zide was killed? Which is it? It could be either one. There's no difference. Gardiner goes to considerable length to show that the same thing happens in Egyptian. When he says, "I have killed a man to my wounding and a young man to my hurt," he just repeats himself. "I have slain a man for trying to kill me, and the same man for trying to hurt me." He won in other words. He won the contest. It just leaves it there. We don't know what is going on until we look at the Book of Moses.

If we look up these words that are used here for killing and slaying, we will find what they mean. This **patza** for "wounding me"; it doesn't mean wound. It means "to place a cut or mark upon, to put a ritual mark." The other, **khabura**, we are told, is the mark or stroke of a wound on the skin. There's a conflict in which ritual wounds are inflicted. We are told that Satan showed Cain the blows of death. This is a very important thing. He taught them to him before he could have his showdown with Abel. Does this mean that Lamech, like Cain, was marked as a murderer? What's happening? You are going to find out very soon what this is about. It says, "Since [not if] Cain is avenged seven times, Lamech will be avenged seventy times seven." Remember, whoever killed Cain would be avenged seven fold. Lamech has done the same sort of thing, and he goes out. But it's a ten to one here, seventy times seven. And here is the ritual contest, what the women sing back and forth.

When David and Saul were competing, Saul was murderously envious of David and tried to kill him. When David came back from war, the women divided into two choruses and sang. One would sing, "Saul has slain his thousands. But David has slain his ten thousands," would be replied. It's ten to one preference for David. The same thing is Cain versus Lamech.

|p10

And the Hebrew tradition is that it was Lamech who slew Cain in the contest. He was the successor because we are told he was also Master Mahan. He took charge of the society we are told here. Right after this seventy times seven is the end of it. Then it says that Adam knew his wife and had another son, and it was Seth. That's the whole story. That's all it tells us in the Old Testament. But the Book of Moses tells us a good deal more here.

It was the same thing in Rome. When the emperor came back, the only way he could be recognized was for the girls to divide into antiphonal choruses. The Arval brethren do the same and the Salian brethren. They would say, "A thousand, a thousand, a thousand we have beheaded." (In order to become emperor, you had to have slain 5,000 in the field.) In the early days, the only way you could become emperor was to be acclaimed this way by the chorus of the maidens when they met at the triumphal arch. They would sing this **mille, mille**. Our word **triumph** comes from the Latin **triumpha** song, and also **tramp**. It's very heavy. It's exactly the way the Hopis dance all day long. The triumph song was one of these. All these things come together, but the point is that this is very old stuff. You are going to run into it wherever you go. I thought I had some references that might be some good ones. But you can think of plenty of them here, the antiphonal chorus and Adah and Zillah. And among the Celtic people there's Era and Ethna led by the white maid and the red maid. In Egypt there's the same sort of thing. For heaven's sake, I've participated in this thing which, of course, was at the May time, the Maypole. When I went to school in the early days in a rural school, we had the Maypole. We went around in opposite directions, the red streamers and the white streamers. We had to choose a king and queen of the May. The queen of the May was Vivian Johnson, I remember. I was eight years old then. The king of the May was a boy called King which was very appropriate because he was the biggest boy in the school. I had this terrible crush on Vivian Johnson which did me no good at all because they were the king and queen. We would have to bring our lunch, and we would all go out in the meadows and sit down among meadowlarks and eat. It was May Day. This was to celebrate the new year, the begetting of the race and all this. In England this has been going on for thousands of years. We have broken all those ties. We don't have those anymore. We still have a commercialized Christmas. In a common wall design in Egyptian palaces, you will find the tall Maypole, the red throne and the white throne. You will find the priests going in opposite directions. It's the Troy game that was done with horses. That's what a carousel is. The horses move in opposite directions. But again it was the red and the white. In fact, I wrote my doctoral dissertation on that very thing. Nobody bothered to read it, but it's a very interesting thing. I handed it in one minute before the deadline. Nobody had any time to read it, so it got by. (It was published later.)

Anyway this thing is going on here. Now let's look at the account in Moses. What was this all about? Lamech was the candidate. He became Cain's successor (verse 49). "For Lamech, having entered into a covenant with Satan after the manner of Cain, wherefore he became Master Mahan, . . ." He is now "the big cheese," and Cain is his rival. So we have the normal story. The common Jewish legend is that Lamech, who was jealous and wanted to become successor to Cain, lay in wait for him. He was blind, so he took a boy along with him to tell

{p11

him where Cain was and to direct his arrow. So he directed the arrow, and Lamech killed Cain. Because of that, the boy was held responsible. That's the story they made up to explain this garbled thing in which we only have two lines in the whole Old Testament to explain what's going on. But here we get a pretty good picture. (Oh, I didn't read you the conclusion here, but that's exactly what they are doing back there in 6500 B.C.) And Lamech became "master of that great secret which was administered unto Cain by Satan; and Irad [the sick one] the son of Enoch, having known their secret, began to reveal it unto the sons of Adam." Ah, somebody's giving the secret away; and, of course, they had sworn by their heads that they wouldn't do that. Since Lamech was the head of the society, it was up to him to see that the proper punishment was administered. "Wherefore Lamech, being angry, slew him [because he gave away the secret; remember, they swore by their heads that they wouldn't and they did, so that's what happened] not like unto Cain his brother Abel, for the sake of getting gain, but he slew him for the oath's sake [for his ritual obligation]." He had taken it and Irad had taken it, so he had to do this, not to get gain. Then it says, "For, from the days of Cain [he started it], there was a secret combination [it was done this way], and their works were in the dark, [but it was a society in which they had their marks and signs] and they knew every man his brother." This is the sinister element that you get with the Gypsies and with the Cainites. The world is full of that now. For example, you find among the Hopis the two groups, the two-feathered and the one-feathered, that act as sort of policemen. The two-feathered are good. They go around helping people, and they only move at night. They have secret societies, meet in their own kiva, etc. The one-feathered people are dangerous. They think they can commit murder with impunity (anything they want). They are a savage and dangerous lot. Stay away when the one-feathered people are running around. The same thing with the Zunis. They have these secret societies, and because they are secret, few people know about them. But they do exist. They are very widespread, and they have been with us all the time. This is the Gadianton. It's a very important theme in the Book of Mormon. It pops up all over the place. But we have a lot of that going on all the time, secret combinations for power and gain.

Notice what happened. "Wherefore the Lord cursed Lamech, and his house, and all them that had covenanted with Satan, for they kept not the commandments of God, and it displeased God, . . ." Now here's the point. This is the pattern. What happens? It spreads everywhere in the world. That's why you're going to find this everywhere you go in the ancient world. ". . . and their works were abominations, and began to spread among all the sons of men." Beginning with the Cambridge School in 1930, this was called patternism because it follows the same pattern wherever you go. The people at Cambridge discovered it. At first, people sort of laughed at it, everybody doing the same thing, but now it is very well established. No one doubts it. "And it was among the sons of man, and among the daughters of men these things were not spoken, because that Lamech had spoken [now we come to a very important thing] the secret unto his wives, and they rebelled against him, and declared these things abroad, and had not compassion." This is the *dame fatale*, namely the woman who gives away the secrets. You know about Pandora, but this goes all the way down the line. This is like Lilith.

|p12

The wife gives it away, and it becomes a very important pattern. We shouldn't linger on these things, except for the fact that it is a very big chunk of world history. These things have only been dropped in the last generation. People were doing these things and they still do among tribes, etc., more than you think. Among the Chinese, wherever you go, you are going to find these secret societies. They are a very important element, as you know, and have always been in Chinese society and in Hindu society and throughout the whole world. But if this wasn't part of the Book of Moses, we would have a very serious defect. There would be something lacking in this story. Not only do we have evil coming into the world, we see the forms it takes here. We need to study them.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 21

T. G. H. James is talking this hour, and he is the director of the Egyptian section of the British Museum. He took a group through last night over at the Ramses exhibit. Maybe we should be over there, but I don't think so. Unfortunately, our time is limited. I'd love to go over there. But he will give us only the most introductory, common-place things. He's an interesting man. He'll be around a while. (A fresh sneeze. Ah, such self-control. **Tio**; I like the Greek word for "sneeze.")

This is very important. We are going to talk about the Book of Enoch now. Remember, we ended the last time with certain fatal ladies, and there is a long list of them. We all know about Pandora's box, but these legends all go back to the very beginning of time. Pandora was the first woman. She was Eve. She was the wife of Epimetheus, who was Adam. Prometheus was his brother, and he advised him not to marry Pandora because the many gifts she brought were fatal, the **dame fatale**. It's the old rivalry of matriarchy and patriarchy here. It runs right through, and it's very old. The oldest story we have in Egypt is "Re and the Sun's Eye." This is the theme. After the flood, Isis wanted her sons to rule the world through the matriarchal line, which they did in Egypt. To do that, she had to get the secret name. She had to get the true name from Re. He had left the earth and decided to blight it with a flood because of the wickedness of men. She wanted her son Horus to have the rule, but to do that she had to have the right name. She had to have his name, so she wheedled it out of him. She makes a serpent out of clay and puts it in his path. When he walks in the garden, it bites him. He is poisoned, and the suffering gets worse and worse. Only she can cure it. She will cure it if he tells her the secret name. So the secret name is a theme that runs right through. This is the first couple we are talking about. This is prehistoric, of course, in Egypt. Then we get the Greek legend of Prometheus. We mentioned him. He is practically a twin of Enoch. That's the primal drama we had in Moses 1. The same story is told in the story of Moses and Zipporah (Exodus 4:24-25). It's inserted there; it doesn't belong there at all. It's a very strange story about the conflict between Moses and his wife Zipporah who was an Ethiopian woman. Then there is Lohengrin, the swan knight who is not supposed to tell his name. He will have to leave the earth. He can't stay here if his secret is given away. His name is wheedled out of him. He says, "My name is Lohengrin." Then **Nachste Schwan**, that famous joke.

You know the story of Delilah. "What is the secret of your strength?" she says to Samson. She wheedles the secret out of him. And Tomyris ends up with Cyrus the Great who was completely bamboozled by her. She got his secret, his rule, his kingdom and everything else. And there's King Solomon and Bilqis, the Queen of Sheba, who was the Shulamite. She was responsible for Solomon's fall. We are told, even in the Bible, that Solomon was righteous up to a particular point. Then this woman got hold of him and led him astray.

|p2

There were others such as Calypso and Candace, who was Alexander the Great's undoing in Egypt. In all the early Christian Gnosticism it's Sophia who does this. Well, this fatal dame; who is she? In our story the wives of Lamech knew no compassion; they gave him away and he was an outcast. Among the sons and daughters of men these things were not known. His wives rebelled against him and declared these things abroad and had not compassion. This is an interesting thing. This story is not in the Bible, but it does come in the earliest accounts we have of these things outside of the Bible. The Lord cursed Lamech and all them that covenanted with Satan. Lamech is the successor to Cain. They covenanted with Satan and kept not the commandments of God, we are told in Moses 5:52. God ministered not unto them. Their works were an abomination, and they spread among all men. So this gets out.

There is this book and I wonder if you can still get it (it's only \$3.95). Because of its sensational title, it was just sort of a pot boiler. They got a lot of things together, but the things they got together include some of the best apocalyptic writings there are, some of the oldest and best. The editors don't know anything about it. They just picked them up and threw them together, but they are good. They go back to early translations, all of these. **The Infancy Gospels, Nicodemus, and Paul and Seneca** are not good. They get them all mixed up. But **First Clement** and **Barnabus** are absolutely priceless. These are the Apostolic Fathers. The letters to the Ephesians, the Trallians and Romans. That's **Ignatius of Antioch**, the seven letters to the Smyrnaeans and the Philippians. Then there's the **Pastor of Hermas** which was discovered in the 1860s. That's genuine and invaluable. These are all the seven earliest Christian writings we have. They're in here (the **Hermas** is priceless). Then there are the **Adam and Eve Books** which are interesting. They are only a small section, but they include some very interesting ones here. For example, it tells you here how Lamech was betrayed by his two wives. He became Adam's [Cain's ?] successor. He was Adam's son, according to this. They were going to have this duel and this showdown, but Lamech was blind. They were out in the field, and Cain was raging through the world full of vengeance because he had fallen. He has a terrible state of mind. He's not only suffering, but he's wrathful and determined to destroy anything he comes across. So he came to the wives of Lamech, and they betrayed him. It says "they had not compassion." They told Cain where Lamech was out in the field. Cain went out there, but Lamech got the best of him because the young man who was with him directed his arrow. It was in the dark, and he thought a wild animal had come. He said, "My lord, you need to shoot in this direction." So he shot, and who should he hit but Cain. That was the end of that. But the thing is that Lamech was betrayed by his wives. This thing gets out. These are all themes in which the hero was betrayed by his wife or his wives. Quite often it's his wives. There's a very good two-volume work on this theme by Ludwig Laistner called **Das Ratsel der Sphinx**. They have a copy at Berkeley. It has the best summary of these. It was written in the 1890s by a German scholar who went through it very thoroughly.

Now we come to the Cainite line. We mentioned that before. We are going to have two lines, the line of Cain and the line of Seth. The Cainite line is in chapter 5, verse 42 and following. Notice it's Cain and Enoch (which seems to be the same sort of name) and Irad and Mahujael

|p3

and Methusael and Lamech. The two wives are Adah and Zillah. Then there's Tubal-cain and the others. These are the ones that covenanted with Satan. On the other hand, we get the separation. A separation took place between them. There are many accounts. I have over 500 pages of Xeroxed very early Adam sources. I wouldn't dare bring them along or we'd get all mixed up with them. The best way if we are going to cover any ground at all is just to tell you the story as it is. So this is what happened. They separated, of course, when Cain had to leave because the land wouldn't yield for him, and he became a nomad in the land of Nod. They wandered, and he went east. Since they couldn't cultivate, they went into city building and banking and things like that. That's what they did. There are good descriptions of how they started. He invented the money, etc. Tubal-cain and Yubal invent the instruments and have real rock music and they rock and dance all the time. They are in heavy business. They go into jewelry and investments of all sorts.

Enoch establishes the first walled city and the first army. And down the line we go. It's the two civilizations. The pastorals are up in the highlands, out in the mountains. Those are the Sethians. It says they live in the holy places. Their main center is called the Mountain of the Cave of Treasures, being the Hill Cumorah where they keep all their records and also their sacred things. When Adam died, he was buried in the cave. When they had to leave, they took him with them. They separated then, and the holy ones were left on the mountain and lived after the manner of the righteous with their flocks. They gathered fruit it says in "the manner of paradise." They still gathered any fruit of the garden they chose to take, and they didn't toil to acquire.

Incidentally, yesterday I spent most of the day reading a new book by Timothy Champion (it's by four authors actually). It's a collection of the latest of all available material on prehistoric Europe. How has the picture changed in the last twenty years? It brings it right up to date, and it's very interesting. One thing we use for developing is absolutely basic—the hand ax, the **coup de poing**, the **faustkeil**. This was the basic thing because you find this at all periods. The stone work was supposed to become more refined, but this says it doesn't. It shows no sign of evolution over the entire period. Just as one big break comes in the geologic history between the Tertiary and the Cretaceous. This big break comes at 35,000 B.C. when you go over to a new stone technique and everything is different. It seems like a new race comes and inhabits the earth, new people. But their racial distribution, their villages, their economy, etc. are very mysterious. Sometimes they are very advanced. Sometimes everything suddenly disappears. Around 3,000 B.C. the great fortified centers all over Europe just disappear. In their place you get undefended villages and general migrations of small groups. It's a completely different picture from what they ever had before. So what's going on back here? Are these our people? Do they concern us? What about the chronology, etc.? Well, things do fall into a pattern. You know that book by Marija Gimbutas I got the last time on old Europe. Her conclusions are from all these thirty thousand figurines, idols, etc. Remember, they had this marvelous metal work, the Varna culture in Yugoslavia, around 4500 B.C. It begins around 5500 actually. There are deep mines there, very rich. There's gorgeous metal works, as good as we can find, a thousand

|p4

years before anybody came to Egypt. So it's a different picture from anything you ever saw. That's the center there.

But we get this picture of the Sethians who are living righteously in the highlands, and the people of the plain with their licentious, easy ways. This, of course, is the pattern of Babylon. Remember, Mesopotamia is the flat steamy plain—very lush like Sodom and Gomorrah when you get to Abraham. So these two lines separate, and the holy ones are left alone on the holy mountain. Things go bad, you will notice (secret works; every man knew his brother). And what are they going to do about it? We get the Sethian line here in chapter six. This is the way it goes. It's Adam and Seth and Enos and Cainan. First Adam, which means man. Remember, Abel was killed and Seth becomes his son then. Seth means "second or substitute or equal." **Shetaa** means the same thing as two, double, twin because it tells us in the scriptures that he will take the place of Abel (this is to take the place of my son, Abel). The line of Adam from now on doesn't run through Adam, Cain, etc. It runs through Adam and Seth, the Sethian line. This is a parallel line. They have names that sound alike but aren't alike. So we have Adam and then Cain; then Enoch, of all people. You wouldn't expect an Enoch to be there. Then you have Adam and Seth, which means the second Adam. The next one, Enos, means exactly the same thing as Adam. It means human being or man. In Hebrew today if you call a person a human being, you can either say **ben Adam**, son of Adam, or **ben enosh**, which is the same as Enoch. We are just getting human race, human race, human race all along here. So then we get Enos and then Cainan. Notice the two Cainans are spelled very differently here.

The eighth verse of chapter six is very important here because the fifth chapter of Genesis begins like this, and it should be corrected. "And this was the Book of the Generations of Adam." That should be capitalized because that's the title. It says at the beginning of the fifth chapter, "This is the Book of the Generations of Adam." And the generations of Adam are Adam, Seth, Enos, etc.; not Adam, Cain, Abel. That's not the line. So when we talk about **bene Adam**, this is what we are talking about. God made him in his own image. And then here again in Genesis, he set them apart both male and female, specific of his own body. Then he blessed them, and gave them a new name. He gave them the name Adam now. This starts the new line. Then the books were opened at that time, it tells us. This is the book of the generations of Adam. He begat a son in his own likeness, just as Adam was begotten in the likeness of God. But Seth is the double of Adam. Notice, "in his own likeness, after his own image, and called his name Seth." It means "looks just like me." It means "mirror image or reflection." Seth means "the second person." **Sata** in Egyptian, as well as Hebrew, means "to take the place of, to replace." After he begot Seth, then we go down the line. In the verse 13 Seth begat Enos, and prophesied in all his days, and taught Enos in the ways of God; "wherefore Enos prophesied also." The children of men are numerous, and Satan starts his big counter attack now.

This is the story they tell between the Sethians and the Cainites. They go on, the descendants of Seth and the descendants of Cain. Their cultures have different traditions, but the Cainites

|p5

win hands down. There's no contest here at all. It happened over many years, however. They tell us how it happened. The plains had great attraction for the more simple-living people of the high places. They naturally were enticed. Satan took charge down below. He made a covenant. They talk a lot about the covenant, how he directed them and gave them the jewelry and the beautiful clothes and loud instruments. He specialized in brass bands. This would attract the attention of the young people up on the heights. They'd come and look down with some envy at all the fun that was going on down there in the plain—all the lights, the dancing, the carousing, etc. Then we come down the list here. After Cainan and Mahalaleel, then comes Jared. His name means "going down" because that was the day when they went down from the mountain; they left it. Jared told his sons, if you ever go down there, you'll never get back. At first they didn't know the way down, so Satan had to teach them. Satan actually came with a delegation of very important-looking people. He came up and invited Jared, "Come down, Brother Jared, and visit us in the city down below. You'll see what a nice society we have and you will love to stay with us. You'll see what it's like." He was curious, so he went down with them. They dressed up like angels, and they fooled him. He actually was fooled until he got back home, and the angel came and told him, Look, this is terrible. You've been led astray. Don't let your people do this. Satan showed them a way down. There was a gully where a stream went down, and you could get down that way. They started drifting down and joining in the fun. Incidentally, when Jared went there, he was introduced into all the delights of the place. Immediately, they started giving him a real show. It was a session—a real orgy with obscene goings on, etc. He was horrified because the men who came to get him had convinced him.

And oftentimes, to win us to our harm,
The instruments of darkness tell us truths,
Win us with honest trifles, to betray 's
In deepest consequence. (Shakespeare)

They won Jared over, but he saw where it was going. Well, his kids started going down and joining in the fun. They couldn't find their way back, and they didn't want to come back either. But they were warned ("if you do"). Pretty soon there was only a small community left up on the hill, the righteous and holy ones. As I say, this is all in these very old traditions. These were discovered in the nineteenth century in several places. There are about a hundred different sources actually. But they go back to Mandaean sources, and they go back to Johannite Christians of Central Asia, the same place where they found **The Pearl**. Then down in Basra at the mouth of the two rivers in Mesopotamia. That's where about two thousand of the Mandaeans still survive and live in these reed (practically) palaces, huge things. You may have seen them in *National Geographic*. But they still preserve these stories on lead plates because they couldn't stand the water, of course, and gold was rather expensive. Elizabeth Drower was able to collect some back in the 1950s and '60s and get some of these records. We have more now.

|p6

But anyway, there was a comeback. It just left a small community. What were they to do to keep up? They removed far off. Actually, it's the Cainites who migrate then. We find this in the time of Jared. Notice, this matches the Book of Ether (it's very interesting). We could go through these cultural details. These little things are so close to the Book of Ether in the Book of Mormon which happens at the tower, as you know. So the holy ones are left. In our Book of Enoch they ask Enoch on the high places who he is. They say, "There is a strange thing in the land; a wild man has come among us." They say, "Who are you?" and he says, "I come from the land of my fathers, which is a land of holiness to this day." The tradition is that those who remained on the high places kept themselves holy, and it was still called the land of holiness when Enoch went forth on his mission. All this is in these sources. You won't find it in the Bible or any Jewish sources either for that matter. This is very old stuff. This is Mandaean, and it's in the old Chaldean dialect that the Jews can't read at all. It wasn't read until the middle of the nineteenth century when they began to decide what it was. The great orientalist De Sacy, in the first part of the nineteenth century, said it was just a lot of nonsense. So we get to this.

So Enoch is sent on a mission to go and see. Here's this crash program at the end of chapter five. When the people went bad, notice on the one hand, abominations began to spread among all the people. On the other in verse 58 "the Gospel began to be preached, from the beginning, being declared by holy angels sent forth from the presence of God, . . ." There are direct messengers, His own voice, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. So it's a crash program by revelation and other ways, and the gospel is handed down as Mormon tells us in the seventh chapter of Moroni how that's done. Remember, we don't get to see angels or have visitations. We're not supposed to. This is Moroni 7:29 "And because he hath done this, my beloved brethren, have miracles ceased? Behold I say unto you, Nay; neither have angels ceased to minister unto the children of men." So the Lord sends angels down. An angel means a messenger. And he says (verse 30), "For behold, they are subject unto him to minister according to the word of his command [all they do is represent Him. You don't have to see God face to face; an angel will do] showing themselves [not unto everybody] unto them of strong faith and firm mind in every form of godliness." You receive no witness until after a trial of your faith. And also firm mind. This is not for hysterical people that are liable to see visions and take drugs and all sorts of things. It's not people of that type that you can't trust, over-imaginative and excitable. No, people of firm mind and strong faith are the only ones an angel can come to. Otherwise, it will set you off your rocker. Remember, Brigham Young said, "Pray that you will never see an angel," because almost everyone who has seen one has apostatized. It's more than they can take. That's an interesting psychological aspect. Let me go on here. "And the office of their ministry [these are the men of firm mind and godliness] is to call men unto repentance, and to fulfill and to do the work of the covenants of the Father, . . ." They call men to repentance and carry out, enter, and fulfill the covenants unto the children of men "to prepare the way among the children of men, by declaring the word of Christ unto the chosen vessels of the Lord [they who have seen the angels declare this unto chosen vessels; this is another step; the chosen vessels are the priesthood authorities, general and

{p7

otherwise, who preach these things; they are the chosen vessels], that they may bear testimony of him. And by so doing, the Lord God prepareth the way that the residue of men may have faith in Christ, that the Holy Ghost may have place in their hearts, . . ." They receive the same witness that the person receives who is visited by an angel. It isn't because these people told them. They don't get their testimony from these people. They are introduced to it "that the Holy Ghost may have a place in their hearts, according to the power thereof; and after this manner bringeth to pass the Father, the covenants which he hath made unto the children of men." So it's through the Father and the men. It's not necessarily a hierarchy, but anyone who has the spirit. Remember, when they asked Joseph Smith, "Are you a prophet of God?" He said, "Yes, and so is any other person who can bear a testimony of Jesus Christ." This can only be done by the spirit of prophecy.

So they send out this crash program to try to save the world which is in a very bad way. Thus all things were confirmed unto Adam by holy ordinances accompanied by the covenants that go down. Of course, the great missionary who is going to preach it is going to be Enoch. So he is sent on his mission. We should mention the Enoch sources here because the **Book of Enoch** is one of the most remarkable and strongest evidences we have for Joseph Smith. Nothing was known about it in his day. It had been found, but it was held in utter contempt. We will mention the Enochs then quickly (what the sources are). I had this series of articles running through from October 1975 to August 1977 in the *Ensign*. That's a lot of them. You can find all this Enoch stuff in there. A lot of it has been brought together, not all of it. You can get it at F.A.R.M.S. down here. The only thing is, it will set you back \$3.50. I figure that's about two cents a page though, which isn't bad for Xeroxing. They've gone to the trouble to pull all the articles out from the pages of the *Ensign* and put them all together. So it's quite a convenience if you want to part with that much "dough." But we will put it on reserve so you won't have to worry.

We start out talking about, among other things, the fact that the Book of Enoch was considered by far the most important of all non-biblical writings by the Jews and the Christians. It's quoted 128 times in the New Testament. Nobody knew that until we had the document and could see what they were quoting. They didn't realize that Enoch was everything. Why had they gotten rid of it? We talked about that before. The same reason they got rid of all the other stuff. The same reason they got rid of the preexistence, the Council in Heaven, and the plurality of worlds. All these things which are greatly emphasized in Enoch were banned in the fourth century. R. H. Charles has done more work with this than anyone else. We have three books of his. You will find the Enoch book in R. H. Charles. (You'll notice that big R. H. Charles book on reserve. You'll find it there. Both the **1 Enoch** and the **2 Enoch** are there.) He says the main fathers of the church declared war on it, including such great names as Hilary, etc. It was so completely forgotten that no one even knew it existed until Joseph Justus Scaliger at the end of the sixteenth century suspected. He discovered a passage from Syncellus, a Byzantine writer, which he said looks as if it came from a Book of Enoch. There had always been a tradition about the book, but the Jews and the Christians lost it entirely. Yet there were thousands of

|p8

copies around if they only knew it. So then they began the discovery which begins with 1 Enoch. That is the Ethiopian Enoch in 1773. Sir James Bruce, in the process of discovering the sources of the Blue and the White Nile, picked up a lot of manuscripts in Abyssinia, especially three beautiful manuscripts which he brought back and was very proud of. They were books of Enoch, in Abyssinia in Ethiopia where they had been preserved. They go back no earlier than the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (they are not very old). He brought them back to Europe.

Incidentally, scholars like Peiresc in the Renaissance were very much interested in Enoch too and claimed to have found him. Peiresc bought a beautiful manuscript in Italy, which they say had come from Ethiopia. But the great scholar (he wasn't a great scholar, but he thought he was, and everybody believed him), Job Ludolf of Berlin, came to Paris in 1683 to examine the manuscript. He said, Oh, it's trash; it's terrible; never look at this. So for over ninety years nobody paid any attention to Enoch. They had a text of Enoch there, a good one. Actually, this is late and it's long. It contains everything, but it's badly copied. It's not the best possible source, but it was the first known. Because it is long, all the chapters are named after it. Whenever you look up an Enoch source, whether it's first, second, third, fourth, fifth Enoch (no matter what Enoch it is), it always quotes the same chapters and verses; namely, those that were established in the 1 Enoch which is the one that's edited by R. H. Charles. So this Ethiopian Enoch comes along, and no one would believe it. In fact, no one would believe that James Bruce had discovered the sources of the Blue Nile. It made him mad, so he retired to his estate in Scotland and didn't come out again. He took one manuscript with him and gave one to Oxford, where it rotted, and another to the Paris library. So he had three Enoch texts.

Richard Laurence was the bishop of Cashel in Ireland. He was a great man and did everything he could to put an end to the endless feuds between the Catholics and Protestants in northern Ireland. He got out the first translation of it in 1821. If you see a copy of that, it's very different from what came out later in 1838 and 1840 (not only unsatisfactory). Undoubtedly, it's the same book, but this is important because it's the only text that would have been available to Joseph Smith. In 1821 it was Richard Laurence. They wouldn't let him take a copy out. They wouldn't even let him take a light. He had to practically ruin his eyesight by reading it in the dark, damp cellar at Oxford in the Bodleian Library. He had to read it that way and make a copy of it. This translation is a very interesting one because "ah ha, that's where Joseph Smith got it from." That's an interesting thing if you hold them to that. Somebody (I think it was at Northwestern University) wrote a dissertation to show that Joseph Smith must have got his Book of Enoch from this because there are so many parallels. Well, there are a lot of parallels, very close, very striking ones. This is the point. But they are nothing like the parallels that come out in the later discoveries, which show he is really on target. Of course, if this came from an original source, all of these are going to sound very much alike.

Second Enoch is a funny one. That was way back as early as—well, it wasn't even recognized as a Book of Enoch until 1892. They didn't realize that it was different from the other Enoch.

They thought it was just the same one, but it's the Old Slavonic one. It was in 1896 that Morfill first made a translation of it. That's when it first came out. It was Charles himself who first suspected in 1892 it might be the Book of Enoch. The manuscript was discovered in 1857 among manuscripts never connected with Enoch in Petersburg. So this is in Old Slavonic. Well, what's Old Slavonic got to do with it? This is actually the oldest and best Enoch until we discovered the Hebrew ones. This is one of the Palaia texts. That means the old texts. This is ninth or tenth century. Well, what happened in the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries? Most of the pilgrimages to Jerusalem came from Slavic lands. By Old Slavonic we mean southern Yugoslavia (Macedonian, that's what it is). It reads very much like Russian. We have texts of it here. I have a Xerox of it in various manuscripts published by Vaillant. They would take their pilgrimages, and pious monks would go from monasteries in Slavic speaking lands to the Holy Land and spend some time there. In the monasteries they would make copies of these texts. They translated them into Slavonic down there. They didn't bring the ancient copies back. They stayed there sometimes for years and translated them and brought these translations home. But the documents they had access to were very old. They were older than any of the others. That's why the Old Slavonic is very reliable. Matthew Black said, "Yes, but the trouble with Joseph Smith; of course, he has these, but he has too much of the Old Slavonic there." Just a couple of weeks after that came some articles out showing the Old Slavonic was by far the oldest and best text. But that was before something else happened. So this is the Old Slavonic. This is in that R.H. Charles *Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. It's translated there by Morfill who made the first and only translation in 1896.

When Richard Laurence's came out, as I say, nobody paid any attention to it. The 1838 edition, which was eight years after our Book of Enoch, was the only one that got any attention. The 1840 edition (it was quite different; it had much more to it and read different) was finally read by lots of people in this country. Michael Stuart, who was the head of the Andover Seminary (the big shot) said, Yes, it's fascinating; it's a great work, but it's trash. All Christians should be warned away from it. The ministry wouldn't pay any attention. So nobody paid any attention to it at all, except one person. It got a very good review in the *Millennial Star* by Parley P. Pratt in 1840. He was the first one to recognize the Book of Enoch as a valuable work. As far as he was concerned, he didn't recognize it as shedding any light on Joseph Smith's Enoch at all. He recognized it as confirming the Book of Mormon. There were so many things in it parallel to the Book of Mormon. But there it was recognized in the same year. Michael Stuart wrote his review in 1840, very much impressed but very much against. Parley P. Pratt wrote his review in the *Millennial Star* in England in 1840, very much impressed and very much for it. So we have **2 Enoch**.

Third Enoch is the Greek Enoch. As I say, way back in the seventeenth century, Scaliger found a Byzantine copy of it. But it wasn't until 1886-87 that the Gizeh fragment was discovered (I have a copy of that). The French excavating at Gizeh (the great pyramid) discovered a Greek text which they thought went back to the eighth century. Now it's known it goes back to the sixth century. So now we are getting older and older. This contains things

|p10

just as they are there, but also a lot more. It's more specific, more convincing. It doesn't have so much nonsense in it. These texts as they get older and older get better and better. The Greek text is very good, the Gizeh one. Then in 1930, Chester Beatty. He's an important person because he was an Irishman who made all his money in Bingham copper over here. He used it for a great museum. The greatest collection of documents, really parchments, in the world are in this special museum in Dublin. He built the museum in Dublin with his money from Utah copper. Among these documents is a very valuable text of Enoch which went back to the fourth century. Then in the next year, in 1931, Sir Frederick Kenyon was visiting the University of Michigan where they have a big Coptic collection (the only big one in the United States at that time). In 1931 he discovered the other half of it, so they put them together; and they have a pretty good **Book of Enoch** here going back to the fourth century (the Kenyon and Chester Beatty papyri). We have a very good copy of it reproduced with perfect photographic verity (same size, color, everything). You might just as well have the documents in front of you. We have the big Chester Beatty collection here, and it's a good thing to have.

So now we're back to the fourth century. Then the important one, which isn't numbered. A long Hebrew text by Odeberg got out in 1927. R. H. Charles permitted Odeberg to call this 3 Enoch, which is a Hebrew Enoch. But it was back in the 50s, in 1853, Adolf Jellinek, who was a Belgian Jewish scholar, suspected that the original Enoch was Hebrew, was a Jewish Enoch. He thought they could find the original, and it would probably be much older when they found it. He looked and looked for it. He edited that great work, the **Bet Ha-Midrash**, collecting all these old stories. He kept searching, and then in 1859 he found a big chunk of it. He found what had been going under the name of the **Book of the Hechalot** which means the chambers or rooms of the temple which represent the various degrees of progress that one made in going through the ordinances. **Hechal** is the temple or shrine. **Hechalot** is the plural of it. So we have the Hebrew Enoch. He began to discover it, and then by 1879 he discovered the whole thing. Incidentally, the dates of these Hebrew ones are from the eighteenth century on down. But the big discovery came later. Let's see, what other Hebrew versions do we have? I think 1927 is the big one. It's funny, most of the scholars who studied all these things never heard of the great manuscript that Hugo Odeberg got out in 1927. Third Enoch; it's a marvelous work, and it's all in Hebrew. But then comes the big one in 1952 with the Dead Sea Scrolls in the caves. In the first cave there was an Enoch. There was a 1Q Enoch, which came out at an early time, and then the big one, the 4Q Enoch, and 4Q Enoch Astr. That means the Enoch text from the first cave. This is the Enoch text from the fourth cave, and this is the Enoch astronomical text from the fourth cave. They were all handed over to Father J. T. Milik (who lives in Jerusalem) by the Rockefeller Foundation. When these were found, they were to be studied. They were divided up among various schools and committees, etc. He got the Enoch book. He kept it for 27 years without letting anyone look at it. It finally came out in 1976. For example, when I was writing this series, it was absolutely unavailable.

In 1976 Father Joseph Fitzmyer was here and gave a course during the summer school in Aramaic. This writing is in Aramaic, and of course, his fellow Jesuit, Father Milik, would

!p11

gladly let him see it. "Oh no," he said. Anytime he asked for it, he would hide it under his coat. He wouldn't let anybody see it. For 27 years it was kept out of circulation. Then after I had finished this series, the last day they finally published it. In 1977 it was published by Oxford, and the English was done by Matthew Black. Father Milik and Matthew Black worked together on it. Matthew Black came here the week it came out. He sent me a letter before he came and said, "Is there anything you would like me to discuss about Enoch when I get there." I said, "Yes, the story of Mahujah and Mahijah."

Oh, incidentally, we've got to talk about this thing, what it is. This dates from the third century B.C. Now, we are really back there. We're not in the fourth century A.D. anymore. We are in the third century B.C., and it's in Aramaic. It's the oldest and the best and has all sorts of stories. Well, now this is really something. The one that interested me here was this one about Mahujah and Mahijah. How come Joseph Smith knew the story about Mahujah and Mahijah? That's a story you find in none of the others. None of them mention it. But it is told here, and here it is told by Joseph Smith. Let's just mention it briefly here from the last of the series (August 1977). Father Milik, the Enoch Text from Cave Four. All scholars working on it have eagerly waited during the last quarter century to see what new information would be added, what theories might be toppled, what hypotheses, etc. Now here's what they finally show, but this didn't come out until the last of this series. They cut the series short in righteousness. It was really going to get good, but certain people didn't like it. They got a new person in there that knew not Israel.

Here is the story. What has always impressed me as the oddest detail of the Joseph Smith account of Enoch was the appearance out of the blue of the name of the only non-biblical individual named in the whole book, and that's Mahijah (Moses 6:40). Mahijah was the one who asked Enoch the searching questions. Well, this is what happens. (We are near to it anyway. It's just an example.) There came a man to him whose name; see, everybody is scared to death. Let's go before it, Moses 6:36. This is a marvelous picture we get of Enoch. He's a mysterious character, and in all the Enoch literature this is the way he comes across. ". . . from thenceforth came the saying abroad in the land: A seer hath the Lord raised up unto his people. And it came to pass that Enoch went forth . . . standing upon the hills and the high places [remember the righteous are always associated with the high places; they have to come up to see him, and they do] and cried with a loud voice, testifying against their works; and all men were offended because of him. And they came forth to hear him upon the high places, saying unto the tent-keepers: [you stay down here, and we will go up and listen to him] Tarry ye here and keep the tents, while we go yonder to behold the seer, for he prophesieth, and there is a strange thing in the land; a wild man hath come among us." Now here's the story we get from here, and it is never mentioned in any of these. ". . . for fear came upon all them that heard him; for he walked with God. And there came a man unto him whose name was Mahijah, and he said unto him: Tell us plainly who thou art and from whence thou comest. And he said unto them: I came from the land of Cainan, the land of my fathers, a land of righteousness unto this day [they had retained their righteous condition unto this day]. And my father taught me

|p12

in all the ways of God. And it came to pass as I journeyed from the land of Cainan by the sea east, I beheld a vision; . . . " He goes on, and then he talks about the book and says "why counsel ye yourselves and deny the God of heaven? . . . And death hath come upon our fathers; nevertheless, we know them and cannot deny, and even the first of all we know [because of this book], even Adam. For a book of remembrance we have written among us, according to the pattern given by the finger of God; . . ." Then he read to them from the book and they were ashamed. They couldn't face him when he read to them from the book and couldn't stand in his presence.

Well, I just had time for this concluding article, which they would allow only two pages for, to match these up. From Moses 6:39: "And it came to pass when they heard him, no man laid hands on him; for fear came on all them that heard him; for he walked with God." From **4QEnoch**: "Thereupon all the giants and the nephilim took fright [when they heard about Enoch]." Joseph Smith: "And there came a man unto him whose name was Mahijah, and said unto him: Tell us plainly who thou art and from whence thou comest?" **4QEnoch**: "And they summoned Mahujah [Mahijah; it's written both ways] and he came to them. And the giants asked him and sent him to Enoch, saying to him: Go then and under pain of death you must listen to his voice; and tell him that he is to explain to you and to interpret the dreams. [Tell them exactly who you are. He comes to them, and he said unto them, Tell us plainly who comest.]." They are scared; they don't know who Enoch is, so they force Mahijah to go and ask who they really are. He's scared and he doesn't want to do that. The principal giant is Ohyah; he's the head of them. Ohyah said to Mahijah: "And I do not tremble. Who showed you all these things? Why do you tell us this?" And Mahijah said, "Baraq'el, my father, was with me." That Baraq'el is interesting too because Baraq'el is supposed to have been the father of Enoch. That's the name Enoch goes by in the Doctrine and Covenants. Joseph Smith is called Enoch or Baraq'el. A professor in Hebrew at the University of Utah said, "Well, Joseph Smith didn't understand the word **barak** meaning 'to bless.'" But **Baraq'el** means the "lightning of God." That was one of the names that Enoch bore. The Doctrine and Covenants is right on target in that, and this confirms it, that he is called Baraq'el here.

Anyway, he said to them (Moses 6:41), "I came out of the land Cainan, the land of my fathers, a land of righteousness unto this day." In **4QEnoch** here Ohyah comes and following him Mahujah comes and reports to the people that sent him and says, "My accusers, they dwell in the heavens; they live in holy places, and they are more powerful than we." So again Enoch says, I come from a land of righteousness to this day. And his answer is, They dwell in holy places, and there is nothing much we can do about them. And then Enoch tells the story: And as I journeyed by the sea east, I beheld a vision: and lo, the heavens I saw. As I was journeying, I went up on the mount and beheld the heavens open. **4QEnoch**: "Mahujah rose up in the air like a whirlwind, and he flew and crossed Solitude, the great desert. And he caught sight of Enoch, and he called to him and said to him: An oracle * * * [it breaks off]." And Enoch said, "We cannot deny . . . for a book of remembrance we have written among us, according to the pattern given by the finger of God and it is given in our own language."

|p13

4QEnoch: "Unto you, Mahijah the two tablets * * * and the second has never been read up until now. It is the sacred book of * * *. The copy of the second tablet of the Epistle written by Enoch, the distinguished scribe, with his own hands." Remember, written by the finger of God. It says according to the pattern given by the finger of God. The finger of God didn't write it. Enoch said he wrote it according to the pattern given by the finger of God in our own language. And here it says, "Written by Enoch, the distinguished scribe, in his own hand, and the Holy One, to Shemihazah and all his companions." The record is sent from the Holy One (that's from God) to Shemihazah. Then it goes on, "And as Enoch spake forth the words of God, the people trembled, and could not stand in his presence." This one says: "Ohyah said to Hahyah, his brother * * * [the two leading giants] they were struck with fear and prostrated themselves and began to weep before Enoch." Here Enoch says, "Loosen yourselves from your bonds of sin. Repent from the sin that ties you up and begin to pray." Then the giants come to battle against Enoch.

The Joseph Smith version says, "Enoch led the people of God, and their enemies came to battle against them; and he spake the word of the Lord, and the earth trembled, . . ." And this one says, "(Ohyah the enemy of Enoch): ' . . . by the strength of my power, I had attacked all flesh and I have made war with them . . ." This is the leader of the hosts saying, "They live in holy abodes, and they are more powerful than I." Then the next verse is interesting: ". . . and the roar of lions was heard out of the wilderness; and all nations feared greatly, . . ." **4QEnoch** says, "And the roaring of wild beasts came, and the multitude of wild animals began to cry out. And Ohyah spoke. . . 'My dream has overwhelmed me and sleep has left my eyes.'" They even have the animals howling out of the wilderness here. "The roar of lions was heard out of the wilderness." It sounds so incongruous, so odd, there. Incidentally, this isn't my translation I've been following. I have been using Milik's translation.

As I said, Matthew Black was coming. He had just got this work out. I said, "How about this? Joseph Smith has this story, and nobody else has it. Where did he get it from?" He wouldn't talk about it (absolutely nothing). When he came from the airport, he had it in his pocket. He said, "Here's your letter here."

I said, "All right, how about Mahijah and Mahujah?" Nothing. I had one four-hour conversation with him, and he never let out a peep about it. That's when we went to a concert together. But he did let this out. Walking along, he said, "Well, someday we will find out the source that Joseph Smith used. Someday we'll find it; we'll find it, don't worry."

Well, just what are the chances of Joseph Smith (living in Kirtland, Ohio, in 1830) getting hold of any of these sources or anything else? Of course, none of this was there. But when you get things like this, they are awfully hard to explain. It is really quite remarkable.

PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 22

We're just going to go through without drawing the comparisons with the documents. We mentioned them before. Almost every point we mention is recalled in the newly discovered documents. So we will begin with Moses 6:22 where we learn that visions and visitations are rare. Adam conversed with God himself, but he was rare. Those who followed him, no; they were preachers of righteousness. So the visitations don't happen to everybody. Joseph Smith, but since then nobody has had anything like that, and nobody is supposed to. You notice in the next verse, there were preachers of righteousness, and they called upon all everywhere to repent and have faith. And what do they teach here? Faith, repentance and baptism—the same old gospel way back in the days of Enoch. And Enoch is one of them. (He's the prize as a matter of fact.) He goes about, like the rest, preaching. "And it came to pass that Enoch journeyed in the land, . . ." When he was 65 years old, he begat Methuselah. He journeyed in the land among the people, and while he was journeying, he received his call. He's going to have a special call. He is going to be the number one missionary. He heard the voice from heaven saying, Tell these people to repent, "my fierce anger is kindled against them; . . ." Now, this is a typical prophetic calling too, isn't it. It reads like any of the major or minor prophets. "I am angry with this people, and my fierce anger is kindled against them; for their hearts have waxed hard, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes cannot see afar off." The theme is apocalyptic in all of these.

Do you realize that up until the 1930s the word **eschatology** wasn't even found in the dictionary? They didn't believe there was any eschatology in the Bible. Up until 1960 they denied that there was any apocalyptic writing at all in the Bible (amazing). Then suddenly they discovered that the whole thing is apocalyptic. All our scriptures here are apocalyptic. That means they are brought forth by times of pressure and crisis. They always come on the eve of great destructions. That's why they are given to us. Read the first section of the Doctrine and Covenants: Harken ye people of the earth. Therefore, ye people, fear and tremble. That's the theme. In the verse 7 of the first chapter, "Wherefore, fear and tremble, O ye people, . . ." This is the message because these things always come when they are badly needed, when the world has been going the wrong way for a long time, and it is time to set things right again. But it is always accompanied by violent upheavals of nature and world upheavals (political, international, everything else). We are going to get a lot of that here. We see it in the days of Adam, and now we see it in the days of Enoch. This gets quite lively. You notice here, the fierce anger is kindled.

From 27 following, I just noted some things here to be able to do it more rapidly. The difference is that people are following their system. He says, they are not following the system I gave them. I gave them a plan. I gave them instructions. They pay no attention to it. They

|p2

think they know better, and they are doing it their way. This is the constant theme in all this Enoch literature we put on the board the last time. That's one of the great crimes. The classic theme that comes in here (it usually comes a little later) is the **Watchers**. They had this crash program that begins here when Satan had great dominion and the gospel began to be preached. Holy angels were sent forth from the presence of God, and by his own voice and the gift of the Holy Ghost and his prophets. In this crash program they sent down angels to preach and put the people right. Now this is a tradition that you will find spread everywhere, including in non-Jewish sources, at a very early time. These were the Watchers, the **agregoroi**. They came down to observe and then went back to report as to how things were going. They came down to instruct the human race and put them back on the plan of the gospel again, but many of them (200 of them according to tradition) fell away, were tempted by the daughters of men, joined with them, and sinned terribly (these were the terrible Watchers). They knew too much, and that made them very dangerous. The Watchers are responsible for a lot of trouble here. You are going to run into them all the time. We are told that they came down on the top of Mt. Hermon, the highest mountain in Palestine, which means the "mountain of the oath." Two hundred of them came down there and took their oaths and covenants. They gave away the rites of the temple, and they perverted them. The whole thing is a rite of perversion. They had all the same things, but they perverted them and claimed that they were being holy, that they had the priesthood, that they had the covenants. This was their great crime, of course, that they perverted the real thing. Fortunately, we are told they didn't have enough knowledge. Their knowledge was limited, so they weren't able to destroy everything. "They knew not the mind of God," as we are told in this book. So their system was not the system God gave Adam.

This is typical. You will find this in many verses in this old Enoch stuff we mentioned. This verse 28 here: They have "sought their own counsels in the dark; and in their own abominations have they devised murder, and have not kept the commandments, which I gave unto their father, Adam." Cain did all this and kept it secret so that Adam wouldn't find out that he was copying and corrupting the whole thing. So here it comes out again. They did not keep the commandments I gave Adam, but they put their own version, their own counsel, and devised their own abominations and murders. "Wherefore, they have foresworn themselves, [they have the oaths] and, by their oaths, . . ." In Moses 5:29 we read about the oaths they made to each other. "And Satan said unto Cain: Swear unto me by thy throat, and if thou tell it thou shalt die; . . ." By their oaths they have foresworn themselves. They were false oaths. ". . . they have brought upon themselves death; and a hell I have prepared for them, if they repent not [and this is a decree which has gone out of my own mouth]."

Enoch is called to go out and announce this gloomy message, and he doesn't want to. He's scared stiff. He says, I am slow of speech, I am but a lad, and all the people hate me. He's not a very good candidate for the mission field, you see. Why does he call himself a lad? This is a striking thing. It says when he was 65 years old he begot Methuselah. This was the time he got his call. This is a very interesting thing. In these early documents he's always called the **na'ar**, which means the "lad." The doctors of the Jews speculated way back in the early

|p3

time in the **Mishna**. Was it because he was younger than other people he went to preach to? Or in terms of age of his time (after all if he begot Methuselah who was supposed to have lived 963 years), then he was indeed a lad at the age of 65. There are various explanations, but nobody knows why. The interesting thing is that Joseph Smith has caught it here. It has only emerged not long ago that the stock name that was given to Enoch anciently (his mystery name) was "the lad" (the **na'ar**). Why, we don't know. That's not in the Bible. You won't find it there, or in any normal Jewish writings. So there is the lad here, and what is he going to do? The Lord will say, Well, I'll give you exactly what you are supposed to say. Filling his mouth; that is a common theme too. He actually puts the statement in his mouth. We have some striking parallels here which we are not going into. Enoch is to place the two ways before the people, of course. In verse 32 here: ". . . I have commanded thee, and no man shall pierce thee. . . . [he thought he wouldn't last very long, and he wouldn't if the Lord didn't protect him]. Open thy mouth, and it shall be filled, and I will give thee utterance, . . . I will do as seemeth me good [I will be in charge and I will take over the whole thing. Just trust me and do what you are told]. Say unto this people: Choose ye this day, to serve the Lord God who made you."

He places the two ways before them, and he does this again. Remember, we have two ways. This is the doctrine of the early church. After the third century we don't have the doctrine. The two ways are the ways of the dark and light, the way of righteousness and wickedness; namely, our party versus your party. That's all it is. If you belong to a particular faction, then you are in the way of light. If you belong to the other one, then you are in the way of darkness. Well, of course, that isn't the way it is at all. Every day, every moment of the day, everyone has to make that choice. This is why we are here being tested. The choice you make will determine what you will be hereafter. But no matter how far you have gone, no matter how many wrong choices you have made, there's always the best choice. There's always the better choice. So this is the doctrine of the two ways, and it is very ancient. And you can't compromise on them. This is the interesting thing. We try to do that today. But as Heraclitus, the greatest of the Greek philosophers, said long ago, "The up road and the down road are the same road." The only difference is you're facing the opposite direction. That's why you can't compromise. It's the same road. It depends on which direction you are facing. That's the road you are on. We are all on the same road, and you are going either up or down. I think we mentioned that before.

Nature behaves here as in the exodus. I mentioned before that all the great scriptures come in these times of crisis, and the natural upheavals go along with it. There's a long period of bad times (and there have been such bad times). It's a very important thing to note. I could recommend something like Claude Schaeffer, a Frenchman who got together a huge manual (thousands of pages) in which he compares all the archaeological work in the Near East and Europe up until around 1947. Those periods still stand. There's a brand new work out by Herbert Schutz just covering the European area, and the same things emerge. At a particular time all hell breaks loose, and the whole world is uprooted. Everybody gets hit. There's no

security anywhere for anybody. That happened around 3,000 and 2,200 B.C. It happened again in 1,700 B.C. It happened in the seventh and eighth centuries B.C. It happened with the barbarian invasion and the fall of the Roman Empire in the fifth century A.D. And so it goes. In the year 1,000 A.D., that terrible time. We mentioned that meteorites may be responsible for it (there's the iridium layer). There's that break at 35,000 B.C. when you have a totally new humanity and everything else changes. But these things do take place. That's what I want to point out. It isn't a steady, gradual evolution. That was the Victorian obsession that everything had to be slow, safe, comfortable, easy, by minute variations; imperceptibly the race irresistibly improved. That's not the way it has been at all. Sometimes with these crashes they collapsed completely and had to start climbing all over again. This has happened numbers of times, when they lost far greater civilizations than they were able to get back again for at least a thousand years. But Enoch is going to be active in this. These are miracles. ". . . wherefore all thy words will I justify; and the mountains shall flee before you, and the rivers shall turn from their course [as they did for Moses]; . . ." Again, it's a matter of timing. The Lord knows those things are going to happen, and the situation is properly set up. Of course, it happens that way. There's nothing unnatural about it. "And the Lord spake unto Enoch, . . ." Now we see that he is a seer. He saw out of this.

We are in a closed, confined situation and system. We don't see very much. We are closed on all sides. We are very much aware of that. We're getting less aware of that. There are a lot of documentaries on TV showing breakouts in all directions now where people have discovered (to use Moses's language) "which thing I never had supposed." I mean these visits to the satellites of various planets (absolutely staggering). Nobody dreamed there would be anything discovered in Uranus. They discovered more with that unmanned spacecraft on the same day as the tragic blowup of the Challenger than all the other 25 manned space flights put together had ever discovered. What do they do? They just fly around the earth; that's all. They took good pictures of the earth, but you can do that with an unmanned satellite. Russians go up and dig samples from the moon and bring them back, dig samples from Mars and bring them back. You can do that. Well, that is nothing to do with this. But the point is he looks out and sees something very different. It isn't the way we think it is at all. Moses 6:35 ". . . Anoint thine eyes with clay, and wash them, and thou shalt see. And he did so. And he beheld the spirits that God had created; and he beheld also things which were not visible to the natural eye; and from thenceforth came the saying abroad in the land: A seer hath the Lord raised up unto his people." A seer is a **piqeahk**, a visionary man who sees things that other people don't see, which are real. That was Lehi. His sons made fun of him, remember. They said, "Our father is a visionary man," because he saw things they couldn't see. Well, that's what a **piqeahk** is, and we got those in the Old Testament very rarely. Elisha and Elijah are examples.

So he goes out and preaches, and all men are offended because he doesn't bring good news. Remember what the people say to Samuel the Lamanite, Tell us what's right with Zarahemla; don't tell us what's wrong with Zarahemla. Samuel the Lamanite said, When a person comes

|p5

and tells you how wonderful you are, you clothe him in fine apparel; you carry him on your shoulders and say he is a true prophet. If he tells you your sins, you immediately cry out, kill him; he's a false prophet. This is the situation here. Nobody likes him at all. Notice: ". . . standing upon the hills and the high places, and cried with a loud voice, testifying against their works; and all men were offended because of him." Nobody liked his very negative record. Why? Because he testified against their works. He didn't support what they were doing. He testified against them (just too negative for words). And so they tried to pass him off as a nut here in verse 38. "And they came forth to hear him, upon high places saying unto the tent-keepers, [this is something; you've got to see this] Tarry ye here and keep the tents, [notice, they are living in the plain, and they go up always to the higher ground where Enoch is moving and preaching] while we go yonder to behold the seer, for he prophesieth, and there is a strange thing in the land; a wild man hath come among us." They are not going to take him very seriously. But when they listened (in verse 39), they stopped laughing. ". . . no man laid hands on him; [they didn't dare] for fear came on all them that heard him; for he walked with God." That's the passage in Genesis 5:21-24. We are only given three or four verses in the Bible about Enoch, and that's all. We don't have any Book of Enoch in the Bible. This is one of them: "He walked with God." But fear came on them, and they didn't touch him. Now this is the story we talked about last time, the Mahujah-Mahijah story of **4QEnoch** from the Dead Sea Scroll text discovered in 1952 (we won't repeat that now). But notice in verse 41 he says, "I came out from the land of Cainan [my fathers are still righteous there. That's where I came from, and I'm coming to you]."

Then he tells them how he happened to get his calling. He told us before that as he was going through the land, he received a call. Here he gives his testimony and tells the people how it happened. Moses 6:42 "And it came to pass, as I journeyed from the land of Cainan, by the sea east, I beheld a vision; . . ." We have three or four early Enoch texts (the Gizeh text is the best), and he says, "As I journeyed by the sea east, I was going upon the hills. I fell asleep, and I received a vision." The same story that he tells here. They even bother to mention that it was by the sea east. One of them says by the sea west, so they say, "Well, that's a lot of nonsense." But remember, if these things were word for word perfect, you could be very suspicious of them. These documents were handed around for hundreds and hundreds of years. They are copied and are full of mistakes. The fact that so much has held together is really quite remarkable. They certainly confirm Joseph Smith here. This from the Gizeh fragment: "By the sea east I beheld a vision." He saw the heavens opened. He saw the Lord, and the Lord spoke to him and commanded him. "That's why I am preaching to you now," he says. This is the call referred to just before. Then Enoch continued his speech, Why don't you listen to God? Why do you counsel among yourselves? he says here. Now this is it. As the scripture says, "How can they believe who receive honor from one another?" If we form a committee; if we get our strength from each other; if we support each other and form a society (a very impressive order or group) then we think we are getting something accomplished and doing something simply by counseling among ourselves. No, you get your counsel directly from the Lord. You do not have to go through channels. This is the important thing. "Therefore, thou

|p6

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 forever more." Here he says, Why do you counsel yourselves?

A great deal is made in these other writings about the secret societies they formed, how they worked together, how one group would fight another. There were various factions, all very secret, all making exalted claims. This sort of thing spread, as it said, among all the children of men from the days of Lamech. Then he says here, Past generations have disappeared, it's true; but you are still responsible for the message because we have that book. Moses 6:45: "We cannot deny and even the first of all we know, even Adam. For a book of remembrance we have written among us, [remember the book that is open in Genesis 5:1; not written by the finger of God, but] according to the pattern given by the finger of God; . . ." God taught men how to write. That's a very interesting thing now. We get something like the Tartaria alphabet which goes back to 7500 B.C. maybe. They were writing beautiful alphabetic writing then, according to some people. It is very interesting.

There is a brand new book out by Alexander Thom and his wife. He is the man who has made more study of the prehistoric, megalithic monuments of Brittany and England than anybody else. He's a mathematician and an engineer. He found out a lot of very interesting things which are now widely accepted. He is absolutely certain they must have had writing. They conveyed ideas in writing. He's finding signs, but nobody can read it or make it out. They had writing given to them. (We have this book written "according to the pattern given by the finger of God." You have it in your own language, so there is no excuse here.) When he read the book to them (now this is the thing we read in the Dead Sea Scrolls version, in the Qumran Enoch) they were ashamed and couldn't raise their eyes or look at him. They couldn't raise their heads up or look at Enoch because they were so overcome by the power of Enoch when he read to them from the book. Here it says, "And as Enoch spake forth the words of God [he had just mentioned the book, and he said, you can't deny it; here it is written], the people trembled, and could not stand in his presence." This matches the Qumran Enoch, the third century B.C. Aramaic Enoch, where it says, "They couldn't raise their heads or look at him when he read the book to them." And then he begins to tell them what the situation is. Here is the big problem in Moses 6:48. Here's the situation, he says. We are here and we are going nowhere, and we are faced with death, which means misery and woe for all of us.

We look before and after, (Shelley, "To a Skylark")
And pine for what is not,
Our sincerest laughter
With some pain is fraught;
Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought.

We can never be really happy. There is always that pain, always the thorn there because we are never sure where we stand, and it looks pretty bad. We know what we all have to look forward to. So we live in misery and woe, he says. If that's our nature, we are finished.

|p7

I've got to get the Book of Mormon out here because, as Nephi tells us, this is a passage very much worth paying attention to. It's the Second Law of Thermodynamics, entropy. It goes on. That's the one that's really working, as we are told in 2 Nephi. If nothing was interfering with that, it would be the course of nature. Second Nephi 9:7: "Wherefore, it must needs be an infinite atonement [something that can overcome all opposition]—save it should be an infinite atonement [if there was any way of breaking that down, if this wasn't all powerful, if we didn't have the key to the whole thing, then what would happen?] this corruption could not put on incorruption. . . ." As we know, the second law is a one-way passage. The heat death: heat always moves from a warmer to a colder body, never never in the opposite direction. So things are always all running down to an indiscriminate heap of ash in the end. Everything is going to run down, and that is entropy. Everything is just winding down and stopping. That's the law we cannot escape. He says, that's the normal law. Of course, the great mystery today is why we are here at all if that's the case. It has been going on a long time. But "this corruption could not put on incorruption. Wherefore, the first judgment which came upon man must needs have remained to an endless duration. And if so, this flesh must have laid down to rot [this is the normal course of things] and to crumble to its mother earth, to rise no more." See, by the course of nature, by the laws and everything else, that is the way things should happen. It is that. We would lie down, rot, crumble to earth and rise no more. To rise again takes a bit of doing, but he says, that's been done; that's been taken care of. That's where the infinite Atonement comes in. Something is working against entropy, and this is the thing that a lot of people point out today. It's a very puzzling thing. As it is, we had a nice chance here. Adam fell, and we are made partakers of misery and woe. Satan came and plunged us into this sewer of misery. Until we get out of here, we are in trouble. All our chances went with that. Moses 6:49: "Behold Satan hath come among the children of men, and tempteth them to worship him, and men have become carnal, sensual, and devilish, and are shut out from the presence of God." That is the ultimate exclusion. We are finished if this hadn't happened. Now comes the good news, the gospel. We had that earlier when it was preached to Adam and Eve. God will take you back, if.

Moses 6:51-68 is an excerpt quoted from the Book of Adam. This is another book. See, Joseph Smith has given adequate excerpts for testing from every major dispensation. He has given us what purport to be excerpts from the original founder (from the headquarters). Here in verses 51-68 is the Book of Adam. And we say we have discovered a lot of Enoch literature. We have discovered even more Adam literature. Remember, Adam was out entirely because his sins brought death into the world and all our woes. They hated Adam because of his terrible blunders and the like. He was the great sinner, but it has all changed now. People were willing (since they didn't believe anything anymore) to start taking a look at the old Adam literature. It's as rich as the Enoch literature. It's even richer. There are marvelous things. I'm reading it now just for fun because I got looking into it the other day. I've already read it. They used to read Tolkien's series because that was romantic, exciting and far away. This is much better, much more exciting, much more ingenious, much more original. You should read this stuff; it's great. But anyway this Adam literature has a lot of controls in it. This verse 52 here points out

|p8

the immense gulf between those who have arrived on the other side, either one side of the gulf or the other. It's the unbridgable gulf between them. The road goes in opposite directions. You cannot compromise on it. Notice, this verse 52 gives you an idea of what is there. If you will repent and be baptized "in the name of mine Only Begotten Son, who is full of grace and truth . . . ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, asking all things in his name, and whatsoever ye shall ask, it shall be given you." This is a state of existence we can't even conceive of now. He says you're not going to get to it yet. It makes a very interesting remark on that. Then Adam asks the rational question, What's baptism got to do with it? Why do we have to be baptized with water? The answer is: I've forgiven the cause. Now, you have to get rid of the effect. The cause was the Fall. It made you dirty, but you have to wash off now. You have to take advantage in good faith of the sacrifice that has been made for you. Here's the chance. It's a very simple thing to do, but you have to do it. Why is it that man must repent and be baptized? Not because you are damned but because I have forgiven you, he says. I have forgiven you. I have taken care of the transgression in the Garden of Eden. That's the **Erbsunde**, the primal sin. To think we are not responsible for that and, therefore, we are not to blame for our sins is ridiculous. That sin has been forgiven, so if you want to go on what you do then is wash off and get started again. He says here, ". . . The Son of God hath atoned for original guilt, wherein the sins of the parents cannot be answered upon the heads of the children, for they are whole from the foundation of the world." But ". . . when they begin to grow up, sin conceiveth in their hearts, . . ."

None of us avoid it, so as a result the baptism is a very important thing here. Until you repent, you are continuing in sin. You are not out of it if you don't repent. Obviously, you haven't repented; you haven't changed, so you are still sinning. This is the appeal of verse 53 to accept the Atonement. Deny not the gifts; this is the theme the Book of Mormon ends on. It's all given to you. Deny not the gifts. Don't refuse the gifts of God whatever you do. That's the most foolish thing you can do, and we do it. So accept the Atonement and deny not the gifts. You can't escape it. In verse 55 here, sin has a bitter aftertaste. Then a strange thing in this verse: How does sin teach you to prize the good? Does sickness teach you to prize health? Well, it certainly does. The angels recognize what is good, but they don't really know how to prize it, what it's really worth, because they have never had a chance. They have never been in sin. As Tertullian says, "The angels envy man his ability to repent because they don't have to." This is really something to have that. They recognize the good. Of course, they know it; they live in it. But they don't prize it. They don't realize its full value. You don't know what it's really worth unless you have sinned and been redeemed. But it isn't for that reason. As John Chrysostom says, you are under obligation to sin as much as you possibly can to give God the greatest possible chance to forgive you. If you don't sin all the way, you have denied God his divine office of forgiveness, and you have curtailed and frustrated his desire to forgive you. So do everything you can, and give him a chance to forgive you, he says. But this says, no, that isn't the way you have to do it at all. It's not necessary to plumb the depths. Notice verse 56: "And it is given unto them to know good from evil," on sight (you know that). And as 2 Nephi in the Book of Mormon tells us, with a perfect knowledge you know what is good and

bad. You have that reaction. Remember, "I will place enmity between thee and the serpent (that gut reaction when something is wrong)." You know what it is. You can't excuse yourself. Therefore, men are without excuse. He says, They know with a perfect knowledge as night from day; all of them do. You don't have to be a member of the Church or anything else to know that.

And again the gap in verse 57: All men must repent for no unclean thing can dwell there. An unclean thing is completely out. Remember, one defect (the slightest defect) in a structure that's to last for an infinite length of time will destroy it. No matter how trifling it is, if it is to last for thousands and millions of years, that will be a fatal defect. So you have to be completely cleaned up if you are going back to the presence of the Father. There can't be any sin or defilement in you. No unclean thing can stand in his presence. Well, you can understand that. In the process of time, that would foul up everything because it is all infectious. Notice, this is the separation. He says, none of that, "for no unclean thing can dwell there or dwell in his presence; for, in the language of Adam, Man of Holiness is his name, and the name of his Only Begotten is the Son of Man, even Jesus Christ, a righteous Judge, who shall come in the meridian of time." He is holy; no unclean thing can possibly enter his presence. This is the gap again. What advantage do we have in this then? Teach these things to your children. Then in verse 59 there's a very interesting statement. The advantage in this world. What do you enjoy in this world in that case? As long as we are here, the way is open to repentance, and we need to repent. Nobody is safe, even on the other side. Remember, "He putteth no trust in his holy ones; his angels he chargeth with folly," as you read in Job. Notice the bottom of verse 59 here: ". . . that ye might be sanctified from all sin, and enjoy the words of eternal life in this world, . . ." You don't have eternal life here, but you enjoy the words of eternal life. "There's no end to my works or my words." And the words put you into the picture. They give us great satisfaction. That's the assurance; that's what we have to work on—the words of eternal life. And hereafter, "eternal life [itself] in the world to come, even immortal glory." You will get that when you get there, but you're not going to get it here. So don't expect it. But we do have the words of eternal life here. They have been given to us.

Then there's this statement about the blood and the water which has a rather mystical sound to us. The water is an easy act of obedience. We mentioned that before. By the water you keep the commandment. "I know not save the Lord has commanded me." That's your sacrifice. So you get baptized as an act of obedience. Then by the Spirit you are justified. That's the Holy Ghost. That's your state of mind. If you just go through the motions as obedience, that's the first necessary step here. The Spirit gives you the state of mind. Naturally, you enter into it—the understanding, the agreement without which any act would be utterly meaningless. You are not just being baptized as a bag of sand. You've got to be baptized physically, but then it goes beyond that to the spirit where you understand and are aware of what's going on. The Holy Ghost does that. He brings all things to your mind and all things to your remembrance. Then the last thing is ". . . and by the blood ye are sanctified." You can't sanctify yourself but by completely giving up life in this world, which means suffering death, which means the

|p10

shedding of blood. This is the end of earthly life, and people avoid and dread that more than anything else. That's why we find substitutes and the like. That's why we find proxies for the sacrifice. All through the Old Testament is that. So the shedding of blood is your final declaration that you are willing to give up this life for the other, and it is an act of faith. Now verse 61 tells you that it is the Holy Ghost that puts you into the scene, giving you complete awareness of what is going on. It's the Comforter, the peaceable things, and all these things it describes. There's a very important statement here in verse 63. Science today emphasizes the interconnectedness of all things. This is the principle that made Egyptian hard to understand until we realized that these things are all interchangeable. There's a wonderful passage in Santillana on this. The ancients believed we live in the midst of a great manifold in which everything reflects everything else. This is a beautiful expression of it.

It's very important to understand the vehicles in which these things are conveyed and the peculiar language. You notice that in these books of Enoch; remember, chapters six and seven are the Book of Enoch. But he is quoting the Book of Adam now. This is part of the Book of Adam. It is mainly this, that all things have their likeness. You can represent everything by everything else. ". . . and all things are created and made to bear record of me, both things which are temporal, and things which are spiritual [you can describe temporal things in spiritual terms and vice versa]; things which are in the heavens above, and things which are on the earth, . . ." The earth is a reflection of heaven, and heaven a reflection of the earth. We use the language of one to describe what's going on in the other time and again. We regard the temple here, as the ancients always did, as reflecting the heavenly pattern. As Murnane said in his recent book on the Egyptian temple, "The universe writ small." The temple is an observatory in which you take your bearings on the universe. These things are all related, all connected together. ". . . things which are in the heavens above, and things which are on the earth, and things which are in the earth, and things which are under the earth, both above and beneath: all things bear record of me." So don't be led astray by particular terms of language that are used and what they are relating to. It all connects up. It all ties up, and it all points back to this one thing.

Then in verse 64 we get the baptism of Adam. The main theme in all these Adam books is the baptism. It's strange. They have long stories to tell about Adam. They go on and on, but the big thing is always the baptism of Adam. Why was Adam baptized? Did you know Adam was baptized? Well, that's what this Adam literature tells us about. That's the main thing. You will find it in the R.H. Charles, the big volume, *Books of Adam and Eve*. How Adam and Eve get baptized; that's a very important thing. And that's what this is all coming to. Adam says, Why do I have to be baptized? The first step is to be baptized, and here is Adam's baptism in verse 64. He is caught up by the Spirit and laid down in the water. "And thus he was baptized, and the Spirit of God descended upon him, and thus he was born of the Spirit, and became quickened in the inner man. And he heard a voice out of heaven, saying: Thou art baptized with fire . . . after the order of him who was without beginning of days or end of years . . . thou art one in me, a son of God; and thus may all become my sons. Amen."

|p11

So we begin the next chapter with the theory that as many as believed have become sons of God. In the first verse of the next chapter, all who follow Adam's example are sons of God. That's more than a complimentary title. We saw Moses starting out saying, "I am a son of God; I am in the similitude of the Only Begotten." And what's the alternative to being sons of God? Again, lives of quiet desperation. You're going nowhere.

Then Enoch goes onto Mount Simeon. That's interesting; why should it be called Mount Simeon? (I'm sure Joseph Smith wouldn't know.) Because Simeon means "conversation." It means an "exchange of ideas." It's **shema**. It means "an audition, a hearing, attention, a place of preaching" (therefore, a place of conversation). He goes up onto the mountain. Remember, he is doing all this preaching on high places, and people go up to hear him. Here he is on Mount Simeon, which means the place of preaching or the place of exchange. He talks with God on this mountain face to face as Moses did on the other mountain. "Turn ye, and get ye upon the mount Simeon." I often wondered why bother about Mount Simeon? Why give it a name at all? It's obvious what's going to happen on Mount Simeon because that's where I'm going to meet you. And he went up and stood on the mount and beheld the heavens opened when he got there, and was clothed upon with glory in the same way that Moses was so he could stand in the presence of God. He sees him face to face. He said, "Look, and I will show unto thee the world for the space of many generations." He is now shown his mission field exactly as Moses was shown. This is ascension literature. A large section of the **Pyramid Texts**, for example, is taken up with ascension literature. There's a book by Widengren on the subject. Before the king can take over his throne, the king must go to heaven and see the field of his labors, which is shown him on a map, and receive his assignment. So here's Enoch again doing this. He describes the people of Shum and the people of Canaan.

Again, you will notice a very interesting archaic pattern here. You could ask the question, Now, wait a minute; he showed him for the space of many generations. When does this happen between Shum and Canaan? Is it past, present or future? It makes no difference. It's following a pattern. You can't figure out which one it is, but it makes no difference here. This is the vision of Shum and Canaan. Shum lives in the valley, we are told. And Canaan is a nomad who lives in tents. In the verse 7, the nomad is over in the valley in the immemorial fashion. That's the basis of Haushofer's *Geopolitik*, which was taken from Alfred MacKinder's *Geopolitics*. The basis of *Geopolitics* is the heartland. The nomads live on a marginal subsistence with the grass, and in the bad years they have to migrate. They go off in all directions to the peripheral civilizations. All the civilizations are peripheral—the Chinese, the Hindu, the Egyptian, the European, etc. They are all on the outside of this great shield which Alfred MacKinder, the Scottish geographer, called the "heartland." From that heartland come the periodic invasions that overrun and destroy the civilizations on the outside. Well, that's a long story. That's a whole course there; we don't go into that. But this is the pattern that's laid down here. The people of Shum live in the valleys. The nomads in their tents overrun them and destroy them utterly. Then in verse 7 what do the nomads do after that? What nomads always do.

|p12

They split up and start fighting each other. And only they, we are told, can survive in these fruitless lands because they live a marginal existence with their flocks and move on. There was a terrible situation. Much heat and barrenness in the land forever.

". . . There was a blackness came upon all the children of Canaan, that they were despised among all people." That's interesting again. The Arabs divide all societies into the **bait al-sha'ar** and the **bait al-hajar**. You live in the houses of stone or the houses of hair (that's goat's hair, the goat's hair tent). You are either **aswad** or **abyad**. If you live out in nature, as the Indians do, you get a swarthy, dark complexion, which they call "black." Then you're the black people. If you live in the houses and in the city on a delicate diet and keep out of the sun most of the time, then you are **abyad**. Then you are "white." This is the same pattern you find in the Book of Mormon. When the Nephites take up the Lamanite way of life, and vice versa, they change their general complexion and their culture. This is an interesting insight it gives into the early beginnings. There are a lot of recent new books that have come out on this very thing. We mentioned that one by Schutz, which is very good. It begins with the Willendorf figurine in 30,000 B.C. But this is the pattern you find all through there. And then he sees the seven lands of Enoch's mission, which very interestingly have names very much like the names of Hopi villages. We won't go into that either, but there's a story there anyway.

Then Enoch starts establishing the church among them. He starts baptizing them and organizing them. He calls upon them, they follow him, and he becomes their leader. In verse 13 he led the people of God, and they were attacked by their enemies who couldn't stand them. The enemies came to battle against them, not the other way around. ". . . he spake the word of the Lord [and notice the terrible times we are in], and the earth trembled, and the mountains fled even according to his command; and the rivers of water were turned out of their course [that's mentioned in a number of the ancient sources—the rivers of water being turned out of their courses; and we mentioned this the last time]; and the roar of lions was heard out of the wilderness; and all nations feared greatly, so powerful was the word of Enoch, and so great was the power of the language which God had given him."

Remember the two giants, Ohyah and Hahyah. When the beasts roared, they were petrified and fell down with fear. And also you notice plate tectonics are at work. The sea retreats and comes up, and all this volcanic stuff going along. "There also came up a land out of the depth of the sea . . ." And we are told again in numbers of sources, especially the Greek and Slavonic sources, that in Enoch's day (it was a great tradition) the sea retreated seven leagues and then came back again and drowned the land. But it retreated and new lands began to appear. It says, "There also came up a land out of the depth of the sea, and so great was the fear of the enemies of the people of God that they fled and stood afar off and went upon the land which came up out of the depth of the sea."

There's a very interesting legend about the island of Aegina which you see from Athens, which has Enoch's cloud over it when the weather is bad, etc. (all sorts of stories here we might get

|p13

hung up on). "And the giants of the land, also, stood afar off; . . ." Who were they? We are told when these Watchers came down and mingled with the daughters of men, what they begot were the giants. Well, there's mention of that in the Bible too. It doesn't mention the waters, but the sons of God and the daughters of men who produced a race of giants (there are such; again, we won't go into that). But when you go down into Montenegro every man is about seven feet tall. Kresimir Cosic looked small down there. That's where he went to draft basketball players because they are all enormous. Then you cross the border into Greece, and I walk down the street feeling very pleased with myself because I'm taller than almost anybody on the street. Now, these people would call the others giants. Alexander the Great fought a duel with Porus. The only way he could get at him was to get underneath his armor and punch him in the tummy. But Porus was about seven feet three and Alexander was about four feet six or seven. He was very short, and Porus was very tall. They had a duel and Alexander won, but Alexander always won. But you can see this idea of giants has that kind of reality. A giant is a relative thing, after all (we know what we are talking about here).

There was all this bloodshed. The people fight themselves as well. When nature is unstable and things become desperate, people start fighting each other. That is what happens here (these great upheavals, total uproar). There have been such times. And then in this the Saints are gathering. It's high time they were getting out of it, so they start pulling together. They start gathering together "blessed upon the mountains, and upon the high places." Notice that difference always between the high and the low places. "And the Lord called his people Zion, [I wonder what it meant then; of course, it means adornment, beauty, perfection] because they were of one heart and one mind, and dwelt in righteousness; and there was no poor among them." I've had students tell me that this absolutely proved that only the well-to-do were admitted to Enoch's city of Zion because there were no poor among them. Of course, if you were poor, they wouldn't let you in. That's how we can rationalize, as St. Augustine says, "Oh, human interest, what a powerful **argumetrix** you are." What powerful **argumetrix**; that's a person given great skill at argument. "Nobody can out-argue money," he says. Then there's a long passage of time (these things take time). They talk about these long ages, etc. We get all disturbed about millions of years when geologists talk about it (some Latter-day Saints do). But we are not disturbed at all when we speak of people living eight or nine hundred years and having children in their seven hundreds and eight hundreds, and things like that. What's it talking about? There's a good rational explanation for these things. As a matter of fact, the ages in this literature are all quite different. Even the Septuagint, which is the oldest and best of the Greek texts, gives quite different chronologies for Genesis from what we get the Masoretic text (the Hebrew text). Which one do you follow? It doesn't make much difference. Chronology has never worried me. Well, Satan takes over the earth now. (Oh, boy, have we got to move to get to Abraham.)

This is like today. Notice verse 24 here. This is a marvelous passage. He looked up and the power of Satan was upon all the face of the earth. Satan held a great chain and it veiled the whole earth in darkness. This passage actually occurs in some of the other texts too. He looked

|p14

up and laughed and his angels rejoiced. One passage says that while he laughed, God wept. And God weeps very soon here, in verse 28. In verse 26 Satan laughs, and in verse 28 God weeps. Then those are brought together in one verse. It's very striking thing. So this is like 1:35, where it says the time is not now but is near at hand when peace shall be taken away from the earth and the devil have control of his own dominion. We're living in that kind of a time now. But they start this shuttle service going. The angels descend and they preach and give a chance to everyone to hear the gospel and clear out while there is still time. The Holy Ghost fell on many, and they were caught up by the powers of heaven into Zion. So what is lost is only the residue of the people, as we are told in verse 22. Nobody gets drowned in the flood who didn't deserve to be drowned. That isn't because only Noah was righteous but because all the rest had made a break for it.

Notice verse 28: "And it came to pass that the God of heaven looked upon the residue of the people, and he wept; and Enoch bore record of it, saying: How is it that the heavens weep, . . ." There's a new book out by Peter Kuhn called *God's Weeping and Sorrowing in the Rabbinical Tradition*. There was very little of it actually, but the idea that God weeps is in the Jewish **Book of Enoch**. Enoch asks him, Why are you weeping? He says, If you don't want to let me weep, I will go where you can't see me and then I will weep all I want. It's none of your business why I'm weeping. If I choose to weep, I will weep; but who are you to ask? I'll go where I want. The point is that God is weeping and Enoch just can't understand it. He's completely nonplussed. It has to do with the destruction of the temple in the Hebrew literature. When the temple was destroyed, God wept. Then they brought Enoch into the picture because Enoch was the one who asked God why he wept. That's the way it has it here. He says, I can't comprehend. You, after you have created millions of earths like this. What does this matter to you? Millions of earths like this couldn't begin the number of thy creations. Thy curtains are stretched out still. Why do you worry about this earth? He said, Because they are all connected.

And then this marvelous passage here. "And thou hast taken Zion to thine own bosom [they are safe now], from all thy creations [that's very interesting; Zion is brought out of all creations; they all have their problems, and they all have Zion; the whole system is pervasive everywhere], from all eternity to all eternity; and naught but peace, justice, and truth is the habitation of thy throne [very interesting passage]; and mercy shall go before they face and have no end; how is it thou canst weep?" Then the Lord explains why he has very good reason for weeping here. He says, I gave them the three things they needed. In the day I created him, I gave him knowledge so that he wouldn't be stupid. (He would know what the situation was.) I gave him his agency so he could choose to do anything he wanted. But, of course, you can have knowledge and agency and still do the wrong thing because you don't have the wisdom and understanding. You don't know everything. He gave them knowledge of good and evil. So he said, I gave him commandments; I gave him specific orders as to what he should do. In the Old Slavonic text, he told them, This you should do and this you should not do, but (just like this) ". . . they are without affections, and they hate their own blood."

{p15

Son against father, father against son, and all against all—the whole human race is in complete uproar.

Then the mingling of fire and water that goes with the flood is interesting. Notice the language that is used all along here. "And the fire of mine indignation is kindled [well, fire and kindling are fire words, aren't they?] against them; and in my hot displeasure [there's another one] will I send in the floods upon them, for my fierce anger is kindled against them." We are often told that the fire and the water came together. It could have been a giant meteorite or something like that. Everything broke loose at once, and it was a tremendous thing. Enoch is completely overcome. He says, "I will refuse to be comforted; . . ." Then the Lord shows him the plan of salvation. In the other text they make more of the fact that "a prison have I prepared for them." They are to be safe until the time of the judgment when they will be judged; and then they will be given a second chance. They will hear the gospel and be given a chance to repent. This is the preaching of the spirits in prison which, as Peter tells us, were disobedient at the time of Noah. That's what the temple work is for, to take care of these people who rejected the gospel and were destroyed. So the patterns all fit into each other very nicely. Joseph Smith calling more of his shots here. Look at the end, he says and be glad. The end will be a sanctified and eternal state, but when and how will it be, says Enoch. Then three times the Lord says, These are "days of wickedness and vengeance." Then he says, What will happen after that? Then he sees the world going bad again. His heart is broken and he says, Oh Lord, will you come again? He says, Yes, I will come again in the days of wickedness and vengeance. Then he sees the Messiah come and the Son of Man lifted up upon the cross and it's worse. All the creations of God mourned (the same thing all over again). The chains of darkness are there, and they are kept in judgment until the great day. Enoch wept again [this is for the time of Christ] and said, When will you come again. "And Enoch beheld the Son of Man ascend up unto the Father; . . ."

Then this passage in verse 59: ". . . thou hast made me, and given unto me a right to thy throne, . . ." This is the one that really knocked Professor Black over. He said, "This is it." This is the one thing he thought he had discovered—that God gave Enoch a right to His throne. Here it is. When he saw this here, it really staggered him. Enoch is promised the throne (this is a very important thing). Enoch is called **Metatron**. That's commonly interpreted today as meaning "the one with the throne." The third time, He will come again. He says, Yes, I will come again in the last days, the time of wickedness and vengeance, where we are today. (That will bring us up to the twenty-first. Tomorrow is the first day of spring in these days of wickedness and vengeance.)

We have to get on to Abraham now, so we have to skip the marvelous story about Methuselah who took honor to himself and brought calamity on the world. The stories about Methuselah, the sons of God and the daughters of men here, and Noah continuing Enoch's work, and Methuselah's boast—there is a great literature backing this up. But this goes way back. This isn't in the apocalyptic stuff here. This goes back to the earliest Babylonian and Egyptian

|p16

literature, especially the Babylonian story of **Gilgamesh and Humbaba** tells the very story that we have here of Enoch. The **Lamech Scroll** was discovered telling the same thing. See, Lamech was the father (too much; I'm sorry, we can't tell you). But we will start with Abraham the next time. We have to be thorough and careful in examining every one here. Maybe we put it off too long, but the other was relevant.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 23

In Jewish tradition and all tradition, it's a complete leap from Noah to Abraham. But they are aware of that because there's nobody that comes in between, so it is very proper that our Book of Moses (which is really the Enoch story leading up to Noah and the Flood) is followed by Abraham. The eighth chapter is the Book of Noah. There's a whole page from the Book of Noah, so we get actual excerpts from books from each of the major dispensations. The thing we want to notice here, how does it end up? How does the whole thing end up after this first phase? You notice you divide just as you do in astronomy and in geology. You divide up into ages, into aeons, into epics (smaller and smaller ones) just as you divide into the epic, the trilogy, the single play, the acts, the scenes, etc. So it is here. This is a big ending, one of those big breaks. You notice it happens right at the end of our Book of Moses. The earth was corrupt before God and was filled with violence. This is a sign of our world today, both corrupt and filled with violence. Moses 8:29: "And God looked upon the earth and, behold, it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah: The end of all flesh is come before me, for the earth is filled with violence, and behold I will destroy all flesh from off the earth [that's what they want; that's what they'll get]." And that's what we are moving toward right now. But this takes us right to Abraham.

The Enoch story reaches its climax in the Flood. After the Flood, we just repeat the Adam story again. Just as Adam found himself in the lone and dreary wasteland outside and had to work his head off to make things go, Noah also finds himself in the wilderness. It uses the very same word in the Bible. After the Flood nothing was growing. He found himself in a **midbar**, a desert world. Then he built an altar. Remember the first thing he did and the affair of the rainbow. Then what did he do? He cultivated a garden. He became a gardener, as Adam did and went to till the earth. The next thing he did was plant a vineyard. Then comes a separation. His family grows up. They flourish and go bad immediately, just as in the time of Adam. Already the flesh becomes corrupt.

You would think that after the Flood, after they learned their lesson, it would be a long time before that happened again. But you go almost immediately to the tower, because very quickly in Noah's own generation they start misbehaving. So we get the tower and the period known as the **separation**. Now you notice you have the **diaspora**. This is the separation. The diaspora is the scattering of the Jews, after the temple was destroyed at the time of the First Temple (the time of Lehi). Then again, when the Romans destroyed it in A.D. 70. There have been scatterings and there have been gatherings, as the Book of Mormon tells us, from time to time. But this separation is the biggest of all. This is the scattering of all the people where it tells us about the Tower of Babel and the three sons in chapter 14 of Genesis. This is called "the separation," and there is no scripture for this.

|p2

This is very interesting—this huge gap between Noah and Abraham and the familiar formula goes: ten generations from Noah to Abraham, and there was no one who called upon the Lord. So then Abraham starts things moving again after this one.

It's very interesting that this is the best documented of all periods in the ancient records. This is where the Egyptian and Babylonian records, the Lamentation Literature, the Admonitions, etc. fill in the gap. We have all sorts of contemporary literature in this early period of the scattering of the people in all directions. And we have a scripture provided for it. Isn't that lucky? The only person that gave it to us was Joseph Smith. It was the Book of Ether. That fills that gap, you will notice. Fortunately, it is the most easily controlled of all because at this particular period, during this gap, the Jewish and Christian literature is silent, and all the rest is. But the non-Jewish, non-Christian, the great civilizations, they give us the fullest records of it. This is when the traditions are laid for all the myths, the Greek tragedies which Aristotle says are just naturally tragic by nature. The quarrels between the great houses, the scattering, the desolation, the horrendous crimes that go on—it's your Book of Ether story all over again, your Jaredite story. We get it in the Jaredite story and you can match this with all sorts of manuscripts. It's interesting that Joseph Smith has filled the separation for us. That's not what we're concerned with now. We've got to get up to Abraham. This is this rich subsoil of myth and drama. The Abraham story is told in Genesis from chapters 11 to 25. There are over 11 chapters devoted to the life of Abraham. We don't have any other biographies that long or that full. We read about Moses between the lines, but here we have 11 chapters (some say 12) of the life of Abraham. What more do you need? Why do we need a Book of Abraham here? This tells us a different story, which is a surprising thing. The thing is the other one has been edited by the doctors (we might as well mention that). Was more necessary? And what else do they tell us about Abraham?

We might as well mention what the Jewish sources are; we refer to them. We put down the various sources for the Enoch literature. Well, we also have the same type of stuff (totally different stuff) for Abraham. Of course, we begin with the **Torah**, which are the first five books of Moses. Now, this is a thing that is recognized very widely. Moses is simply recapitulating Abraham. He tells Abraham's story, and scholars today are inclined to think the Book of Genesis should really be called the Book of Abraham (the creation story of Moses) because he picked it up from Abraham. Of course, it was revealed to Moses too, revealed in each particular dispensation. But he recapitulates Abraham all the way through. Anyway, the **Torah** goes back to Moses. The five books of Moses are studied by the **Soferim**, the "book people," the "learned ones." These are the Scribes and Pharisees of the New Testament. They discussed and they argued about things, and they produced a repetition or review. (Incidentally, next week we will review the whole course and try to agree on some feasible subject for a definitive essay so we can decide what people are up to. We will review the stuff, and then we will decide what would be a good subject to write about.) So they repeated it, and **Mishnah** means a "doubling or repetition." They would examine the **Torah** and go through it again.

|p3

Why do you have to tell the story again? Because there are many things therein that are full of contradictions and leave lots of things unsatisfied. Well, we get other stories in the Pearl of Great Price that fill in lots of those gaps. We started out by saying that what the Pearl of Great Price did was fill in a lot of gaps. Well, these gaps are recognized, and they are filled in by the **Mishnah** where they discuss and they speculate on what might have been. The **Mishnah** was the work of the **Tannaim**, the teachers teaching of the **Mishnah**. Incidentally, this goes from the third century B.C. to the third century A.D. There were 148 great doctors that worked on it. The doctors were rewriting the Bible practically. The last thing was finally sealed up in the third century by Judah Ha-Nasi. Judah the Prince gave us the last version of the **Mishnah**, but it is still studied. These things are all being reprinted today. They are being studied as never before because there is lots of information here.

So you have the **Mishnah**, but were the doctors right about anything? You can argue until the cows come home, and that's what the doctors of the schools loved to do. So you had to repeat the **Mishnah**, and in that you have the **Gemara** (which is the same as the **Talmud**). It means filling out, completion. We are going to give the final, definitive answer now, which is the same thing as the **Talmud**, the teaching. (What's happened to the Bible all this time?) This runs in two issues. There's the Palestinian, which ceases in the year 370 A.D. (that's the last installation). The Babylonian is the great one. It's three times as long as the other one. We have all these texts here, but you won't be required to read them before the end of the semester because they are very long. The Babylonian **Talmud** goes down to the fifth century A.D., almost a hundred years later. They are discussing these, and they are discussing these. The people who take care of this are the doctors of the church. **Sobarim** means "to be patient." What they (the **Tannaim**) did was go through the **Mishnah** line by line, verse by verse. They went through everything with a fine-toothed comb. They were patient, plodding **Sobarim**. The Arabic word for patience is **sabbar** (Job the **Sabbar**). So these were the **Sobarim**.

This **Talmud** is divided into two parts. The one is the main part, the **halakah**, which is the law. Moses gives the law to the people, the fasts and the festivals, the moral laws, the judgments, and the courts. They are legalistic. That's an important part of it. The other part is the **haggadah**. These are the stories that illustrate things they could have picked up. I heard Rabbi so-and-so say so-and-so. They will give a long line of authorities to determine where this story originally came from. But they are supposed to illustrate and confirm arguments and explain what is going on. They have some wonderful stories in them, and the stories are gathered in the well-known **Midrash** (not too well-known). Like **Talmud** it means "teaching," **darshan**, the professor, the teacher. **Darash** is "to teach." **Midrashah** is the council. The **Midrash** started right in the beginning with the **Tannaim** in the third century B.C. As soon as they started telling these stories, they started remembering them. The Jews are great on that. So from the third century B.C. it went on down to the year 1040 A.D. when the schools of Babylon were officially closed by the Moslems. They could no longer have any schools and discussions (so it runs to there).

But all these give sources, and the most interesting of all are the ones that are being revived today more than anything else, along with this. We call this the Rabbinical literature. Of course, these people are Rabbis too, but there is the Hasidic, which is very important.

There are various arguments as to who the **Hasidim** are. Would it have been the original Rabbi Hasid of Regensburg in 1200, or was it much older? They say it is the **Cabala**; it's Cabalistic. But **hasidam** means "grace." They have the old tradition that went back to Adam, the one that these people have been lousing up all along with their discussions. The reason they had so many gaps in the first place was that the doctors, the **Soferim** (Scribes and Pharisees) threw out so much they didn't like. It turns up, and they argue about things. But the Hasidic is the **Cabala**, and there are two main sources of that. The first, the basic one of all, is the **Sefer Yetsirah**, the "Book of Creation," supposedly written by Abraham (Abraham's original story of creation). It's considered today by nearly all Jewish scholars as the most important book in existence. The **Sefer Yetsirah** is a complete mystery. It's divided into two parts, and it's all in code: the meaning of the particular letters and then the "emanations" that go forth, the **sefirot**, the 10 emanations that created the world. The 10 **sefirot** and then the 22 sacred letters. So we have **Cabala**, **Sefer Yetsirah**, and then the **Zohar**, which has the most important section about Abraham. These are all good Abraham sources. They are just full of stories about Abraham. So even with 11 chapters in Genesis, what were they missing? Well, it is that they have missed the point. Today, there is a new look. (We have to watch the clock like crazy now.) I'm going to mention again the series on Abraham, which is a long one. It ran from 1968 to 1970 in the *Improvement Era*. It's 200 pages. You can get it at F.A.R.M.S for three bucks. That's less than two cents a page. There's some useful stuff in here, and they have paged it properly which makes it very easy to find things. It can save you a lot of trouble by reading from these, which we won't have time to do. But first of all this new look on Abraham. This is the way they talk about him now.

We quote a lot of recent Jewish scholars, and we have been visited often here, as you know, by eminent rabbis who come to discuss things. We get along famously with them. "With these new-found documents the whole picture has changed now. Whereas, we are told, only one mortal being, Moses, does the holy scripture state that God spake to him face to face. With all the other prophets, the Deity speaks in dreams, in visions, in riddles, but only to Moses face to face. Today, we are told that the covenant made with Moses on Sinai is 'but fulfillment of the covenant made with Abraham,' which is the true foundation of the life of Israel ever since. Whereas it has hitherto been taken for granted that everyone knows that it was Moses who first knew the Eternal One, we now learn that Abraham and not Moses was the founder of Israel's monotheism. God is always described as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not the God of Moses." We are quoting certain rabbis writing today. "The covenant of the **B'nai B'rith** (that's the Society of the Covenant in Israel) is today considered to be the covenant that God made with Abraham, the first Jew, afterward renewed with Moses [Moses simply renewed what Abraham already had; there's nothing new, so this is a new attitude], the central deathless theme and constitution of Judaism."

|p5

This goes on and on. And notice here. They say, "Ah, we have discovered something now, that Moses is simply continuing Abraham." Well, we could have told you that all along. What is now becoming clear is that Abraham is simply doing what Noah did, and Noah what Adam did. That famous saying, "ten generations from Noah to Abraham" is repeated in the Book of Abraham. The Lord tells Abraham here, "It shall be with thee as it was with Noah." You are going to carry on the work of Noah, which Abraham does. So Noah, and then Adam. The whole idea, as we mentioned before, is that Christians and Jews alike say it's all just a one-act play. We are quoting standard Jewish sources that tell us it was Moses and Moses alone to whom God appeared. He gave him the whole law and that was it. They no sooner came out with that than they began to spawn this.

Incidentally, these books go into volumes and volumes, the **Babylonian Talmud** (they are huge). They could never be satisfied, so more goes on. From here, are there no prophets after Moses? We are talking about dispensations here. Then in our Pearl of Great Price the next one is the Little Apocalypse (Matthew 24) Jesus Christ speaking about the dispensation that is to follow him in the last days. And we just saw in Enoch (we could include Enoch here with Noah; he was his great grandfather) "in the days of wickedness and vengeance." These were days of wickedness and vengeance. These were days of wickedness and vengeance (Jesus Christ), and these latter days are the days of wickedness and vengeance. So we have this totally different pattern here. If the world would recognize that, it would save them a lot of trouble, a lot of arguing about scriptures. Abraham is regaining the esteem which he once held with the Jewish doctors who called him **arbah**, the greatest of the faithful, the **tzadik tamim**. That's what belongs down here, the subject of the **Cabala**, the Hasidic literature. **Cabala** means "transmission, to receive." With a double **b**, it means "to pass on from one to another." The whole theory of the Hasidic literature, with these very important writings in it, is that the whole tradition, the whole plan or pattern was passed on among holy, chosen men (men of God) from one dispensation to the next, ever since Adam—that we have exactly the same teachings that Adam had. That's the teaching of the **Cabala**. The Jewish doctors reject it completely.

When Jerusalem was destroyed in 70 A.D., the Jewish doctors, led by Johanan ben Zakkai, went out in a delegation to the Emperor Titus (he was the father of Vespasian) and asked him for permission to go beyond Jordan to Jamnia and found a school because they hated the temple. They rejoiced to see the temple burn. That's a surprising thing, but they did. The rabbis held no priesthood. They were just learned men who were elected by the community and taught in the school. A rabbi has no priesthood at all. Some are very proud of bearing the name Levi. Then they claim that they are Levites **cohens**. But to be a rabbi is simply to be a learned man. They went out and established the school of Jamnia. Then you get the two great schools, the school of Jamnia and the school of Pumbeditha in Mesopotamia. These are the schools that flourished until the middle of the eleventh century. They went out and taught their own stuff and built up the whole thing. Of course, it was based originally on this, but they just "went to town" with this and condemned all this. Some say it was Baal-Shem in 1700 who was the first

|p6

Hasid. Others say it was Isaac, the Hasid of Regensburg in 1200. Others say it was others. But they say, No, it wasn't this or that one or that one. The **Cabala** has been handed down since the very beginning. There is this tension here, so we have very much need for a Book of Abraham.

We could go on here: "He is the first and greatest of those whose coinage is current in the entire world, who colonized the world for God so that whereas before Abraham the Lord was king of heaven only, with Abraham he became the king of heaven and earth." God depends on Abraham to make him king of earth. "Abraham entered into a covenant on which the world is based," says the **Zohar**. "And thus the world was firmly established for his sake [if it hadn't been for Abraham, God wouldn't have created the world]." So this new status of Abraham is an important thing, the new view of him. This is about the new evidence that has come out. Here's an interesting statement: "Abraham qualifies to stand as the most pivotal and strategic man in the course of world history." Everything pivots around Abraham; he makes all the difference. And you see in this second verse of the Book of Abraham how loaded it is. Notice how long it is, one single sentence. There's not a break in it. You can't put a break; it all goes together. It's a very strange sentence, very potent, very powerful. This gives the whole mission of Abraham and it explains his importance when the world gets lost. As I say, the ten generations again. He starts out: "In the land of the Chaldeans, at the residence of my father, I, Abraham, saw that it was needful for me to obtain another place of residence."

We haven't ended with it by any means here. Now, we have the apocalyptic literature for Abraham which has been found since the middle eighteenth century and nineteenth century. Two special works, the **Apocalypse of Abraham** and the **Testament of Abraham**, are enormously important works, the most important yet discovered. They are very old and very closely related to our Book of Abraham. They give us a complete surprise. They are being gone over today. They come in in the apocalyptic writings, the **Apocalypse of Abraham** and the **Testament of Abraham**. There are many other things, but these are the most important ones. This writing comes out very early and it gives us this picture. The **haggadah** are extremely rich in stories of Abraham's childhood and what he suffered, how he protested with his family, how they did try to put him to death and why they did it. We go into all the stories about that here. There's no need repeating it now. They were up in the North there, and he protested with his family. He says here, "They utterly refused to listen to my voice." They were going to have the annual celebration when they have to make a proxy sacrifice for the king, who doesn't want to be sacrificed himself. They would always choose the proxy at this particular time and place. And all the details are very well set forth in the Book of Abraham. Notice this first chapter is greatly concerned with ritual (the whole thing is ritual ceremony and religion). This answers the historical question: could this really happen? You bet it happens. This is exactly what they did.

Wainwright has written a very good book on the old Star Religion of Egypt, which is revived from time to time, especially would be at this time. Nobody can date Abraham. They date him between 600 B.C. and 2600 B.C.

|p7

There is a gap of 2000 years in the present-day dating of Abraham. One scholar at Yale puts him 600 B.C. Others, because of Ebla, put him 2600 or 2800. That puts him way back. Well, with that sort of a gap, time doesn't mean a thing. You're not going to get anywhere arguing about chronology. You might say, "Well, look, this puts Abraham in the wrong time." Nobody knows when Abraham lived. These things happen ritually every year all the time, but it is also history. What is performed on a national scale with great panache and splendor is an historical event. In fact, it is the most historical event. War is merely a side issue. Their wars with Ramses II were small-time affairs, but they were ritual. It is especially very clear in Rome. Every part of the act of war is part of the annual rites of going forth, etc.

So here he starts out by saying that he has to leave home. All his life he has to keep going (the ten trials of Abraham). He was never able to settle at all. Remember, he has to rent ground to bury his wife and a tomb at Hebron where Abraham is supposed to be buried. He had to buy the land from the Hittite, Ephron. The Hittites owned that territory at the time. Everywhere he has to keep moving. That's why the book about Abraham in the **Zohar**, as in the **Midrash**, is entitled **Lekh Lekha**, meaning "get up and get going." Abraham always has to keep going. Remember, the famine drives him. There was corn in Egypt, and so they keep moving. He always has to settle on foreign land. He's always in trouble wherever he goes. And he always does the generous and magnanimous thing. What a marvelous man! He has every trial you can imagine. And this is his motivation here, what keeps him going. He has a vision of something else. He knows something else besides the regular routines of this world. A new place of residence; well, he looks around and he finds that there is greater happiness and peace and rest than he has at home. He has to find another place of residence because he hasn't got enough happiness and peace and rest. That's what he wants, and frankly, that's what he is seeking for himself. "Greater happiness and peace and rest for me." Nothing wrong with that. That's the formula the Egyptians use after the name of the king. Some people put it after their names, when they are buried. "Life, security, peace, prosperity." So he seeks for the blessings of the fathers. That's the only way it can come, in the blessings of the fathers. Now he emphasizes the fathers here and the patriarchal order. ". . . the right whereunto I should be ordained to administer the same [happiness, peace and rest]; . . ."

I think we might describe the world of Abraham. It's a very important thing. It's the same as the world in these others, but it is particularly vivid in the case of Abraham. Maybe we will read a few examples of what was going on in the world of Abraham. First, hard times, very very hard times he had to go through: the ten trials of Abraham. Listen to the situation he has in the Bible here. This is on page 149, what he goes through. His life is an unbroken series of tests right up to his death. The saying is "Rabbi was like a son, a devoted son, who was ceaselessly beaten by his father." But he says, "Let him go on beating him; he knows what he is doing." Abraham knew the law of obedience. First of all, "But Sarai was barren; she had no child [Genesis 11:30]." Then Genesis 12:1, ". . . Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, . . ."

He has to get going. Nine and ten: Going on still southward, and there was famine in the land (nothing to eat). That's one of the reasons everybody is moving now.

Then he gets to Egypt. Then what happens? The Egyptians beheld the woman, and the woman was taken to Pharaoh's house. His wife was taken away from him. Then when Pharaoh found that Abraham was her husband after all, he was indignant and said, "What is this that thou has done unto me?" And they sent him away. In chapter 13: "And the land was not able to bear them, . . ." There was strife. His men fought with his nephew Lot's men because there was not enough grass for the flocks. They had a terrible time (poison wells and things like that going on all the time). Then the five desert chiefs came and made war, the way they are always zeroing in on Israel today. They took Lot and his goods away. Then Abraham had to bring them back again. In Genesis 15:2 he said, ". . . I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus [still no child]." Then the sacrifice of Abraham. He was still a young man at this time when he was sacrificed (our Facsimile No. 1 here). ". . . lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him." The other accounts of it describe what the sacrifice was.

Then his wife has this terrible affair with Hagar (all these squabbles at home). In chapter 16 she says to him (the great and marvelous Sarah, his wife), "My wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid into thy bosom; and . . . I was despised in her eyes: the Lord judge between me and thee." She wouldn't judge, but because Abraham was childless she allowed him to take another wife, Hagar. Then Hagar started making snide remarks because she had a son, and making life miserable for Sarah (not a happy domestic situation). Then Sodom and Gomorrah, those terrible cities. But he pleads for them. He tries to get them saved, as you know. If there are only ten righteous people, will you please save them? And he abases himself before the Lord, "Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? Oh let not the Lord be angry." Then came the big nuclear blast, and the next morning he looked out from his camp high above. He had chosen the bad ground above so that Lot could take the good ground below. It's a good 1500 foot level, and you look down on the whole valley. He looked down, and it was just like a furnace. It says flickering fires all full of smoke and dust, as if there had been some tremendous blast going (and there was). It's the most active volcanic and earthquake zone in the world down the rift there. The Gulf of Aqaba leads right up into the Djauf. ". . . and lo the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace." So he gets out of that. He moves to the coast to be safe. After that explosion, it wasn't safe to be where he was. Then he took his family and went to the coast. The king of Gerar, Abimelech, was in charge there. They got along all right, but he took Sarah to wife also. Sarah was a raging blond and a terrific beauty, they tell us, but that wasn't the reason. They wanted to raise up a royal line by her (her name means "princess, queen"). Then he is in trouble again. ". . . They will slay me for my wife's sake." Then he has to get rid of Hagar, his wife who had a son, Ishmael. "And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar . . . and sent her away: . . ." That was no fun. "And Abraham reproved Abimelech because of a well of water, which Abimelech's servants had violently taken away." Then comes the supreme test, the sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22:2). "TAke now they son, thine only son

Isaac, whom thou lovest . . . and offer him there for a burnt offering." And then finally at the end of his life in chapter 23: "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you: give me a possession of a burying place with you, that I may bury my dead out of my sight."

Well, that's the career of Abraham from the beginning to the end. He's a wanderer. In the book of Deuteronomy you are supposed to come forth and make a basket of fruit (all the goodness the Lord has given you) and you are supposed to bring that to the altar. Every man is supposed to do this and say, "Our father was a wandering Syrian, an outcast, a tramp [an **Amorite** is the word they use], and you brought him to this blessed land and gave him this." But this was Abraham. He was the "outcast." That's what **Ab** means. It says, my father was a Hebrew, which means "a person from the beyond, a wanderer, an alien, a stranger, a person without a passport." The Hebrews have been that ever since. That's what they are—wandering, settling, getting into trouble, etc. It's an interesting history. It all goes back to Abraham. So why the sacrifice of Abraham here? This is the situation because of this confounded drought in this period. There have been periods, we know now, of major climatic change in the earth. In Abraham's time it was terribly bad. Remember, it says there was famine in the land, and they moved on. They could not settle in Canaan. They still had to move on into Egypt. The reason they went into Egypt was because there was corn in Egypt. The only place they could buy corn was in Egypt, and that's why Joseph sent his sons into Egypt later. There was a terrible time of drought, that whole period. We have the lamentation from this time. When the Nile failed to rise (if Egypt was the only place to find grain and they didn't have any in Egypt, you were hard up). And the vivid, full descriptions it gives from these early times in the Egyptian record: the **Famine Stela**, and the one called the **Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage**, and **Neferohu**. These are descriptions of how bad things could get in Egypt and what happens. They are very interesting ones. But this is the world of Abraham.

They have to make sacrifice. They have to do something about it, and they do. Abraham goes up, and he is to be offered. The whole theme of the Abraham story in the Book of Abraham is the rivalry between Abraham and Pharaoh as to the priesthood and kingship. That's why Pharaoh, we are told in the **Midrash**, wanted to marry Sarah—to raise up a righteous line, which is what Abraham wanted to do too. So he took Sarah away because she was the princess. He was to raise up a line. But there is this constant conflict between the two. And you notice in the first part Abraham is sacrificed on the altar in the place of Pharaoh, which was considered a great honor at this time. This goes back to the **Sed-festival**. The most important festival in Egypt was the **Sed-festival**. From prehistoric times you find it. The earliest monuments of Egypt have the **Sed-festival**. There are **Sed-festival** monuments over in the museum there now. The **Sed** was the celebration, originally at the end of thirty years, when the king started to get old and feeble. The king had to be sacrificed, and then he would be restored in his son Horus who would be regarded as the resurrected version of the king. He would disappear for three days, and suddenly he would come out as Horus (as himself). It was convenient also to come forth without being put to death that way but just disappear for a while and then come forth, and

|p10

have somebody else put to death in your place. So you have the sacrifice. You have the proxy, which is done. The rules are very strict and they were followed here. There are a great many instances of this happening. Abraham was chosen. As I say, it was considered a great honor. You had to be a noble and you had to be a stranger, and you had to have either yellow or red hair. They preferred red hair to anything else. So you were in real danger if you visited Egypt and were a redhead.

You notice it starts out by giving four gods in Canaan. Those were the four gods of Canaan that ruled the four parts. It says in the Book of Abraham, "Now, at this time it was the custom of the priest of Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, to offer up upon the altar which was built in the land of Chaldea, for the offering unto these strange gods, men, women, and children." Well, what was the Egyptian king doing in Chaldea? In the eighteenth dynasty there was Ramses II. What was he doing up there at Megiddo? Well, he conquered that. That was Egyptian country in those days. That's where this was, Chaldea. It was a temporary time. At the time Abraham wrote this, or at the time his children were supposed to read it, apparently it was no longer part of the Egyptian Empire. It came and went, depending. In the eighteenth dynasty Thutmose III took the whole shebang clear over to the Euphrates. Then they lost it all. Then they got it back again in the twentieth dynasty. Then finally, in the twenty-second dynasty the great Sheshonk went out and conquered it all again, and even more. Then it was lost again. Then Alexander the Great took the name of Sheshonk, said he was the son of Amon, made himself Pharaoh, and went back and conquered the whole thing again following the very same pattern. Each one of these conquerors called himself a **cosmocrator**. The story of the cosmocrator is important because Abraham's rival, Pharaoh, always calls himself the cosmocrator. You know what that would be. The **cosmos** is the universe, and the **crator** is a person who rules. It's a Greek title, but this is a Latin form. The cosmocrator was the man who claimed to rule the world as God's successor on earth. The mortal rival of Abraham was a cosmocrator who went by the name of **Nimrod**. All the legends say that the Pharaoh who tried to sacrifice Abraham was this Nimrod. You know Nimrod, the mighty hunter of the Bible. Is it the same one? That's a long story; we won't go into it. But the point is that Abraham in the legends has this mortal rivalry with the person who claims to have the priesthood and the kingship. Does he have the right to rule, and does he have the priestly right? Well, that's what Abraham had, and that's what Pharaoh coveted.

When he tries to sacrifice Abraham (this is the story that is told in the **Midrash** here), Abraham was put on the altar, and the fire was ready. You first cut the throat of the victim and then you cast him on the fire. It is always done that way. You notice in Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, Isaac was carrying the wood for the fire. But Abraham raised the knife. It was the sacrificial knife, and then the fire follows. Well, as the priest raised the knife, a great, mighty earthquake struck. It overthrew the altar. It killed the priest, and Abraham wasn't touched. Well, this impressed the king, who immediately let him go. And he didn't have to sacrifice Abraham anymore because the sacrifice had already been made. The high priest was the substitute.

|p11

Now that someone had been sacrificed, he had no argument with Abraham. And he did honor Abraham by letting him sit on his throne. The Pharaoh had ordered the people all to bring cedar wood and make an enormous bonfire to burn Abraham on. Then the priest's knife was cast from his hand. The priest was overthrown and killed and Abraham was let go. Then he ordered them to gather wood and build a special place to put Abraham's throne on. Then he said he had 365 of the highest nobles of the land come with their children to Abraham to sit on the throne and be taught the principles of astronomy by Abraham. Well, that's what we have here in Facsimile No. 3. Figure One: "Abraham sitting on Pharaoh's throne, by the politeness of the king, with the crown on his head, representing the Priesthood, [notice the two feathers; that is the spiritual crown, the shew feathers] emblematical of the grand Presidency in Heaven; with the scepter of justice and judgment in his hand." Then it says, "Abraham is reasoning upon the principles of Astronomy, in the king's court." We are told that's exactly what he did. We are told in the **Bet Ha-Midrash** (I have a **Bet Ha- Midrash** text), page 140 in the fifth volume, that he sat upon the throne by Pharaoh's permission, and all the court brought their children to be instructed in the principles of astronomy. We are told he began his preaching, "Blessed be God who created the sun, the moon, and the planets." That's the way he began his sermon to the children of the Egyptians after Pharaoh had accepted Abraham. He accepted Abraham at court, and Abraham became a great favorite with him. Then you have the story of Sarah and the like.

Pharaoh took Sarah to wife. Remember, Abraham said, "She's my sister." This has lots of meanings. But he wanted to raise a posterity by Sarah, who was the princess, the queen. Sarah was true to the law of her husband. With this we have a source we forgot (the most important of all). We are always mentioning the Dead Sea Scrolls. In 1950 we discovered the **Genesis Apocryphon**, the Genesis written by Abraham. This is the Genesis, first thought to be the Book of Lamech because of the outside. This tells the story of Abraham in Egypt with Sarah (it really goes into things). You notice there are insights into Egyptian doings. This is from the first century. This goes back 2,000 years; it's an old story. This is all much later than that. Why did the rabbis throw this away? They had it. This is in a Jewish source. This happens to be written in Aramaic. This tells the story.

Of course, Pharaoh wanted to have Sarah for his wife, but Abraham and Sarah had made a covenant to each other, and Abraham in this story (1Q GenApocr, the **Genesis Apocryphon**) is outside the palace walls all night and prays to God to spare Sarah. And Sarah finds herself on the king's bed. Now, this is a bed (it's the standard bed). It's also an altar, the standard form of Egyptian altar. It is also an embalming table. You can use it for all these things. It is also a table for birth. We have many representations where queens give birth. Queen Hatshepsut, for example, is being born, and her mother is on one of these beds. So this is where life is conceived, where it begins, where it ends. Everything happens on a couch, always shaped like the lion here. It's the lion couch that represents the processes of destruction in the earth, represents the second principle where everything returns back to the earth. It's the fierce lion that consumes all things.

|p12

So he prayed outside and she prayed inside, with the understanding that if she didn't submit to Pharaoh, she would be put to death (that was the understanding). You don't refuse Pharaoh that way. So she prayed and Abraham prayed. Just as Pharaoh was to approach her, an angel came to the rescue at the last minute, exactly as he came to the rescue of Abraham at the last minute. This is told in the Genesis Apocryphon. It's not an ancient text, as far as we know. It's the oldest we have, and it's the most recently discovered. Just like this, it goes through the whole thing. The angel comes with a whip, and he forbids Pharaoh to take another step. The Bible tells us this Pharaoh and all his house became barren, including animals, until he had finally delivered Sarah and returned her to Abraham. Then he sent Abraham out of the land loaded with royal gifts as a prince. He recognized him as a prince. Especially, he recognizes Sarah. He sends her out as a queen with a crown and a robe, and all the rest of it. And he sends him on his way. In a story in the **haggadah**, it tells us that once Pharaoh was riding in his chariot with Joseph, and he says, Joseph, you're my best friend, but I'm going to have to ask you to step down from the chariot because when the people cheer as we go through the street, I don't know whether they are cheering me or you. I understand that you are very popular, but in Egypt there can only be one king; there can only be one high priest; there can only be one ruler as there can only be one God. So we don't want to confuse the issue. Will you please get down. (This is the thing that happens all along. We have the same thing here.) This is a Babylonian version, not from the **Talmud**, but from Babylon.

When Abraham is miraculously delivered from the altar, the Pharaoh (who is Nimrod over there too) says, I recognize your God; I want to make a sacrifice to him. I want to sacrifice 4,000 oxen to him (it's an embarrassing situation). Abraham says, I'm glad you do recognize him, but you can't do that. You don't have the priesthood. You're not authorized to do that. You're blessed as to the kingship but cursed as to the priesthood (which is what we have here in verse 27). "Now, Pharaoh being of that lineage by which he could not have the right of Priesthood (notice, it was his lineage to blame), notwithstanding the Pharaohs would fain claim it from Noah, through Ham," That would have been all right, but it happened that he claimed it through his mother. The Egyptian priesthood comes through the matriarchal, not the patriarchal line. In the verse preceding it says he was blessed with the blessings of the earth (notice, he was a good man). "Pharaoh, being a righteous man, established his kingdom and judged his people wisely and justly all his days, seeking earnestly to imitate that order established by the fathers in the first generations, . . ." Now, that's a very important word, "imitate." You say, but look, did the Egyptians have the gospel? They have so many ordinances and things like that resembling ours. No, they didn't, but they had a darn good imitation. So if you want to know what the original was like, this is the best chance you have (studying this) because the imitation was a good one. But he knew he didn't have it. I have a section in that book on **Abraham in Egypt**, where there are many texts in which Pharaoh is fretted and worried and doubts his authority. But here: "that order established by the fathers [the patriarchal order]." He is seeking earnestly to imitate that patriarchal order of the first generations, ". . . the first patriarchal reign, even in the reign of Adam, and also of Noah, his father, who blessed him with the blessings of the earth, and with the blessings of wisdom, but cursed him as pertaining to the

|p13

Priesthood." He couldn't have it because he came through the wrong line, it says. Through Ham? Well, Ham we are told was a righteous man and walked with God too. But it was through the line of Cush and Nimrod. They rebelled and left the priesthood. It's the famous story of the stolen garment. The priesthood garment of Adam was stolen. It should have belonged to the other brethren. They all had an equal claim, but when they were coming out of the ark, Ham stole the garment, made a copy of it, and claimed he had the priesthood. For that reason he was denied the priesthood until all the others should have it first. But this says he would fain claim it from Noah. That's the very thing we have here and the story we have in the **Genesis Apocryphon**. This Babylonian I was mentioning where Abraham says to him, I'm sorry you can't make the sacrifice because you're not authorized. You don't have the priesthood. You are blessed as to the kingship but cursed as to the priesthood. And again, the king must do what Pharaoh does here. He says, I'm sorry, I'll have to have you leave the country because we can't have two kings. If you have the true priesthood, then I would have to bow to you in Egypt. I would have to accede to you. So he invites him to leave with all honor, you understand. He recognizes his kingship and his priesthood (but it's uncomfortable to have you here because we can't have a rival Pharaoh; we can't have a sub-Pharaoh). Well, Joseph almost held that job. His great-great grandson, Joseph, was going to hold the same job and be almost equal with Pharaoh. Later on in Exodus we find that the people esteemed Moses as Pharaoh.

So we have this dealing with Egypt all the way through. People ask, "Why are we interested in Egypt?" The Egyptian delegates that came over here asked, "Why are you people so interested in Egypt?" That's why they let us have the exhibit because we seemed to have a genuine interest in Egypt. It comes out all over the place. Nephi starts giving us his record, the Book of Mormon, "in the language of the Egyptians and the learning of the Jews." It was at that time. That was the time when Demotic flourished. It was just a short period, and it was marvelous writing. It was a shorthand—the greatest little space saver you ever saw. Up in room 22 in the Cairo Museum, they have a remarkable inscription. It is above here; it is in Egyptian here; it's in hieroglyphic. Down here it's in Greek. Big blocks, so much Greek, so much hieroglyphic. In between there's just a little strip about eight inches wide that has the whole record on it of both these others in Demotic. It was that conservative. That's why Nephi, Lehi, and the others who wrote on the plates say it was very difficult. (It was hard to do; my hands got tired.) Mosiah makes his sons learn to read it so they can keep the record; they keep the record in a different language. Well, the **Anglo-Saxon Chronicle** was kept in different language—the archaic keeping of records. (Oh boy, the time is up now.)

So we have all these things mixed up. The best thing to do is read the Book of Abraham. Of course, we have this week on Abraham. It's next week we're going to talk about the other. Not the next time because we still have a good deal to do, but this isn't very long. You notice the interesting thing is he starts out in chapter 3: "And I, Abraham, had the Urim and Thummim, . . . " And that's how he found out about the creation. Then he starts giving us this valuable

|p14

cosmology we can't go into here. I'm still sloshing around with this stuff. This is one of the most remarkable documents in the world, and we can't talk about that either. But the last part then is the creation, a different creation. It's the best creation story we have probably and most scientific. There's the Moses creation story, so there's not so terribly much to read. But oh how it's packed with stuff. The information in there is dynamite. It's encapsulated, believe me. What do we do, unravel it?

We can break it up now, but I'll tell you more if you want.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 24

Now we are on Abraham. We don't have much time for Abraham, or anything. But we have original statements by Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham in the first person. Abraham is written in the first person. It is interesting that the apocalyptic Abraham literature that's come up in the latter part of the nineteenth century is in the first person, "I, Abraham." That sort of thing had not been known before. Apocalyptic literature was always in the third person as in the Book of Moses. But Abraham speaks in his own person here. And we have Moses. And we have a summing up by the Lord himself of the whole situation from an inspired interpretation by Joseph Smith that really makes sense of things for the first time. Then we have Joseph Smith's story itself. So we have all those dispensations in there, each represented by an original source.

All the leaders of dispensations, like the dispensations themselves, follow a certain pattern. But each leader and each dispensation is also quite distinctive. It is different from any of the others in certain ways. So that would be true of ours too. Abraham, as we saw, has been called the most pivotal. With each one of these you get a description of the world in which the person found himself and the way he reacted to it. But he can't do it on his own; he has to receive a call. He doesn't just get the call; he has to seek for it first. He finds himself a stranger and a loner in the world. He's in the position of Lehi. All the heroes in the Book of Mormon are one against the world, a man who can't get anyone to follow him at all as the prophets of old. That's the normal pattern. And Abraham is the most lonely of all. He doesn't have a single friend at times.

It's a time, we mentioned before, of natural disasters. First of all, signs in the heavens. I am going to read a few excerpts from each of these headings here. You notice this is characteristic of other dispensations too—in fact of all of them, including ours. So we start out with signs in the heavens as number one. At this time a great comet appeared periodically in the North and destroyed the crops. Jewish tradition here tells of a time when a great dragon-like monster (now we have Halley's Comet with us) had taken over the earth until God cut it off suddenly; and also the planet that comes out of Scorpio and spews gall and drops of unhealthy blood and fouls the waters of the earth. A great comet appeared periodically in the North and destroyed the crops and the kings of the East and the West. The Greeks called this one **Typhon**. In Palestine it was called **Resheph**. Resheph and Typhon were the same person. He is the Canaanite Resheph, the sky god, who came to Palestine and to Egypt also as a fiery meteorite rushing through the heavens (it was probably a comet—now we realize that comets are real things and really can hit and make trouble) whose sacred symbol was the iron meteorite in his shrine. Resheph is closely bound up with Abraham, and we are told that the stars fought for Abraham the night he marched against the marauding kings of the desert and slew his enemies by the almighty power of God.

|p2

The Egyptians were, according to Wainwright, convinced that the destructive falls of meteorites were, according to Wainwright, convinced that the destructive falls of meteorites were an affliction peculiarly reserved for the wicked. But the heavens were very active at the time of Abraham. This is a thing that has been commented on a good deal: the great interest in astrology and astronomy. A recent book by Vermes, a Hungarian scholar, points out the enormous importance that was placed on Abraham as an astronomer and astrologer by the Jews. Though the rabbis fiercely deny it, it's constantly connected with him. Ancient sources suggest quite often that disturbances in the skies, especially these blazing meteorites, were the cause of this intense preoccupation. People were watching the heavens like never before at this particular time. They concentrated on them. Notice that the Book of Abraham is very much occupied with cosmology and astronomy. He has given us a chart there, and he explains things. All these things are very closely connected together. This is part of the picture in Abraham's world beginning with the disturbances in the heavens. Remember in Enoch all the heavens shook; everything was in disturbance (the universe itself). The earth shifted on its axis is the explanation to that one. It was a time of earthquakes and volcanoes too.

According to our Book of Abraham the Lord broke down the altar of Elkenah and the gods of the land and utterly destroyed them. Here we read in the **Pseudo-Philo**, a very important source: "Just as Abraham prayed on the altar [for God to deliver him], there was a violent upheaval of the heavens and the earth and the mountains and all the creatures in them. Then God sent a great earthquake, and fire gushed forth from the furnace and broke out into flames and sparks of fire and consumed all them that stood around, 83,500 of them. But upon Abraham there was not the least hurt by the burning of the fire." This attempt to sacrifice Abraham is often connected with Nimrod who tried to build the Tower of Babel. It was overthrown by the wind, by a great destruction. The attempt to sacrifice sometimes takes place at the site of the tower in northern Mesopotamia where the rites are interrupted by "a vast burst of roaring flame which destroyed many people and saved Abraham, but it did not bring the people to repentance. Traditions constantly associate earthquakes with fires bursting out of the earth." That's Sodom and Gomorrah, of course. That's part of the Biblical story of Abraham. They were overthrown, Genesis 19 tells us, while fire enveloped them both from above and below. And the rivers of the region turned to bitumen. They still are bitumen. The five cities of the plain were at the south end, and they were destroyed. The bitumen pours out here. At En-ge-di is where you will see the Jewish people come to vacation. They bathe in the water there and rub this bitumen on them. It's black pitch that comes out of the sea there, very black and very heavy. They think it cures rheumatism, so you will see these fat old Jewish ladies completely covered with this black stuff from head to foot to cure their rheumatism, wading around in the powerful, briny waters of the Dead Sea. Everything is active; there are fumaroles and everything going on there. This was very active at that time. It's very shallow here. You can walk across there at the Lisan, that tongue of land that sticks out into the water there. The Arabs know the way, and they smuggle contraband, cigars and things like that, across at night. You must be very careful. If you miss your footing and fall into that water, it's much brinier than the Great Salt Lake (it's terrible). It was very active at that time.

|p3

This is the great rift that goes down to the Gulf of Aqaba and goes right on up into the Djauf and the Bekaa depression. The rift that matches it and runs right along with it, is the Nile Valley. Before they had plate tectonics, they didn't know what caused them, but now we see what they are. This makes it the most active earthquake zone in the world, along here. Things are always going on here. That's what you get in Abraham. The cities of the plain are destroyed. It's very dramatically described in Genesis. We can't go into that, but it's really a great story. "And earthquakes and fumaroles and fissures, rumbling sulfurous smells, all go together in the story as they do in nature. For 52 years, according to a well-known tradition, God warned the people of the cities of the plain with preliminary rumblings and earthquakings. He made the mountains to quake and tremble, but they hearkened not to the voice of admonition. [It's like St. Helens, isn't it?] The last 25 years were particularly ominous with the earth subsiding and quaking almost continuously. All through the life of Abraham, even before the fall of the cities of the plain, we meet with these earthquakes."

We have quoted the **Clementine Recognitions** so much. They are so old, and they connect with Enoch and all the rest. We use them all the time. Here they are again talking about this. "In Abraham's time the world was afflicted by fire which, beginning at Sodom, threatened to destroy the entire world. After the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Abraham had to leave his beloved Mamre." The plain of Mamre was up here. This is where Lot was, and the road immediately goes up here. It mounts 1500 feet. You look down on the whole plain all along here. These are the great cliffs that go along. This is Qumran up here. There's no break in them. But these great gorges are very much like our Red Rock country, or like Rock Canyon. They are very deep, very precipitous. That's where you find hundreds of manuscripts in the caves, up there in a place you would least expect them, all along here. But the road only goes up here. Then you look down and you can see the whole darn thing, right from one end to the other. It says when Abraham woke up in the morning and looked out over the plain, he said it was all just covered with dust and a vapor of smoke, with fires flickering here and there. It had just been wiped out completely. It sounds like a nuclear holocaust, doesn't it? But he had to leave. He was camping up here, and he had to leave and go over to the coast where it was safer. There he ran into King Abimelech and had to go through the same routine he went through with the king of Egypt—taking his wife Sarah, telling him she was his sister, getting her back again, all the other things. So we are dealing here with ritual patterns that go on, but they really took place is the point. Visiting another monarch you had to fulfill certain obligations. Abraham was in constant danger here of being dragged in. You notice the Book of Abraham makes that clear. He lives in a terrible world. He hates it, and he tries to disengage from it. They not only want to sacrifice him; his fathers have turned to idols again. He tries to dissuade the family. They won't hearken to him. On the other hand, they volunteered him for the annual sacrifice. He had to get out, leave the land and go to Canaan. It was just as bad there.

We are told here, "Because the plain of Mamre had been completely blighted by the catastrophe [it's pretty blighted today; it's a very dusty plain; they've tried to save it by planting eucalyptus trees here and there, but it's not a pleasant place], all plant life was destroyed, and seeds

|p4

transplanted from Sodom would not grow anywhere. No wonder Lot's daughters, hiding in a cave, thought they were the only surviving mortals. The entire landscape was desolation, we are told. There were almost no travelers. Everything stopped moving." Archaeology confirms that grim picture here. And along with earthquakes, volcanoes, etc., you are going to have food troubles, world famine. This is an important thing. We just go to our scriptures, and especially to the Book of Abraham, for this. "Far more conspicuous in the Abraham tradition than these raging storms and floods is the blasting heat and drought that bring famine to the scene. In the Book of Abraham, the prophet, even before the conflict with the people of Ur of the Chaldeas, learns from the Lord that there is going to be a famine in the land." (Abraham 1:29-30) After his escape from the altar the famine descends in earnest, blighting the whole land of Chaldea. He leaves the country, and his first act on crossing the border into Canaan is to sacrifice to God, praying we are told (Abraham 2:17), "that the famine might be turned away from my father's house, that they might not perish." He hoped that all of his folks back home wouldn't die of hunger. It's a very severe situation. Does he find rescue in Canaan? No, not at all. Even in Canaan the famine got worse and worse, forcing the patriarch to go clear to Egypt for food. In Abraham 2:21 it says "the famine became very grievous." It's a world famine. It's everywhere; you can't escape. It was bad in Egypt as a matter of fact. Of the ten great famines which afflict the world, according to Jewish tradition, the greatest was that which hit in Abraham's time, the first world famine. This was one of the ten trials of Abraham, the hunger he had to face. Everywhere he goes, he is hungry. The flocks have trouble grazing. They are driven out, etc.

This takes us to the troubled nations and the social problems. When things are desperate and insecure, people get dangerous, insecure, nasty and mean with each other. This is very characteristic of Abraham's world here. Just an excerpt here: "It was because of the wickedness among the people that the birds came to destroy their crops when Abraham was a boy." He had a job driving the birds from the fields. The birds were desperate, but he made an agreement with them. He devised a special kind of plow, and he was famous for his inventiveness. Remember, he was a scientific wizard. This is emphasized all through the Abraham literature, and we get it here in our Book of Abraham (after all, he is the star man). He is the man who discusses things with the learned men of Egypt on these subjects. This plow would plant seeds and at the same time turn over the earth to protect them from the birds; but only after he had made an agreement with the birds and set aside some food for them too. It was because of wickedness among the people that the birds came to destroy their crops when Abraham was fifteen. As it was in the days of Noah, so in the days of Abraham, a very old Christian writing explains. The world was ripe for destruction according to the principle that whenever men fall away completely from God, destruction must follow. "Indeed, the people had sunk so low," says one very old source "that God caused their civilization to degenerate back into the stage of cave dwelling and brought Abraham out of the land." Things went right back to everyone for himself, and it was a desperate situation. This was after the Flood, and for a long time people had been haunted by fear, knowing that it could happen. What could we

|p5

do in case of another such world disaster? After the Flood men were haunted by an understandable feeling of insecurity. To overcome this, they undertake great engineering projects, some of which are very famous.

This Nimrod we talk about was great for his technological knowledge and engineering projects. "Among these was the famous tower which was to be a symbol of man's ultimate mastery of nature. It was so ingeniously designed and solidly constructed as to be absolutely safe against flood, fire, and earthquake." But we are told in many sources what happened to it. You will get that from the Book of Ether too, the Jaredite story. Remember, the winds did never cease to blow for 344 days. It was the terrible winds. We are told the tower was overthrown by winds or tornadoes, a violent force, and most of it covered with sand. This happens, and there are some very interesting archaeological and geological studies by the Dutch on that particular subject. Notice, it was to be safe from flood, fire and earthquake, but they didn't mention wind. There are three floods: the water flood, the wind flood, and the fire flood. They come in that order. The water flood came in the time of Noah. The wind flood came in the time of the tower, long after. And the fire flood (the great overburn) comes at the end of this dispensation, in the last time. "Within the walls of the tower was to be stored the sum total [they had computers in there] of man's knowledge of the physical universe enabling him to meet and master any situation that might arise." It was all done, says our writer here, out of fear of another flood.

That's interesting, that awareness of the weather, etc., because Sister Blackmer from Alaska, a very competent woman who works with the Eskimos, was down here and she left me some very interesting material. It's so close to what you find with the Hopis and Navajos. They have professional weathermen who are very skilled at predicting the weather. They know all about it. The people pay great heed to them. They don't undertake any great project unless they consult the weatherman. They compare their notes, etc. That's what these people were doing back there. None of this is implausible. This sort of thing really happens. "A great economic boom and commercial expansion enabled them to undertake all kinds of engineering projects for controlling a dangerous nature. But the Lord fooled them by altering the course of nature and creation." All the Lord has to do is shift it a little bit. As Derchain says, the temple is like a control center or a power house. All you have to do is move a lever or shift a switch and tremendous powers are released. You don't have to do very much if you have the control there. That's the way God does it. All he has to do is wiggle a finger. But men can duplicate that performance. That means we are not safe. If we overlook one little tiny factor, that will spoil everything and our machine blows up. So that was in Abraham's day. The Nimrod legends are full of marvelous gadgets and structures—super buildings, mechanical thrones and altars, flying machines, etc. It was a time of great scientific and technological progress. The Abraham stories, including the Book of Abraham, are unique in their concern for a scientific understanding of the cosmos as against purely religious and moral teaching. Remember, this is a physical science that Abraham is teaching us in that Facsimile No. 2 and the others and, of course, in his text. Those hot winds were breathing down everybody's neck. In desperation men turned to worshipping idols. Why idols, of all things, in a scientific age?

|p6

It was, we are told, because in the whole world people were without a teacher or a lawgiver or anyone who could show them the way of truth. Of course, there was Abraham, but they didn't want him. So this was the situation. And willpower renders things quite dangerous.

Here's a famous saying from the **midrash**, "When you see the great powers fighting against each other, look for the feet of the Messiah. The proof is that in the days of Abraham, because the great powers fought against each other, greatness came to Abraham." The root of all this, as you might suppose, was the desperate greed (there are some marvelous passages on this). Everybody was out for himself, so we get this situation. Here we have the Jordan Depression that goes clear down, and then you go right over to Egypt. It was a veritable paradise when Abraham first visited it, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, it tells us in chapter 13 of Genesis.

"It's not surprising that the men of Sodom were a wealthy and prosperous people on account of the good and fruitful land whereon they dwelt, for it supplied them with every earthly need of man. Nor is it very surprising that they did not trust in the shadow of their creator, but in the multitude of their wealth they trusted for wealth thrusts aside its owner from fear of heaven." Here Rabbi Eliezer seems to be quoting the same sources as Samuel the Lamanite. Then he goes on, "They had no consideration for the honor of the real owner of their wealth." Samuel the Lamanite says the same thing, You do not give thanks to the one who gave you your wealth. "Behold, you do always consider your riches [you are always thinking of the economy]," he says. "Therefore, your riches shall pass from you. They shall become slippery that you cannot hold them." Samuel the Lamanite is quoting from Enoch there though (very striking passage). But here this sounds like the same situation certainly. They were mean. This is thing that Abraham would not tolerate, any kind of meanness. He was just the opposite of that. "They had no consideration for the honor of the real owner of their wealth by distributing food to the wayfarer, but they even fenced all the trees on top above the fruit so that no one else could have any, not even the birds of heaven." This is the authentic Babylonian tradition, eye witness accounts.

We have documents from this time, and from earlier and later times, that describe just such situations. They tell how the people of Babylon "oppressed the weak and gave him into the power of the strong. Inside the city was tyranny and receiving of bribes. Everyday without fail they plundered each other's goods. The son cursed his father in the street, the slave his master. They put an end to the offerings and entered into conspiracies." The picture is just as lurid from the lamentation literature of Egypt at the same time. "The people of Sodom and Gomorrah were not condemned for their ignorance of the God of Abraham, but rather for their meanness, their immorality, and their greed. They were destroyed because they did not strengthen the hand of the poor and heeded not the needy. For them everything existed for the sole purpose of being turned into cash." There's a whole cycle of stories from the **Midrash**. They put a toll on their bridges with a double toll for wading the river. They would let a merchant come into the city, but they wouldn't allow any foreign merchant in town to buy food while he was there. They would wait until he starved, and then they would take it all over.

|p7

There is the story of Lot's daughters who were kind to some poor people in Sodom. Immediately, they were subject to severe punishment for it. "Of course, the richer a man was, the more favored he was before the law, for it was wicked to encourage idleness by helping the poor. Anyone helping the poor in Sodom got thrown into the river." And so it goes.

Here again from the **Ugaritic Letters** on the coast here. You just go up a little ways here to Ugarit where they found in 1929 and 1930 the great Ugaritic library, the Ras Shamra library from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. It's very old stuff and very full. This is merchants' accounts, etc. But here we read the same thing: "The records of Ugarit, which some [including me] hold to be contemporary with Abraham, show that the practice of killing merchants was widespread in that part of the world, even as the **Amarna Letters** show us the world in which it was every man for himself. [The Amarna letters are at the same time.] Having no love for the stranger, the people of Abraham's homeland had even less to waste on each other. Finally, there was so much crime and murder among them that everything came to a complete standstill. Being grossly materialistic, they rated the hardware high above the software [famous saying]. If a man was killed in working on the tower, he was ignored; but if a brick fell, they sat down and wept. Abraham, seeing this, cursed them in the name of his God." One cannot help thinking of the church builders in the Book of Mormon. You adorn yourself with that which has no life and allow the poor, the sick, the afflicted and the needy to pass by you and notice them not.

Another quote, "They were dwelling in security without care and at ease without fear of war, sated with all the produce of the earth, but they did not strengthen the hand of the needy or the poor. And it is said, 'Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom.'" We think of Sodom in terms of sexual depravity before everything else, but in all the stories and all the accounts it's meanness in any particular regard you're talking about. Well, what else do we have here? So there is this wicked world and all these greedy people and all the troubled nations. The result is economic collapse, as we see here. Everything comes to a halt, and everybody has to move (migrations). It's a restless world. Everybody is on the move, going somewhere else. Abraham is the Hebrew, the first person to be called the Hebrew. **Hebrew** means "displaced person." It means a person with no home, one of the **avarim** who comes from the other side of nowhere and who has no claim on local hospitality. So we have Abraham's order to move on here. He migrated because God told him to. If it was a test, it was a severe one. Professor Albright has recently pointed out that the ancient pioneers, far from finding a golden West awaiting them, were ethno-political intruders in the West. As such they were not well received, but were closely watched and were usually driven away by the local inhabitants who bitterly resented any attempt on the part of outsiders to move in and take over their fields or pastures. So it was a rough time, and you didn't find hospitality anywhere. Even in Canaan, the Babylonian threat followed the patriarch, who was forced to leave Damascus (according to a very ancient source) because of military and political pressure from the East. In Canaan Abraham's nephew Lot, catching the spirit of the times, declared that he preferred the suburban Sodom to the society of his uncle, saying, "I want neither Abraham nor his God" and moved down into the crowded and prosperous plain, down here, which was about to be destroyed.

|p8

So the theme for Abraham is, and the Book of Abraham is usually titled **Lekh Lekha**, "Get up and keep moving; get going; on your way."

This is the world of Abraham. Now Abraham himself. As a leader of dispensations, he stands alone. This is the great mystery, the great excitement, about Abraham: he is so absolutely alone. He starts things moving all on his own. How is that particular thing? Students of Abraham are impressed by the way in which he seems to start from scratch. The whole world had ground to a stop, was dead center. Who could possibly get it moving again? Well, of course, God could send an angel or something like that, but regarding Abraham is the famous saying, "There must be a stirring below before there can be a stirring above." You have to make the first approach, as we read in Abraham 2:12, "Thy servant has sought thee earnestly; now I have found thee." But he had to seek diligently first. You must seek before you find. You must ask before you receive. You must knock before it is opened to you. So Abraham seems to start from scratch. With the world all going in one direction, he steadily pursues his course in the opposite direction. This marvelous independence of Abraham is wonderful. Granted that the tradition of the fathers, of which the Book of Abraham speaks so eloquently, was still known; yet his own father and grandfather had lost faith in it and departed from it. We mentioned before there were "ten generations from Noah to Abraham, and not one of them had walked in the ways of the Holy One until Abraham our father," says Rabbi Nathan. He asks, "Where then did Abraham get the idea of starting things moving? The common explanation is that Abraham was self-taught. God appointed the two reins of Abraham to act as his two teachers. That still doesn't make him a privileged character for all men have the same promptings of the Spirit if they will only listen to them. For charity was also asleep and he roused it. The power was there, but it lay dormant from neglect. 'When all the inhabitants of the earth had been led astray by their own pride and self sufficiency, Abraham still believed on me,' [and so I made a covenant with him because he was true and faithful in the first place]. Abraham received his covenant only after he had made the first move." Speaking of him the **Zohar** says, "The prophetic spirit rests upon a man only when he has first bestirred himself to receive it." Again, "the stirring below is accompanied by a stirring above, for there is no stirring above until there is a stirring below." That's the **rajjar**; that's from the **Zohar** too. But who is to start the stirring? This is the point. You say, Well, nobody does it. You justify yourself by what everybody else is doing, etc. Lehi, alone in Jerusalem, said, "Which of the prophets was not alone?"

"It was to Abraham's merit that he loved righteousness in a hard-hearted, wicked generation without waiting for others to show him the way." A wonderful illustration of this is set forth in the 1831-32 account of Joseph Smith which was just found in 1967. He recounts how for three years as a boy he sought diligently for someone that apparently interested nobody else. Finally he said, "I cried unto the Lord for mercy, for there was none else to whom I could go, and the Lord heard my cry in the wilderness." We get that in the last book of the Pearl of Great Price. This was exactly the case with the young Abraham. No one was on the track at all. "For generations the world had moved ever farther and farther from God until by Abraham's time it had become what the Pearl of Great Price describes as the worst of all worlds.

Then Abraham single-handedly reversed the trend. The **Shekhina**, the spirit of God came on the earth at the creation, but through human sin it removed itself farther and farther from the earth. Then Abraham brought it down again. He was, says the **Midrash**, "like a man who saw a building all on fire and no one willing to put out his hand to save it." Abraham was the first one to get involved. As people get more in a "me" generation, more self-centered, they don't get involved in another person's affairs. But Abraham is involved, so he gets himself in trouble all the time. He did the only thing he could do. Exactly like Joseph Smith, he appealed directly to God at an early age. It was he who made the first move, according to Abraham 2:12, "Thy servant has sought thee earnestly; now I have found thee."

The wonderful thing about Abraham is that he always does the right thing no matter what anybody else does. He had to get along with all sorts of people, most of them rascals, and he treats them all with equal courtesy. He never judges any man. And then there are various examples. We go through quite a number of them. And the saying from **Midrash Rabbah**, "If Abraham does not play fair, who will?" His passion for fair play breaks all records in his pleading for the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to whom he owed nothing but trouble. He knew all about their awful wickedness, but still, Josephus observes, he felt sorry for them because they were his friends and neighbors. He appealed directly to the Lord's sense of fairness. This is Genesis 18; remember the various steps. It's such an interesting psychological study here. And he says to the Lord, "Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?" He knew God wouldn't do that. (Genesis 18:23) "The impressive thing is the way in which Abraham is willing to abase himself to get the best possible terms for the wicked cities, risking sorely offending the Deity by questioning his judges. He says in the next verse, Far be it from thee "to slay the righteous with the wicked. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Then he says, "Behold, now I have taken it upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but dust and ashes." He is abasing himself more as he gets less and less people. Fifty righteous people will spare the city. Twenty-five, yes. Ten, yes. How many righteous people will it take to spare the city? Oh let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak again. I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord." Again, in verse 32, "Oh let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak yet but this once more . . ." It wasn't an easy thing to do, but he is doing it. So we have Abraham here doing all these things for everybody, and he is the one who helps everybody. Notice, in this second verse in which he sets forth his program, it sounds like sort of an ego trip, doesn't it? He wants to be the father of many nations and king and have the priesthood. Why does he want it? He makes it very clear here. "And, finding there was greater happiness and peace and rest for me, I sought for the blessings of the fathers, and the right whereunto I should be ordained to administer the same [he wants to administer the blessings, pass them around], having been myself a follower of righteousness, desiring also to be one who possessed great knowledge, and to be a greater follower [improvement] of righteousness, and to possess a greater knowledge, and to be a father of many nations, . . ." The reason he was is that he would administer the same to them. "This is my work and my glory." It was Abraham's work and glory too. ". . . and desiring to receive instructions, and to keep the commandments of God, I became a rightful heir, a High Priest, holding the right belonging to the fathers."

|p10

Then it was conferred to him, but he is seeking it. He wants to become the father of many nations and sought for the blessings of the fathers to administer them to the rest of the human race (and that he did). As we are told, through Abraham and his seed all the nations of the earth would be blessed. And we are all the seed of Abraham. So he stands alone.

Now this mystery of the paradox—how he could stand dead center and do all this good? How does he do it? What is he going to do in this world? This is a terrible world in which he is being pushed around everywhere, moves from one place to another all the time, never settles down, never can. By faith, of course. He receives revelation. He sought the Lord and finally finds him and receives direction. But just like the founders of the other dispensations, it's what we would call a holistic picture. He gives the big picture. The emphasis on family, the emphasis on cosmology, and the emphasis on eternity. It's not just here; it's the eternities he is interested in. Those three things dominate with all of these, especially with Abraham. They really culminate in him. So in our Facsimile No. 2 that's what we see—a holistic picture, a four-dimensional picture of the universe there (a marvelous thing which we can't go into now). But having received the revelation, what does he do? He goes forth as a missionary to spread the word. And this is going to be hard. This is why he wants it; he wants it to administer. In Abraham 2:14 it tells us, ". . . and I, Abraham, was sixty and two years old when I departed out of Haran. And I took Sarai, whom I took to wife when I was in Ur . . . and the souls that we had won in Haran, and came forth in the way to the land of Canaan, and dwelt in tents as we came on our way." The souls are the ones they had converted in Haran. He and Sarai immediately started work at conversion. In Genesis 12:4-5 there is the puzzling statement that when Abraham left his home he took with him "the living things." The rabbis argue what can the living things mean? The puzzling living things they have named was interpreted by the rabbis exactly as it stands in the Book of Abraham. The **Midrash** explained that it means the people converted in Haran. He goes even further to explain that when we are told that Abraham called on the name of the Lord in Sichem (Genesis 12:6; the first big place he camped in Canaan) it means he summoned the people to the Name. He began to preach the gospel to them and convert them.

According to the *Sefer ha Yashar*, the people of the land of Haran saw that Abraham was good and just toward God and man. Men from among the inhabitants of the land of Haran came to him and attached themselves to him, and he taught them discipline of the Lord and his ways. We have him here in Facsimile No. 3 teaching astronomy and the principles in the court of Pharaoh. "As he moved on his way, each altar raised by him was a center of activities as a missionary, he and Sarai diligently preaching and making proselytes wherever they went and pitched their tents." **Midrash** 39 says, "Abraham converted the men and Sarah the women." There was a tradition that all proselytes and heathen are the descendants of the infants of the pagan mothers, whom Sarah nursed. But all the followers of Abraham, including Abraham himself, were converts. It doesn't come by blood. As Lehi and Nephi explained to their sons, he who is righteous is favored of God. But you had to accept it. Abraham founded his Zion, and those who wished to follow became the followers of Abraham. By special rites and

|p11

ordinances they were adopted into the family. All the following of Abraham were adopted, which means the whole world is eligible. So he founds the church with the ordinances of the temple. This is a thing that is being played up a good deal these days here. "Today, Abraham is being described as the restorer rather than the initiator of the knowledge of God [so it came earlier than Abraham]." First Moses restores Abraham's knowledge. Now we are told that Abraham is restoring earlier knowledge of the holy rites and ordinances. He both "recapitulates all that went before and anticipates all that is to come," as one Catholic writer points out. This is in perfect agreement with the declaration at the opening of the Book of Abraham that Abraham's immediate ancestors had fallen away from the order established by the fathers in the first generations in the days of the first patriarchal reign. According to Maimonides, the great Rambam, it was Abraham who found his way back from idolatry to monotheism.

Incidentally, Maimonides is their greatest philosopher, but he wrote in Arabic, not in Hebrew. This return to the old faith is symbolized by his rebuilding of the ancient altar of the first fathers, especially Noah. Remember, from Abraham to Noah and Noah to Abraham. According to the Samaritan tradition, in Abraham the covenant of Noah is renewed, just as the covenant of Adam was renewed by Noah when he built his altar after the Flood. In the Book of Abraham that patriarch is also represented as resuming the work of Noah, in Abraham 1:19 and 26-27. Where Noah left off, you will take up. Like Noah, Abraham's work represents "the restoration of harmony that was broken when men fell away in the preceding dispensation."

According to Jewish theology, Mount Zion, on which Abraham built an altar to sacrifice to God, is the cosmic rock uniting heaven and earth, and all the great sacrifices of the past were offered there (it was the primal temple) on an altar which was demolished by the generation of the division (that's that separation, we mentioned before, after the Flood at the wicked times of the tower) but it was restored by Abraham. This was supposed to be the very spot whereon Adam had brought the first sacrifice and Cain and Abel offered their gifts to God; the same whereon Noah raised an altar to God after he left the ark. Abraham knew it, and that was the place appointed for the temple to be built later. We are told there were seven who built altars before the temple existed: Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and Aaron (notice this succession again). The most important of these was Abraham. "It was he," according to Maimonides, "who recommended that Mount Moriah be consecrated as the place of the ordinances forever after and who dedicated the spot for the future temple [as Moroni dedicated a spot for the future temple at Manti, we are told]. For when Abraham was shown all the dispensations of the future in a vision, God also showed him the future temple and the service and the law." He knew all about it.

"Before he went down into Egypt," wrote Baring-Gould, a famous English Jewish scholar and very important statesman, "Abraham was shown the entire temple worship by God, after which he returned to Haran and instructed the people in the true religion. He erected three altars and gave thanks to God." Remember, on the Mount of Transfiguration, Peter said, "Let's set up three altars here," representing the three degrees of glory, the temple, etc. So Abraham gets

|p12

the temple going here, simply restoring what had been there before (as a missionary and with the ordinances). Like others, his rival Nimrod is for kingship, the priesthood, and the heavenly order. This comes out all along. There is an imitation of this going on all along. Abraham has restored it again in competition. Nimrod thought he had it. We shouldn't go into the Nimrod story, but it connects very closely with the name of Abraham everywhere, and also (strangely enough) in our facsimiles in the Book of Abraham. But like the others, Abraham also left a full written report. Here it is in the first person. It is necessary to leave that, and we have it. In every dispensation, we are told, the gospel of the kingdom is preached for a witness, and then the end comes. So this is the next step. The world has always rejected the message. Remember, Adam and Eve mourned before the Lord. Their sons fell away from him. Adam's successor was Seth, and the children of Seth all fell away and joined the Cainites and the like. What happened was the great blight on the world, blackness. It was a sad place. Enoch was rejected, and he was inconsolable. "I will refuse to be comforted," he said. But he did select a people. He gathered them out. Those that were willing to go were gathered together, and in the process of time they were taken away. So there were none left behind at the time of the Flood. Incidentally, Rabbi Ishmael says that the Book of Enoch was written to prove to the world that God was not cruel in sending the Flood. They asked for the Flood because only the wicked people were left behind. The rest were given fair warning. The question is, well what about the innocent animals? There's a very interesting passage on this subject in 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra which says, "What is the fear of death? What is it that's bad about death?" It's the anticipation, the fear of it. He says that animals don't have that at all. They don't worry about that. They don't see it coming at all. When it is there, it's there, and that's all there is to it. "No animal can even imagine its own death," says Ezra. That's the thing we think about all the time. Human beings brood about this thing, whether they are wicked or not, I suppose. So He was not cruel to the animals. In fact, He changed them in a twinkling, if you judge by some of the remains that are found from the Great Freeze.

This gospel shall be preached for a witness, and then shall the end come. The gospel is always preached, not to convert (it doesn't convert) for a witness, as the Lord says, so they will be left without excuse. "Now, they have both seen and hated both me and the Father," he says. It was for a witness, not that he expected to convert them. Enoch was rejected and his Zion went away. Noah warned in vain, and then came the Flood. After Abraham came a tremendous world collapse. Awful things happened then ending the period. Again, it's the idea, where do you date him? But the nature of it is very clear from the Abraham record, the great droughts and the great winds, which did wipe everything out. Then again after Moses, the Exodus is part of a period of world upheavals again.

Then came the time of Christ who was completely rejected. "Despised and rejected, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," he had no place to lay his head. How did he end? Being publicly executed with not a friend to stand by him. This was being alone really. Then what happens? Well, the Roman Empire was just one continual war of annihilation, but the point is that shortly after there came the great plague in the time of Marcus Aurelius which

|p13

wiped out eighty percent of the population of the whole Western World. Things were really happening. So this is the pattern that we follow here. We ought to bring it up-to-date.

Next time we will have to talk about chapter 24 of Matthew, which follows here. This is a very important document summing up dispensations. We've got onto the dispensation theme here, but it would not be complete if we didn't bring it up-to-date. So I'm giving you an assignment. These are two talks by President Kimball. The last one was printed in the *Ensign* exactly one year ago at President Kimball's express request.* So that's important, and this is important here. This is a description of our dispensation, a very good one. Of course, you are going to find that in Joseph Smith 2, but this brings things up-to-date. There was some empty space, so I have inserted a recent piece from a newspaper in January of this year. It's a statement by someone which will give you an idea of the condition of our situation here. This is required, and it will help you with the final. We want to bring it up-to-date. If you want a picture of our world, this is it. It is seven pages long and costs 35 cents. I have change here, and I'm open for business at a small profit (no, there's no profit). This is necessary if you want to see the picture because he is going to quote the very passages we have been quoting and relate them to our dispensation, bringing them right up-to-date.

* A copy of this talk from the June 1976 *Ensign* has been included with the lectures.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 25

Now we have the very important next to the last book, the one about Matthew. Matthew 24 (the so-called Little Apocalypse) is an extremely important document that Joseph Smith has given us. This is where the Lord summarizes the three major times of wickedness and vengeance, including his own. Matthew 24 is apocalyptic because the Lord tells you what is going to happen to the world. Notice that the Joseph Smith version of Matthew 23 is quite different. The verses are arranged differently, and that's for a very good reason. He talks about the loss of the gospel, the falling away, etc. here numbers of times (when it comes).

This is a thing, of course, which the later church would not tolerate—the idea that it got lost, that there was a gap. If anything, the Lord had brought it. He had saved us, and now it is the triumphant march of the church. The human race is saved, and that takes care of that. They did not like to admit the gap. They did not like to admit that he would come more than once. That was known as chiliasm, and that was absolutely out. In fact, 400,000 Donatists were slaughtered in North Africa with the approval of St. Augustine because they preached that there would be a Millennium and the Lord would come again. That's chiliasm (**chili** is the Greek for thousand). If you believed that sort of thing, you were out. So the verses had to be rearranged to make only one coming of Christ. That's why the thing is all mixed up. It is such a mess that nobody can make any sense of it now. For that reason, in the Catholic Church, this is not recommended (in fact, it is not permitted) as a subject for sermons. You can't give a sermon on this because it is so confused, and you might lead people astray. I have some interesting documents on that. We won't refer to this here.

In Matthew 23 the Lord sums up his dispensation. Remember, it's at the temple at Easter time. They are there for the Passover, and he gives this great sermon in the temple. As he leaves the temple, then the apostles come with the question (Matthew 24). But notice the situation here in Matthew 23. The dispensation has rejected the message, absolutely and completely. The very people who should have accepted it are the ones who have scorned it and rejected it and caused all the others to reject it as well. How many times does he repeat here "woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites"? In verse 15: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." Verse 23: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." Then again in verses 27 and 29. So that's the refrain. The scribes are those who study the scripture. He is talking to the people, and he says, "They sit on Moses' seat, and you harken to what they say." Because they preach the gospel, they are the very people that should be most ready to welcome the Messiah. The scribes (we mentioned the **Soferim** before) are those who study the scripture and who teach it. And the Pharisees are the **Parishi**, "those who are set apart." **Parasha** means "to set apart." Our word is **part**, **parat**, meaning "consecrated, chosen, sanctified."

|p2

They regard themselves as especially pure. The scribes and the Pharisees are the ones who should lead. They should be the ones expecting the Messiah and the first to welcome him. They were the only ones who didn't. They would have absolutely nothing to do with him, and they turned the people away from him. So he goes down the list. We don't want to linger on it here, but it is very much to the point. He repeats that refrain.

"Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: [do everything they tell you to do, but don't do the way they do; that is don't do their works]." (Matthew 23:1) So every time after this he refers to them as hypocrites. Hypocrite is simply the Greek word for actor, a person who is playing a role which is not his real role, who is pretending to be somebody he isn't. Every time he refers to them on those grounds. They play a good role; they talk good talk, but they are hypocritical about it. They do all these things simply for appearance. He goes down the list of various things about them (the scribes and Pharisees, the sanctified, etc.). Title, rank, office, and authority count for everything, he says, among them. The authorities are the great obstacle instead of the great aid to progress. They are crazy about statistics, he says in verse 15. The temple is merely a matter of statistics with them. They are wholly engrossed in business, the accounting, the record. Remember, the mint, the rue, the tithes, and the taxes. They are so minute and careful about keeping the records that they ignore the main law. He says that's important (this you should do) but you should not neglect the other. They simply reverse things. They are blind leaders of the blind. Three times he calls them "blind leaders" here. They don't know where they are going themselves, so he says they are very careful. Administration is great with them. Administration is important, but they have completely inverted the values, he says in verse 24. They have exploited their position. They seem very sincere and are very impressive (verse 28), but they are false and unscrupulous. They identify themselves with the prophets, the founding fathers.

From the beginning though, the true messengers have been rejected and thrown out. From the beginning in every other dispensation, he says, from Abel on down that has been the way it has gone. His dispensation has fared no better than the others. When the Messiah finally came for his dispensation, they would certainly accept him this time. But how did they treat the Son of the Lord of the house? They treated him worse than any of the others had been treated (remember the parable on that subject). So the famous saying (verse 37): "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen [bird] gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! [you didn't want it]." In the next verse he says it is all over. This is the last chance you are going to have, he says. So now you are finished, he says in verse 38. I won't bother you again.

Now Joseph Smith's story begins here with this different verse arrangement. You notice that verse 1 of the Joseph Smith text is verse 30 of chapter 23. Jesus had never talked as strongly as this before. It's his farewell. He knew he was going to be crucified, and he said astonishing

|p3

things. This is very strong against the scribes and Pharisees. The apostles are really upset. They are worried about him; and they come to him secretly (embarrassed) and ask him, Lord, just what will happen? What is going to happen? And this is what he tells them. (This is how it happens.) This is the pattern that is laid down here. This is very important in our list of dispensations because this is the Dispensation of the Meridian of Times, the most important of them all. He tells them, as did Enoch, about the three times of wickedness and vengeance. First, what will become of the Jews; what will become of the Christians; and then what will come in the next dispensation. He talks about the Restoration and what is going to happen then, about our own dispensation. So it brings us right down to date.

So we begin with verses 1-20, and they deal with the end of Jerusalem (what is going to happen to the Jews, the fate of them). But notice the verses are different here. Our verse 2 is verse 1, and I have underlined here in red all the words that are not found in our text of Matthew, which makes a great deal of difference. They are hollow without them, and they become extremely perplexing. But when you realize what he is talking about in this first verse, it makes sense. He says, you will never see me again. This is the last you will see me until I come again. All the Greek text says is, "I will not come again until you say, Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." What did he mean by that? "For I say unto you that you shall not see me henceforth and know that I am he of whom it is written by the prophets [they rejected him], until you shall say: Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord, in the clouds of heaven, and all the holy angels with him. Then understood his disciples that he should come again on the earth after he was glorified and crowned on the right hand of God." (Joseph Smith 1:1). In the Christian record in the New Testament he appears 27 times after the resurrection. The resurrection wasn't the last time he appeared. But when he appears to the Nephites, he is accompanied by angels. In 3 Nephi 17:24, he appears accompanied. But they didn't like "until I come again," so they just rubbed that part out because they didn't believe he would come again. St. Augustine said, To think he would come again is an insult to the church, because after all, didn't he come and found it? Where are we if we need him to come again? Until very recently (now everybody is talking about it), they considered the idea of Restoration or restoring the gospel quite insulting. They would say, "Don't we have the gospel? Wasn't it given to us?"

So we start out: "And Jesus went out and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to him, . . ." They said, What about the buildings? As they went through the temple, they commented. There was a lot of building activity going on at that time. They were asking about what was going to happen here. "Master, show concerning the buildings of the temple, as thou hast said—They shall be thrown down, and left unto you desolate." That's not in the King James, that part. "And Jesus said unto them: See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you there shall not be . . . [that's the King James]" But here he says, "See ye not all these things, and do ye not understand them? [as it was in all the prophets] Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here, upon this temple [that's what they are talking about specifically; that being left

|p4

out in the third verse made argument as to what he was talking about], one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." (Joseph Smith 1:3) And this fourth verse is very important. It says, "And Jesus left them, and went upon the Mount of Olives." Somehow puzzlingly, the next verse in the King James says that they came to him when he was on the Mount of Olives. Well, they were just leaving the temple with this conversation. But here it says that they came to him when he was on the Mount of Olives, and they came to him (as it says here) privately. Each one wanted to know for himself. They are puzzled by it. What's really going to happen? Will you please tell us? Can you let us know? "Tell us when shall these things be which thou hast said concerning the destruction of the temple, and the Jews; . . . [fourth verse]" This is the first destruction he is talking about after his own time, the destruction of the temple and the Jews. Notice that "temple and the Jews" is not in the King James version. ". . . and what is the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world, . . ."

Now the end of the world is mentioned three times here, and each time it specifies what it means by the end of the world. The King James simply says "end of the world." Well, you say, that's the end of everything. Everything just passes away or is vaporized. There's no universe; there's nothing. No, that's not it at all. As it says here, ". . . and of the end of the world, or the destruction of the wicked, which is the end of the world?" That's what we mean by it. That is the perennial question. They are always asking that, right through the Middles Ages. The year 1,000 became a year of great panic because they said it's the end of the world; all things will end. Time and again that has appeared, but especially in the year 1,000. A Romanian scholar wrote a book on that, on the year 1,000 (what was his name?). But in the English Chronicles, the year 1,000 was a time of panic and alarm because they thought everything would come to an end. But what do you mean by the end of the world? This is what you mean: the destruction of the wicked, which is the end of the world. And then this comes in. He is going to give it in chronological order. Again, it is very important for him to say, "Take heed that no man deceive you," because this subject was more argued about than any other subject throughout the centuries to follow. When is the end of the world? When is the Lord coming? Just what's going on here? So the Lord says, you must get this straight; it's very important. What is given in Matthew here is a very confused document that makes nothing clear, so people decide they'll just leave that alone. But "take heed that no man deceive you."

Now it comes in chronological order. First, "For many shall come in my name, saying—I am Christ—and shall deceive many;" Now this is Christ, the Messiah. Other false Messiahs came as Christ immediately after Christ and during this very time. This is what the Jews do to the apostles: "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you, and ye shall be hated of all nations, for my name's sake." This is the seventh verse here, but it is the ninth verse in the King James Version. The verses are going to be moved around here. They shall say, I am the Messiah and deceive many. Well, who came? There was Hanan ha-Nehba, which means "the hidden one." He had a career in Babylon as a clerk. He came to Jerusalem and ingratiated himself with the scribes and Pharisees, with the high authorities in the temple, etc. He started giving out that he was the hidden one, that he was Messiah. People started following

|p5

him, already at this time. And there was Elchasai and Honi who spent seventy years in a cave and gave out that he was the Messiah. Everyone was asking in that day, Josephus says, "Where is the holy one? When will he come?" Everyone was looking for him. Herod claimed to be the Messiah, as a matter of fact. Herod Agrippa claimed that very thing. Well, his brother Pheroris was the one who first put forth the claim that he was actually the Messiah, and he promoted a Persian by the name by Bagoas who was a Carian eunuch who claimed to be the Messiah. Brother Welch has my two big volumes of Eisler on that subject. Robert Eisler wrote a huge work on this—all the false Messiahs in the time of Christ. The woods were crawling with them. It was no crime to claim that you were the Messiah at the time of the Passover, because who would know which was? When the Messiah came, he was not going to be recognized by many. So it was no crime for the Lord to say he was the King of the Jews. Many people claimed that and got away with it.

This is the condition you find in Josephus, what follows immediately after the crucifixion. It becomes all hell, just like it is in the Middle East today. "And then they shall be offended, and shall betray one another;" Everyone becomes offended here. Here we have a blank, blank, blank. "And then many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many;" This is what we were talking about, and they did in this time of stress and hysteria. "And because iniquity shall abound [what happens? the usual reaction], the love of many shall wax cold;" It's everyone out for himself, and everyone is desperate. Iniquity abounds, and the love of many waxes cold. "But he that remaineth steadfast and is not overcome, the same shall be saved." Again, "remaineth steadfast and is not overcome" is not in the King James. They will be martyred (they expect to be). Now, this is his instruction for the Jews, what is going to happen for the people living at that time. This is verse 15, and here it is verse 12: "When you, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel. . ." That's **khormah** or **khereba**. Khormah is abomination, desolation. The land desolation was the land that had been destroyed by an enemy and was cursed and could not be inhabited again. It figures in the **Milkhamah** in the **Battle Scroll** in the same way it does in the Book of Mormon, where they use desolation the same way. Bountiful is the other side of it. There was the **dar al-harb**. Harb is **hereb**. That means "desolation." It's also the Arabic word for war. And the **dar al-Islam**, the land which is saved, the land which is submitted. Those are the two parts of the world. You are either in **dar as-salam** and the Roman **ager pacatus**, the peaceful world, or **ager hosticus**, the hostile world.

The **abomination of desolations** is the one who is on the other side and who will take over. Time and again Israel was occupied, taken over completely, by the great powers and utterly wiped out. When it was destroyed, I mean they destroyed (almost as thoroughly as we can do it today). They couldn't touch our techniques, but they were thorough about it because they had plenty of time to work on it. Anyway, ". . . concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, then you shall stand in the holy place; whoso readeth let him understand [this is secret, you see]. Then let them who are in Judea . . ."

|p6

Notice specifically that's where Jerusalem was. These were the Jews; this was the kingdom of Judea. Every time Jerusalem is seized, what do they do? The place is surrounded by hundreds and thousands of caves and mountains. The deep gorges there, that's where the Dead Sea Scrolls were found in several hundred caves. You notice those gorges—the Wadi Hever, Nahal Hever and Qumran, all those places. The huge cave, the Muraba'at cave, in which so many documents were found is quite near Jerusalem. Nobody even knew it was there, and it was packed with documents. All these things had been so near to Jerusalem all this time and nobody knew about it. Well, you flee to the caves is what you do. It's the safe thing to do, and you hide out until it gets over, just as Lot did when he escaped from Sodom and Gomorrah at that time of great destruction. "Then let them who are in Judea flee into the mountains;" And when you are on the housetops, you flee, but this time you don't return to take anything with you. You are not coming back this time.

We have some wonderful letters. Nahal Hever is right behind En-gedi. The gorge steeper than Rock Canyon on the sides. Barefoot Arabs climb up the cliffs there and discover these caves full of documents (the Cave of Records is up there) of the time the people left Jerusalem. It was the destruction at the time of Christ. They went up there, hid out there, and died in the caves (they couldn't get out). The Romans camped on the hills above them and watched everything they did from the opposite side of the valley, didn't make any effort to get to them. They tried to get out by night down these very dangerous paths, etc. They buried their records deep in the dust in that cave, hundreds of documents describing that time. One is particularly interesting because it's a deed to a farm owned by a man called **Alma**, the son of Judah. We've always laughed at that name before, but this man's name was Alma, the son of Judah (and there is that deed). The first thing you see on your left-hand side as you enter in the house of records there, the Shrine of the Scrolls, with a light behind it shining through the parchment is this deed to a farm owned by Alma, the son of Judah. They left all their farms and everything. One very rich woman thought she would make it to Egypt. They were trying to get out the same as in the Book of Mormon, fleeing to Egypt in the time of Lehi. They couldn't make it; they died up there. A tremendous tragedy was going on, and the records are very moving.

So this is what's going to happen. Don't return to take anything out of your house. Don't go back for a watermelon; it won't do you any good. And if you are in the field, don't turn back at all because there is no point to going back. Don't go back to town once the city has been taken; it's not going to be freed again. "Neither let him who is in the field return back to take his clothes; [just go]." This sounds like a cry of woe and a threat (even gloating) but it isn't; it's a fair warning. The Lord is telling them ahead of time. "And wo unto them that are with child, and unto them that give suck in those days;" Make sure you won't have to leave in a time of pregnancy. Make sure you don't have to be there in the same way. "Therefore, pray ye the Lord that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day;" Arrange things so that you won't have to flee in winter. Look forward to it, but I'm giving a fair warning. It's no time for pregnancies and no time for winter. It's giving a fair warning so you can make your proper arrangements and prepare. But this is the way you do. You do what the Jews have

|p7
always done.

Incidentally, these caves with the scrolls go clear back, some of them, to the first kingdom of Egypt. They have been hiding out in those caves for three thousand years. Every time it was invaded, they would go to these caves. Fleeing to the mountains is what they did (it was routine). So that's what the Lord tells them to do now, but don't come back this time. This is the worst that has ever happened or ever will happen to the Jews. They became a non-people for two thousand years after that. They became nothing. They were completely dissolved. "For then, in those days, shall be great tribulation on the Jews, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem [notice he's is talking about that destruction, the destruction that's to take place at that time, not the apostasy], such as was not before sent upon Israel of God since the beginning of their kingdom [all this is supplied by Joseph Smith and is very necessary to have] until this time; no, nor ever shall be sent again upon Israel." It lasted for two thousand years. It says here in verse 19, "All things which have befallen them are only the beginning of the sorrows which shall come upon them." The King James simply says, "These are only the beginning of sorrows." It was. The fall of Jerusalem, the driving out of the Jews, was to go on in sustained misery for the next two thousand years. They had no citizenship, no rights anywhere (pogroms and everything else everywhere all the time). So this was the worst. There could never be anything worse than that.

Why didn't it wipe the Jews out? It so very nearly did. Look at the Holocaust. That wasn't the only holocaust; there were many of them. In 1648 there was a tremendous holocaust under the Polish Hetman Shmielnitski. He was really not Polish; he tried to overthrow the Polish government. But he wiped out the Jews of Poland in the great pogrom of 1648. Why weren't they wiped out? He says just for this reason. They would have been He says. "And except those days should be shortened, there should none of their flesh be saved [again, you notice Joseph Smith adds very valuable notes here; no, the Jews wouldn't survive unless their captivity was shortened]; but for the elect's sake [for the righteous among them], according to the covenant, those days shall be shortened." The King James says only, ". . . for the elect's sake, those days shall be shortened." But it's because of the covenant He made with the fathers.

For example, in the Book of Enoch he covenanted with Noah that his descendants should be on earth until the end. And he makes it very clear in verse 21. This looks rather puzzling because this stands in the King James this way: "Behold, these things I have spoken unto you concerning the Jews [that's what I'm talking about now, the Jews]; and again, after the tribulation of those days which shall come upon Jerusalem [he's talking about that particular one], if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe him not;" The Christians are in for it now. Then there would be false Christs come, and they were a dime a dozen. Of course, this is the whole Gnostic movement. The whole second century is the century of heresy, and Irenaeus lists some 88 different heresies (Gnostic and otherwise) led by men like Valentinus and Marcus who pretended to be the Messiah.

Simon Magus, one of the great Gnostics, loses his temper in the **Clementine Recognitions** and claims, "I am Christ; I am the creator of the world." Simon Magus appears in the New Testament and argues with Peter. So as it says here, ". . . if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe him not; For in those days there shall also arise false Christs, . . ." Note, he has talked about false Messiahs before among the Jews (using the same word for both). There would be false Messiahs and Christs among the Jews, and false Christs also after that (which is what happened). "For in those days there shall also arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, . . ." Oh, they were good at that—Marcus and Apollonius, for example. Fire breathing; he had sulphur in a walnut and things like that, and special magic tricks. One of his great ones was turning water to wine (or turning it to blood) and back to water again. It was a well-known magician's trick. He would pour out the white liquid, and then it would turn red. It was a transformation, a miracle, etc. They were doing those things right in the time of the apostles. You can get those stories in Irenaeus. ". . . false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if possible, they shall deceive the very elect, who are the elect according to the covenant. Behold, I speak these things unto you for the elect's sake; . . ." It's to encourage them. This is why because this is not good news. Here the Lord has come. He has brought the glad message. He has founded the church, etc. Why should things go bad? Why doesn't anything turn out happily? Why doesn't this have a happy ending? He says, I don't want you to be discouraged. I'm telling you these things ahead of time so that you won't be upset when they happen and say, well, it's false, and leave the church. People expect sudden blessings now. ". . . you also shall hear of wars, and rumor of wars; see that ye be not troubled, for all I have told you must come to pass; but the end is not yet." So don't let it upset you; expect the wars, etc., and the end isn't yet.

This is very important because this is a touch that didn't come out until 1948 when they discovered desert sectaries crawling all over the place with the Dead Sea Scrolls. These sectaries would go out in the time of John the Baptist, and in the time of Christ they were there, numbers of them: the Damascus Covenanters, the Qumran communities, **Raqim**—people all over the place that would form these conventicles waiting for the Lord to come and their leaders would claim to be Messiahs. It says here, "Wherefore, if they shall say unto you: Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: . . ." And that's what they did; the Jews weren't allowed to stay in Jerusalem after the year 70 A.D. After the year 130 no Jew was allowed to go there at all. So they went to Pella in the desert (a very interesting place to visit) in Jordan, and they made that their capital. They went to all these desert places, but he said, Don't go into the desert; you're not going to find the church out there. You won't find it anywhere. If anyone says he's the Christ, don't believe him. They are false Christs. There won't be anyone qualified. "Behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not;" Again, these secret conventicles that met in Jerusalem and elsewhere in secret. If they didn't flee to the desert, they could hide out. There is the famous rescript of the emperor Hadrian on such conventicles in Asia Minor. He says, don't believe it.

|p9

If you are looking for the gospel, this is what to look for. This is what will be found. And then we come to the Restoration here. This is how it is going to be: "For as the light of the morning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, and covereth the whole earth [this is added and is very important] so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." The gospel will spread in this manner, as the sun comes. Gradually and imperceptibly it spreads, but rapidly. I'm going to give you a parable how it will be, he says. This is the one that puzzles so many people because it sounds so unpleasant to compare the elect gathering in the Church to a carcass, a rotting corpse in the desert. But the purpose of every image, or parable, or metaphor is to emphasize one particular point right across the way. In verse 47 he says that the Lord will come as a thief in the night. Does that mean he is going to come to rob people, that he is going to come over the wall, that he is going to be sneaky, that he is going to be dishonest? Of course not. It means he will come in the manner that a thief comes and takes you by surprise when you are not expecting it. In that sense he will come, and in that sense only. We get the same thing here. Here he says, "And now I show unto you a parable. Behold, wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together;" That's all the New Testament says. What do you mean, wheresoever the carcass is, there the eagles will be gathered together? That isn't a pleasant image. So we have to be told here: "so likewise shall mine elect be gathered from the four quarters of the earth."

What happens when there is a carcass in the desert, or anywhere else? The eagles come, or the vultures, or the buzzards (whatever they are going to be) from all directions. All of a sudden they appear out of nowhere. It's quite miraculous to see. How do they know? How can they see? Their eyesight is absolutely fabulous. From miles away you see the specks coming, and where the carcass is they gather in a mysterious way from all directions (in a way that can't be explained). This is the way the Saints are going to be gathered in the last days. First, the light breaks in the East. We have that hymn, "The Morning Breaks, the Shadows Flee." The light breaks in the East in that manner. It doesn't necessarily have to be the East. Oh how they argued about that East business. What do you mean about the East? Did it come from the Orient? No, not necessarily, I'm talking about how the light begins. It always begins in the East in the dawn. That's the way it is. It spreads in that manner, it says, and covereth the whole West. "For as the light of the morning cometh out of the east," that's the manner in which these things will take place. Then the people will be gathered together to Zion. How? In the same miraculous manner in which the eagles are gathered together to an object nobody else can see. So likewise shall they be gathered. But it will be a bad time, unfortunately. Now wait a minute. Verses 1-20 are the end of Jerusalem; verses 20-25 are the fate of the Christians and the sectaries. The sectaries are those in the desert and those in the secret conventicles. They were very common.

Now we come to verses 26 and 27 describing their reformation in this metaphor, this parable—emphasizing the one point, the way in which it comes, the way in which it spreads, the way in which the gathering takes place, and the circumstances under which they take place (which are very unpleasant, of course). Verses 28-31 describe the bad times of the Restoration,

|p10

the times we live in, the time of the gospel being restored. "And they shall hear of wars, and rumors of wars." And again, it's important that Joseph Smith adds, don't let these wars and rumors of wars make you think that the Lord has failed in his purposes, or that the purpose in restoring this glorious work is just to lead to world into a bathos of war and trouble. No, "Behold I speak for mine elect's sake; for nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom and against kingdom; there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places."

Did you notice that in the year 1985 ten thousand children a day died of hunger in Africa? That's real famine; we've never heard of anything like that. All the troubles and the earthquakes are piling up. It has happened this week: three earthquakes in San Francisco, just like that. Statistically, they have kept a chart of frequency over in the Geology Department here, and they are just piling up at an alarming rate. And again because of iniquity; we are getting plenty of that. Notice again, this is the second time. It happened in those ancient times; now it is happening in the final times, both among the Christians and the Jews. "And again, because iniquity shall abound [for that reason], the love of many shall wax cold; . . ." A wicked person doesn't have true love in him—a person who is lecherous, vile, evil, dishonest, etc. Naturally, his love waxes cold. He can't deal with people the way he does and live with himself, unless he takes a very cool, calm, and detached view of everything. ". . . but he that shall not be overcome, the same shall be saved." That's important: he that shall not be overcome by this wickedness shall be saved. "And again this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come, or the destruction of the wicked; . . ." But not yet, you see. The gospel has to be preached to all the world. Well, it hasn't quite yet.

Then we have the **Khormah**. Then we have the desolation again. "And again shall the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, be fulfilled." These verses are all different numbers from those you find in the King James. "And immediately after the tribulation of those days [ah, after the big bump; after we get over to the other side of the bang, then what happens?]," After the tribulation of those days, then is going to happen this phenomena: "the sun shall be darkened [what would darken the sun, except something in the atmosphere?] and the moon shall not give her light [the moon is blocked out entirely by something in the atmosphere; I'll let you guess what] and the stars shall fall from the heaven [then meteoric showers and the like; a star is any shining object in the sky] and the powers of heaven shall be shaken." This looks something like nuclear winter if you want to look at it that way. "Verily, I say unto you, this generation, in which these things shall be shown forth [they come rather close together], shall not pass away until all I have told you shall be fulfilled." There will be a post-nuke age then. "Although, the days will come, that heaven and earth shall pass away; yet my words shall not pass away, but all shall be fulfilled." But this isn't the time when heaven and earth shall pass away. He is talking about something else there.

So we have the Restoration and then the bad times, verses 28-31. Then 31-37, the great destruction again with the fearful process (D&C Section 88) by which this takes place.

|p11

These things are described in Section 88 in the same vivid language, very fully. That's a good one to look up. "And, as I said before, after the tribulation of those days, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken, then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; . . ." This is world affliction. The whole earth is smitten now. There has never been a war or destruction like that. All the tribes of the earth, the inhabitants, wherever they are, will all be mourning. ". . . and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." But notice, the Son of Man, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn. This is something that covers the whole earth. The Book of Mormon says that. There will be a vapor of smoke, and it shall cover the earth. These things are going to happen; we are determined on it right now. "And whoso treasureth up my word, shall not be deceived, for the Son of Man shall come, . . ." People will say, Well, he is not coming. These times are too terrible. We're having no good news at all. ". . . and he shall send his angels before him with the great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together the remainder of his elect from the four winds [the remainder is added there, just like the gathering to the carcass] from one end of heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig tree—. . ."

Now, here again, this is important, verses 38-40. How about the timing of this thing? He says there are no clocks. There are no stop watches, but there are indicators. In economics you have market indicators. You can't be specific; you can't set figures, etc. But there are indicators of which way the market will go. In the same way, the Lord says, I will give you indicators how you can know where you stand in this thing and how things are going. But don't try to time it because that's dangerous, as he tells us later here. If you say, I know exactly when he is going to come, then we can enjoy ourselves until ten minutes before, and then we will be ready. If we know the general is coming to inspect, we can clean up the barracks and make everything perfect before he comes. It's the surprise inspection that catches you as you really are. That's what the Lord is going to do. It says here he is going to come as a thief in the night and catch you the way you really are. So don't try to prepare for this.

And this is very important when he talks about this destruction. "So likewise, mine elect, when they shall see all these things, they shall know that he is near, even at the doors [Mark 13 here]; But of that day, and hour, no one knoweth [no calendar or clock is going to do you any good; don't try to predict it that way] no, not the angels of God in heaven, but my Father only [Luke 17:22 there]." But business as usual is the theme now. Things may be going pretty well as far as that goes. "But as it was in the days of Noah [this is the way it went], so it shall be also at the coming of the Son of Man; . . ." In Luke 17:23 and following, he adds another thing. He says they were buying and selling; they were giving in marriage; they were eating and drinking. All the normal activities of life were going on; it was business as usual. Then the Flood came and hit them like that. That's the way it is going to be, so you can't tell by those signs, he says (but as it was in the days of Noah). ". . . for until the day that Noah entered into the ark they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage [Luke says buying and selling]

|p12

And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. Then shall be fulfilled that which is written, that in the last days, . . ." How do you prepare for this? How did he tell the Jews to prepare? He says flee to the mountains, hide in the caves (they got out that way). But don't go back to Jerusalem. Well, that's exactly the way it happened. What do we do now? How do you prepare for this? Do you hide in a cave? Do you build yourself shelter? The Lord says it's not going to do you any good at all. That is not the way you prepare this time, he says. As it is written, ". . . two shall be in the field, the one shall be taken, and the other left;" There are not survival schemes. Which one? They are equally prepared or equally expecting. The New Testament says two women shall be grinding at the mill (two women in the kitchen), one is taken and the other is spared. How can you figure that? They are side by side, the two women. It happens that way in war time too. You never know who. "And what I say unto one, I say unto all men; . . ." So what can you do about it? Don't prepare ahead of time and say, I'm going to be perfectly safe. I've got a plan that will make me perfectly safe. No, two can be together in the same situation. One is taken and the other is spared, and there is no way they can calculate which one it will be.

But there is a way. He says, I'm going to tell you what you should do. This is the plan of procedure. This is the direction. No strategies for survival. They are not going to do you any good, but from 46-54 he is going to tell us what should be done. Instructions for the Saints here: First of all, you watch. You act as if the Lord were coming all the time. If the barracks are in spic and span condition all the time, then you don't worry about inspection. ". . . watch, therefore, for you know not at what hour your Lord doth come." There is nothing you can do about that. "But know this, if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to have been broken up, but would have been ready."

All right, if you knew when the Lord was coming (you had been watching), you would make special preparations to receive him. But since you don't know, the only thing to do is to be prepared all the time as if he were coming any moment, tomorrow. That's what he says because he will come as a thief in the night. "Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." The only answer is to be ready all the time. Well then how are you ready all the time? In verse 49 he says, "Who, then, is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?" Notice he has made them ruler over his house. The ruler is supposed to take care of the rest of the household. He is the **Dominus**; he is the lord. That's what both those words mean. **Dominus** means lord of the house, and **hlafweard** means keeper of the loaf. So he says the same thing here. The servant who has been appointed must be responsible and take care toward his fellowman. "Blessed is that servant whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing; and verily I say unto you, he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But if that evil servant shall say in his heart: [here it is, see] My lord delayeth his coming [He is not coming; I'm safe

|p13

for quite a while at least], . . ." See, if you knew when he was coming, you could say, "My lord delayeth his coming." This is what is likely: He will begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink and be drunken and take advantage of them, be cruel and greedy and all the things that people are when they don't expect the Lord to really be coming for quite a while. Remember in the Book of Mormon, He will beat us with a few stripes and then everything will be all right. "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of." He is going to be surprised.

But this is what you are supposed to do: Behave toward your fellowmen in a manner the Lord would have you if he were here himself in Zion. What we should be like in Zion (as you get in that writing of President Kimball)? I have some copies for any who didn't get them. (I'm going to give the subject now for the final. Since it's April 11, it will give you ten days to think about it. I think it's a good subject; we'll see.) "And shall cut him asunder, and shall appoint him his portion with the hypocrites [there are the hypocrites again]; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Now this is important: notice the last verse. This is not the end of the world as people conceive it. "And thus cometh the end of the wicked, according to the prophecy of Moses, saying: They shall be cut off from among the people; but the end of the earth [now he uses a geological, cosmological, scientific term] is not yet, but by and by." That's not the end of the earth or the planet. This isn't the time when the earth will be vaporized and the heavens rolled up as a scroll. That's another thing. When does that come? That doesn't concern you now, as he tells Moses, but by and by. "And thus cometh the end of the wicked, according to the prophecy of Moses, saying: They shall be cut off from among the people; but the end of the earth is not yet, . . ." We are not talking about that at all. That is by and by, but these are the ends that will concern you (and this is the end that concerns us).

Next time we will review the whole thing. Still I think it would give us more time to think about it if we consider this. Some have been worried about assignments here. You notice I've passed over the books of the Pearl of Great Price rather lightly—the assignment being for you to read them more carefully along the lines indicated. It's a short enough book, after all. It's a short book but a great one, and you are justified in spending a lot of time with it. That's a standing assignment. I don't know that any more should be necessary. Notice, I have deliberately omitted the most important book of all, with President Kimball's updating—the Joseph Smith story, the last one of the lot, the last of the dispensations. That's 156 years ago now. What's happened? Well, President Kimball is bringing us to date on the present situation. So I deliberately left that out because I have been saving that for the big assignment. This is it, the essay due on April 11 by 6:00 p.m. This is the subject, and the essay will be judged as an essay, of course. I think the subject is glaringly obvious in view of that, and it is how does the Pearl of Great Price testify to the mission of Joseph Smith? You notice it can be philosophically, historically, literary, religious, documentary, scientific (all those things about the creation). How does the Pearl of Great Price testify to the mission of Joseph Smith?

|p14

Remember, this is the last book in the Pearl of Great Price? Do they all belong together in the same book? How do they support each other? There are so many points of view here. There are so many angles from which you can treat this thing that you should take some time to think about it. Read through the Pearl of Great Price if you've never read it before and ask yourself—.

The Lord comes and gives us the three dispensations (the times of wickedness and vengeance) just as it had been put down in the days of Enoch. He tells us about that time of wickedness and vengeance; then the time against the Christians, the long Apostasy. First, the destruction of Jerusalem (that horrible thing) then the Apostasy, then the Restoration. Remember, this was given at a very early time. It doesn't say, well, now the gospel is restored; this time it will be different. This time everything is going to be beautiful because the gospel is restored and the Prophet Joseph has come. It's worse than ever. That's a remarkable thing, isn't it? When was this given? This is the 1838 one, but in 1969 they discovered one much older than this written in the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams, which the Prophet dictated when he was 26 years old. It is a much better account than this one. This one is the one they chose to publish because they didn't have that one. That one wasn't discovered until 1969. That was printed in the *BYU Studies* in the spring of 1969 along with all the other versions, five different versions of the first vision. It's very important to fill out the picture there. You can still get that 1969 issue. It is gray with a picture of Joseph Smith on the front of it. But this is the theme of the whole thing. This would answer everything else. As far as the big question is concerned, where do we find our comfort? What joy is there in this? What is the reassurance of the gospel? And the big question we were talking about all the time in the earlier part was, what's hereafter? What's coming? Are we going into the dark? If anyone answered that, it was Joseph Smith. Did he answer it? Does this give us reason for confidence in his mission? You think about that for writing an essay on it, and then the next time we can sort of review the course.

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Hugh Nibley, Lecture 26

Here is a very important statement. It pretty well sums up everything I have been trying to talk about. It's quite a recent one too, 1983. There's a large handbook titled **Prehistoric Germanic Europe** that begins way back with the Aurignacian, which is Upper Paleolithic, which is also Upper Pleistocene. One is paleontology; the other is geology. The Willendorf Figurine goes back older than that. It's the period roughly from 27,000 B.C. on (not 2700, 27,000 B.C. on). It's goes right through the whole thing. It's very well documented, very full. It goes through the various periods, and it covers all of Europe too. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands of artifacts now from those ancient times, and this is the very interesting conclusion these people draw at the end of their book. They go through the works. It's very good if you want illustrations and reproductions.

"From the material evidence surveyed, culture appears to be a collective attempt at providing answers to the questions posed by man . . ." About what? About his economic survival; about his dominance; about sex, or something like that? Not at all. That's not what keeps it going at all. Of course, we, being a materialistic society, have always given a materialistic interpretation of it. Naturally, what primitive man was after was to save his life, to avoid wild beasts, to bash his neighbor over the head and all this sort of thing (always for survival). That was always the first rule. But that isn't the point at all, as he says here. From all this evidence culture appears as what? Not from that but from a "collective attempt to provide answers to the questions about his position in this life and the next life." That's the thing.

"As long as a distinct set of answers was satisfactory, the distinctive aspects of the culture remained constant and offered that degree of continuity which made for stability." You had a stable, continuous society as long as they had something they would believe in regarding this life and the next life. Of course, this is the age of sophistication, and science is supposed to abolish those things. That's exactly what you get in Lucretius and the others. As long as they had that, they had continuity and stability. "It appears, on the other hand, that experiment, innovation and change [they are necessary; they are forced on them] are a response to inadequacy or outright failure in some sector of the culture's general view of the world."

Can you answer the big question? (You know what that is; it's important for the final.) As long as they have some answer to that that satisfies them in any degree, the society can survive. And this talks about world civilization because it goes the same way throughout the whole world all the time. It's not localized. These ancient civilizations (primitives) were not localized. You find the same culture in most areas which we associate with Neanderthal. You find it clear from China to Solo Man. You find it in Choukoutien. You find it in Ireland. You find it

everywhere, Heidelberg man and the rest. But they are world civilizations and they hold their coherency. They have dispensations as long as a dispensation is going. But when people lose their faith and don't have any particular plan, then they wander and stray off in all possible directions. It's the answer to that question that keeps you on an even keel. Otherwise, you are simply seeking for power and gain and influence or whatever you can get in the moment here.

Well, now this takes us to Joseph Smith. This is that account I was talking about of the First Vision in the Spring 1969 issue of *BYU Studies*, which they tell me you can still get at the Bookstore. It gives five different versions. This is the most important, the one of 1831-32. They have reproduced it here in the handwriting of Frederick G. Williams. This is the part I want to point out about the First Vision. The Wentworth Letter is also included here. We have our own version in our Pearl of Great Price, the last chapter and the most important. It ties everything together. The spelling and punctuation are standardized in the following quotation from Joseph Smith's First Vision: "At about the age of twelve years, my mind became seriously impressed. . ." Notice, he was very precocious, and all the accounts of his enemies from the time tell the same story. I collected a lot of them years ago in a book called *The Myth Makers*, all the various accounts of people who knew Joseph Smith (his enemies). There's a very good collection from those who were not his enemies by Hyrum Andrus. It's called *They Knew the Prophet*. You can get that; it's very good. There are 150 accounts of people from journals, etc., not written in response to anything, just their personal reflections in their lives about Joseph Smith and their connections and their knowing him. It's a very remarkable collection of documents. The other one is the other side. Anyway, they all tell this, that when he was very young, he was always thinking about things, asking questions about things. He was seen often walking in the woods talking to himself, etc. They thought that was, as Harding says, "an evil, groveling, self-centered nature." He was planning more evil tricks as he wandered around talking and feeling people out with questions.

"At about the age of twelve years, my mind became seriously impressed with regard to all important concerns for the welfare of my immortal soul which led me to searching the scriptures believing, as I was taught, that they contained the word of God. Thus applying myself to them and my intimate acquaintance with those of different denominations [and he did go around and converse with all the ministers] led me to marvel exceedingly for I discovered that they did not adorn their profession by a holy walk and Godly conversation agreeable to what I found contained in the sacred depository. This was a grief to my soul. Thus from the age of twelve years to fifteen I pondered many things in my heart concerning the situation of the world [this is the Abraham story too, as you notice] of mankind, the contentions and divisions, and the wickedness and abominations and darkness. . ." What, in upstate New York in the 1820s? This was the condition of the world? What would he know about a wicked world? Well, he knew all right. You might say, what a very negative, sour nature, but Joseph Smith was notorious for his sunny, cheerful, optimistic nature. He was everybody's friend. His worst enemy said he never heard him say an unkind thing about anyone (very interesting).

|p3

He said, Oh, he told all sorts of lies, exaggerations, deceptions, everything else, but he never said an unkind thing about anyone. With all the provocation he had, imagine that. Well, that would be the acid test as far as I'm concerned. He goes on here, ". . . which pervade the minds of mankind. My mind became exceedingly distressed for I became convinced of my sins, and by searching the scriptures I found that mankind did not come unto the Lord, but that they had apostatized . . ." You know, there's no mention of the Apostasy in the Articles of Faith. It's not necessary. The Article of Faith is an assertion of positive doctrines, the things we believe in, not the fact that other people are astray and wrong. It says that these things are true; then everybody else must be wrong. You don't have to include that as an Article of Faith, but he was aware of it, "that they had apostatized from the true and living faith, and there was no society or denomination that built upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ as recorded in the New Testament. And I felt to mourn for my own sins and for the sins of the world, for I learned in the scriptures that God was the same yesterday, today and forever, and no respecter of persons for he was God."

Now he describes the world which God has given us (this we get a lot of in the Pearl of Great Price) and then the world which men have made—what men have made of the world that God has given us. He looked around the world in upstate New York, a sublimely beautiful part of the country. It was gorgeous then, you can be sure. And also notice the concern with cosmology. He's talking about sun, moon and stars here. ". . . I looked upon the sun, the glorious luminary of the earth, and also the moon, rolling in their majesty through the heavens, and also the stars shining in their courses, and the earth also upon which I stood, and the beasts of the field, and the fowls of heaven, and the fish of the waters, and also man walking forth upon the face of the earth in majesty and in strength of beauty, whose power and intelligence in governing the things are so exceeding great and marvelous, even in the likeness of Him who created him. And when I considered upon these things my heart exclaimed, well hath the wise man said, 'It is a fool that saith in his heart there is no God.' My heart exclaimed, all these things bear testimony and bespeak an omnipotent and omnipresent power who maketh laws and decreeth and bindeth all things in their bounds, who filleth eternity, who was and is and will be from all eternity to eternity . . ." The interesting thing is that this is the contrast to the world which men had made (when I looked upon the situation of mankind, the contentions, the division, the wickedness, the abominations, the darkness). They were mobbing and misbehaving at this time badly.

We have a very interesting account from a woman revivalist. She preached in England and in New England, especially around this part, on the Geneva road and near Palmyra. The ministers gave her a bad time. Nancy Towle was her name, and they ~~h~~icked her around. These people weren't very nice if you disagreed with them. The division, wickedness, abomination and the contrast with that—the stars, the glorious setting in which we are placed here—all these things bear testimony. And then ". . . when I considered these things and that that being seeketh such to worship him as worship him in spirit and truth [he wants to be worshipped] therefore, I cried unto the Lord for mercy for there was none else to whom I could go . . ."

|p4

The situation of Abraham, you see. When he starts out, the world has stopped dead center. Who can ever get it moving again? There must be a cry below before there can be an answer above (a stirring below, as the **Talmud** says). And the same way with the table. You do not ask for a blessing on an empty table. You set the table, then ask for the blessing. ". . . there was none else to whom I could go and obtain mercy, and the Lord heard my cry in the wilderness. While in the attitude of calling upon the Lord in the 16th year of my age [changes the age] a pillar of light above the brightness of the sun at noon day came down from above and rested upon me, and I was filled with the spirit of God. And the Lord opened the heavens upon me, and I saw the Lord and he spake to me saying [this is a direct quote; it's an indirect quotation in the other account—he told me; he said to me, etc.—but this is what the Lord said, and it actually quotes Him here] . . . saying, 'Joseph, my son, thy sins are forgiven thee. Go thy way, walk in my statutes and keep my commandments. Behold I am the Lord of glory. I was crucified for the world that all those who believe on my name may have eternal life. Behold, the world lieth in sin at this time, and none doeth good, no not one. They have turned aside from the gospel, and they keep not my commandments. They draw near to me with their lips while their hearts are far from me. Mine anger is kindling against the inhabitants of the earth to visit them according to this ungodliness and to bring to pass that which hath been spoken by the mouth of the prophets and apostles. Behold and lo, I come quickly, as is written of me, in the cloud clothed in the glory of my Father'" And then Joseph says, "And my soul was filled with love [that was his reaction]. For many days I could rejoice with great joy [remember Lehi was so depressed; and after he saw the vision, then he rejoiced, even though the news they had was bad] and the Lord was with me, but I could find none who would believe the heavenly vision. . . ."

Nobody would believe him. This is the situation in a dispensation. But without the important answers to go by, as this book by Herbert Schutz says, any world civilization simply crumbles and dissolves. You remember what the poet Yeats says, "Things fall apart; the center cannot hold; mere anarchy is loosed upon the world." Things fall apart today. The center can't hold. Everything is dissolving. That's the only difference, you see. We don't have a central doctrine. We don't have the gospel to believe in. Well, now as to our question: How does the Pearl of Great Price testify to the mission of Joseph Smith? Notice, testify to it, not for it or against it. It can be either one. Remember, the Pearl of Great Price, especially the Book of Abraham, was taken for years and years (and still is) as the number one evidence against Joseph Smith, as overpoweringly strong evidence against him. We went into quite a "song and dance" about that in the *Improvement Era* back in 1968. We might as well mention some things here because this is relevant. We've overlooked this part of it.

In 1912 S.A.B. Mercer at Chicago spearheaded an attack which initiated with Franklin S. Spalding, the Episcopal bishop of Salt Lake City. Mercer was a 32-year-old minister who wanted to be an Egyptologist (oh, how he wanted to be!). He was never very good; in fact, he was terrible. We know because he sold us his library, his notes and all that sort of stuff. How ignorant the man was; it was just a laugh. But the point is he was to spearhead this

|p5

attack on Joseph Smith. In about 1953 (I had just come to BYU) he retired from Toronto. He collected a great Egyptian collection there, a library of books, and he offered to sell it to BYU for practically nothing. Tyler was our librarian then. He went back to Paris to see him and ask if he was kidding. No, he wanted the Mormons to have this library after this vicious attack on them. Harvard immediately offered four times the sum, but we got it. We have the Mercer collection here, which is the core of a very good Egyptian library, one of the few in the country that could really be used for advanced study. So he was in charge of this attack, and it was very carefully engineered. He sent the letters to a lot of Egyptologists. He got answers from eight very eminent ones. Sending the three facsimiles, he said, "This is what Joseph Smith says; is he right?" Instead, he should have said, What do these facsimiles denote? Well, none of them knew what they denoted. They just had one answer to give. Was Joseph Smith right in his interpretation? Well, all they had to do was say, "no." None of them believed that Abraham had ever lived. Now if you are going to say, Is this a true autobiography of Abraham and ask a man who firmly believes there never was an Abraham, what answer is he going to give you?

These are the people that tested it, and this is an amusing thing. The answers were very good actually; Brother Widtsoe, R.C. Webb and others answered back with some very pointed things showing that they disagreed among themselves, etc. But since that wasn't their particular field, these people naturally had a field day. Here's an editorial in the Church newspaper. They point out that there are some obvious contradictions and discrepancies in the views of the experts, and the Mormons might be at least permitted to ask for a stay of final judgment, as B. H. Roberts wrote then. He said, "These questions that depend on special scholarship are questions that require time and research, and the conclusions of the learned in such matters are not as unchangeable as they seem." *The New York Times* exploded when they read that. They had a big headline: **Mormons Revile Scholars and Scholarship**. They said, "The *Deseret Evening News* has spent its entire editorial page reviling scholars and scholarship." Just because they asked some perfectly natural questions that was reviling scholars and scholarship. It was pure authoritarianism, nothing else. These are the authorities. They used this, and then when the Church got the Joseph Smith documents in 1967, they brought all this up again (the big 1912 thing). They said these authorities were the ones; they said this that and the other. Two days after this, incidentally, the *Deseret News* showed the position the Church took then and still takes.

They were very much impressed because of the fact that as soon as the Church obtained the eleven fragments of the Joseph Smith papyri, it published them. They sent slicks around of every one of them. Without any comment or anything else, the Church made them available to everybody and asked anybody to make any comments they wanted to about it (the Egyptologists or anyone else). We have never argued with them. Well, that's exemplary; nobody ever does that in Egyptian. When you've got a document, you hug it to your bosom until you edit it, etc. and live for the next ten years on it. This was really impressive. But this is the policy the *Deseret News* takes. It says, "The Latter-day Saints court inquiry such as this. They want to know the truth and only the truth. There's no important issue that they are not glad to face

|p6

whether presented by friend or foe." Now in this testifying to the mission of Joseph Smith you can say there are things you find in the Pearl of Great Price that would show Joseph Smith must be faking or where he must be getting this, that or the other. But they thought they really had him dead to rights in this. Way back in 1845—that is very soon, you know, when you consider that the first attempt even to decipher it was 1838. This was only seven years later. They hadn't got to first base at that time, but this is what they say about Joseph Smith and the facsimiles in the Book of Abraham here: "Well, all these figures in the facsimiles are familiar and now understood. Joseph Smith in coming out with these things has confidently defied inevitable exposure. The Champollions of the Bibliotheque de Rei [of course, they got that absolutely wrong; there's no such a bibliotheque] and the British Museum have the subject well in hand. It's already apparent to the learned that the whole thing is too gross to bear patiently, too painful to laugh at." Just don't even consider it, the experts say, just brush it aside.

Then an interesting thing here. Mercer says quite frankly—this comes a little later here. We'll go into a lot of spiel about this. Well, that should have settled the matter with the authorities, but, of course, the Mormons were not convinced and would have done well to have done a little study on their own. In fact, Joseph Smith and Brigham Young both said (and Parley P. Pratt especially was strong on this): This is a signal that we should get going and do something on our own here. This is an invitation to look further. They pointed the way for Latter-day Saints to prepare themselves for just such eventualities, pleading with them to take heed of themselves and use their brains. I notice Brother Maxwell recently said that we can expect new documentary discoveries because they have been promised. They are part of the prophecies. "Even during the grim days of December 1844 the leaders of the Church advised the elders to get up schools that all might be taught in the branches of education and prepare themselves, that they at the least might be fully competent to correspond with the wise men of the world." But they neglected it because they were very busy with other things.

Now this Mercer headed this enterprise in 1912, and this was all revived and all republished by the Salt Lake Lithograph and Companies got up by the Tanners. They make a big thing of it. It's highly funded from various parts. Walters and people like that are still traveling around giving lectures on it and making a lot of money (not here, but in Arizona and back east). Night before last I met with four people from Denver. The pressure is really on there because they are building a temple there now. They make a big thing of it. Here Dr. Mercer frankly admits that he and the other scholars "did not seem to take the matter very seriously and devoted very little time to it indeed." Now they were supposed to pass their judgment on it. They said, "Well, it's just nonsense." But they didn't bother to read it because that's not necessary. You say Joe Smith, and that's all there is to it. You've tipped your hand and there's no argument. And then he says, "The haste was justified in the minds of the scholars by the simplicity of the task. Even less time could be expected. They probably felt as I did," says Mercer, "that their time was too valuable to spend on such scientific work as the Joseph Smith guesses." Whatever the reasons, they never intended to do any real work. They depended entirely on their credentials to get them through.

|p7

This is the sort of thing that has been going on for 150 years now, and we let them get away with it. But we have lots of evidence here.

We are talking incidentally about the subject here: How does the Pearl of Great Price testify to the mission of Joseph Smith? It's a subject that has very broad latitudes. You can write from many points of view. It's just how good the essay is. You can consider it from a doctrinal point view, historical, philosophical, literary, scientific; you name it. And there is internal evidence and external evidence. As Friedrich Blass says in his classic work on the criticism of documents to determine their antiquity (whether they are genuine or not), you rarely ever have to use any external evidence for the Book of Mormon, Pearl of Great Price or anything else. He's not talking about them, of course. He's talking about ancient documents in general, a massive volume on the subject. In the first place there's the fact that you have the document. You must give it the benefit of the doubt. That's the very first thing. But the point he makes here is that the evidence is internal. You rarely have to go outside of the internal evidence of the document itself. You don't need anything else. You don't have to refer to the time, to its setting, to anything else. Well, you know those things. They are important.

We haven't done anything at all as far as external evidence is concerned. We mentioned other sources for Enoch, other sources for Abraham. Some of them match. Which ones match? Which don't match? Well, that's a long story. You can take a lot of time on that. We haven't had time for that. We have been talking about the general thesis here. The thing I would be concerned with if I were writing this would be the internal evidence. How many books do we have? What do they pretend to be? What do they pretend to show forth? What kind of an accomplishment is this? Again, Brother Maxwell calls it an "Everest" for anyone who could set up a thing like that. What about a few mistakes and slips here and there? How do you know they are mistakes and slips, and all these other things? Well, we have the criticism. That's an interesting story. We go into a long thing, but we'd never bother to do it again.

We said we would have a review here. Well, here are the various lessons we have gone through (26 of them) and each one had a subject more or less, and they are connected more or less. Remember, the first lesson was what was the main concern of religion? This could be a perfectly legitimate question to write an essay for the final. What is the main concern of religion? That's indicated in the Pearl of Great Price. You could use the Pearl of Great Price as your text. Or, what is the main source of our religious knowledge? Where do we get it from and what's the type? We talked about definitions of religion and the like. What's the source of our knowledge? What serious defects are there in our knowledge, and what's the result of them? We made a big thing of this. In the religion of Israel, what's missing in the books? And in the religion of Christ, in Christianity? What's the evidence? How do you know these things were lost? What evidence do we have that these things were lost? We provided some of that. What has Joseph Smith restored? What does the Book of Mormon restore? What does the Pearl of Great Price restore?

|p8

This restores some very interesting things, and we talked a lot about them, beginning with the literal sense of things in the second lecture. Why was the literal sense of the scriptures rejected? Why would they do that? Why wouldn't they accept them as literal? What is the big question? We talked a lot about that. Remember Clement of Rome asking the big question wherever he went. How is it connected with other things? Remember, it is necessarily cosmological, deals with the creation of all things. But the main thing is what's going to happen to me? Where was I? Why does this big question overshadow all the others (that's the big one)? Can you give some examples, literary and historical, of the big question? Well, wherever you look you'll see it. Men are haunted wherever you go. Why are they behaving so desperately, so hysterically, so irrationally everywhere throughout the world today?

This takes us right back to our original thesis here from this recent survey of prehistoric Europe. As long as people have some satisfactory answer to the questions regarding the position in life and the next life, the society will keep going. People will go along and will not become desperate. The Egyptians had a pretty good answer to that, and this accounts for the unique stability of Egyptian society. You can see that. They never changed it; they never lost it. They were always naive and left the door open. They knew they didn't have the answer, but they felt they had enough tradition and they had enough evidence on hand to justify a grand jury and say, Yes, this thing is worth a test.

"Positivism" is the word invented by Auguste Comte in the middle of the nineteenth century. That is the positivism of science: what you see, what you hear, what you can feel—that's real and true, and all the rest is myth and superstition, and it is vicious. It's not a thing that you want at all. So positivism will not allow any of this. On the one hand you have the superstition of religion, and on the other hand you have the light of science. These things are absolutely as they are, and they are still very strong. A person like Carl Sagan is rabidly positivistic, and so is most of science. Remember that passage from C. P. Snow about the great physicist of his time, Rutherford. They were positivists, and they knew they had the answer. And they knew just as surely as they lived (just as surely as they knew Rutherford's atom) that they were all destined for annihilation and were going nowhere. When they were in public, they presented a brave front, but to themselves they were panicky. The dark night was over them. They had not only moments of doubt. "But men at times are sober. They think by fits and starts. And when they think, they fasten their hands upon their hearts." We don't escape that at all. It comes to everybody, strongly. It worried Darwin sick. He almost became a mystic in his last days. There is a very good book on that by Malraux. Well then, that was this one, this literalism that they got rid of. Why did they get rid of it? Joseph Smith brought it back. Then in the third lecture we talked about preexistence. This has to be part of the picture (it's central). We could ask this as the question for the final: Why is preexistence central to the discussion of religion? What is the present Christian and Jewish attitude to the teaching? Well, it is coming back, actually. But why were they against it? And what evidence is there for or against a preexistence?

|p9

I guess you can quote Wordsworth there, but we have better evidence for that. Plato's **anamnesis**; we mentioned that. Everything we know is a memory of what we learned before. We know what's right and wrong because it's implicit in us. **Anamnesis**, a memory of former times, and Zinzendoff "The Poem," etc. What was the early Christian view of it? Remember, we read that poem called **The Pearl**, how he leaves his heavenly home. He actually begins by saying, "In my first primeval childhood." He was raised by his parents in a palace. He came down here, got into trouble and went back. There was a welcome by the people back home.

Then the fourth and fifth lectures. If you have literal preexistence, that means you've got to take the cosmos into it. Cosmism is considered a great crime in Christianity and Judaism alike. The rabbis and the fathers of the church both condemn it, the physical cosmos. That's Hermeticism; that's Pythagoreanism. But why is it basic to religion? They can't get away from it, of course. In Genesis 1 that's what you get. What is the present attitude toward what they call cosmism or cosmology and why? And why does the Pearl of Great Price make such a big thing of it? What evidence is there for the concerns of the primitive for cosmology? Well, any references we have to the primitive (their stone circles, their glyphs, their drawings) all indicate their awareness of the four regions and the processes of nature and their observance of the sky. They are very much centered in the four directions (their dances and things they left behind in stone). But they still have them. Go down and visit the Hopis and Zunis now, and you see cosmology. They have some terrific cosmology things such as the visiting star. You go down in the kiva and a fellow comes in with a big silver star on his head. He comes down the ladder and says he has descended from another star. There are some very dramatic things that they do, but the cosmology is with it. They had megaliths and temples just like our own.

What about the religious elements that appear in science fiction? Why would they be significant for this course? Look at the titles of science fiction books. What makes science fiction interesting? The fact that it's plausible that there are other worlds that people might visit. There are troubles among them, etc. It goes back to the old theme, Councils in Heaven. You have high councils meeting in other worlds, and you have wars between the worlds, and you have the good influence and the bad influence, the good guys and the bad guys, the dark side and the light side (**tsid akher** as it is called in the **Cabala** in the Jewish mystics). The **tsid akher** is the "other side." There is the other side of things. Well, all these things are the sum and substance of science fiction because they have no ideas of their own. All they can do is draw on the scriptures. All throughout you will see the most popular ones, like **Star Wars**, are those that have that element of plausibility. It starts out "in a galaxy far away and long ago." This sort of thing could happen. We have been teaching that these things have always been happening. There has always been something going on. So cosmology is a big thing here.

The sixth lecture was on the big question. Why was, and still is, creation the number one issue of controversy today? Why would they consider that the most important of all? Once we're here, we're here. That's the main thing,

{p10

but why be so exercised about how we happened to get here if you don't know. Just accept the fact that you are here and go on from there. As Professor Wormuth used to say up at the University of Utah, "Mormonism is the only non-speculative religion." We don't ask, is it right that we should be here, or were we created at all? These are problems of solipsism and entomology, etc. Do I really exist, or should the world be here? Well, I don't know; but it is here, and we begin with it as a given quantity. It's not speculative. That's what you speculate about, things like that.

What is the clash of Mormonism with fundamentalism? You know what that is there. We don't believe things were created instantly, simultaneously—that all things instantly came into existence out of nothing, not at all. That's the fundamentalist view. That's the standard view of creation, which is why science objects to it. Well, where do we clash with science? Where do we clash with Darwinism? We say it is both a process and a plan. They say there is no processing and no plan; it just happened. The only process would be chance (pure chance). Both coming into existence and whatever progress takes place after that is pure chance one way or the other. So we don't agree with either one of them. But why do we take sides, just the same? There's a psychological study you can go into. How does the Pearl of Great Price answer both of these? Remember, we read those passages from John Gordon Bennett and William Bartlett (those eastern editors) about how Joseph Smith impressed them. It was especially his cosmology that impressed them enormously because it wouldn't accept either side. How can ancient writings contribute to scientific support of Joseph Smith? We have a lot of them.

We come to the seventh lesson then. What is the concept of beginning in the Christian world? That is, beginning out of nothing? That's important because it takes us to the Council in Heaven. Where is the Council in Heaven described in ancient writings? Well, in all sorts of ancient writings it's described. We went into this one, the **Shabako Stone**, the oldest book in the world. That's what it told us about, this Council in Heaven at the creation of the world. It was not mumbo-jumbo or primitive superstition at all. It was a very rational and important document. It is regarded as still having powerful influence on Jewish literature and on Christian literature alike, down to modern times. What's the rationale of the Council in Heaven? Why did they have it? What was the reason for it? And the implications in the Shabako text with regard to cultural and religious evolution and the sources of the Pearl of Great Price. What are the implications there? Then the eighth lecture was still the **Memphite Theology** as we compared it with the **Enuma Elish**. Remember that's the Mesopotamian version of it. What are the main teachings in the **Memphite Theology** and in the **Enuma Elish**? And in the eleventh lesson, what are the precious things removed from the scriptures? We are back to that issue again. Who would do such a thing? Who removed them and why would they possibly remove them? When did they remove them? We know very well when they removed them. The councils of the church are very plainly dated. Where did it happen and how did it happen? These processes are all well known, but that's in Christian history (in the early church actually). What is the hermetic tradition?

|p11

Then we talked about the eight religious permutations, different philosophies. Remember the light-dark-light, dark-light-dark, the dark-dark-dark, the light-light-light, etc. Like the Chinese I Ching, there are the eight possible combinations. Which one are we, and why are we the only one that has all three alike? And what is the standard? What is the one the world usually accepts of those three? A bright preexistence, a bright world, or a bright hereafter? You can rearrange those in eight different combinations. There's the tragic combination, there's the standard, there's the Pythagorean or mystic, there's the conventional Judeo-Christian, there's the monastic, there's the romantic, and there's the gospel.

Then we have the doctrine of plurality of worlds. That goes along with cosmology. (I keep watching the clock for a reason here.) Why should the plurality of worlds be a major issue in religion, or in science? What's its place in the gospel, and what are the classic arguments for it and against it? That's a good subject for a final. How does it relate to the preexistence, and how does the preexistence relate to the problem of evil? This is the problem that no religion solves at all. The Pearl of Great Price is the only one that really handles it, really comes to grips with it. What religious issues are raised by geology, cosmology, biology, psychology? We know those. How does the Pearl of Great Price meet them? What is the connection that scientists are making between religious beliefs and quantum physics? You can get that in one of those books by Gary Zukav or Fritjof Capra.

Then lecture 15 was on the creation. How can there be a new world on old ground? Remember, we believe the episodic idea, which is very important. This is chronology. They always talk about the time. Is the earth only 6,000 years old? What a fuss! What is the significance of the tektites, of the iridium layer? What are the main phases through which the earth passes in the process of creation, according to the Pearl of Great Price? The geological process, and then it goes through the biological phases in the Pearl of Great Price again, beginning at a particular phase. At what moment does creation begin, and at what moment does creation end? What is the significance of the mountain in religion, as an image, in reality? Then back to Moses 1. How does Moses, chapter one apply to individual human beings? What are ascension texts? In lecture 18 we talked about them. What takes place in the Prologue in Heaven and what's the role of Mephistopheles? What are the main acts and scenes in Moses 1 (because it's a drama). What is the argument of the play? How does it resemble the classic year drama? What is the purpose of handing down this account?

Lecture 20 was on Moses 3:19. What light does the Pearl of Great Price throw on primitive man? Where is the line between man and animal? When do you step over the line? What are the timeless episodes in the Book of Moses? There are timeless periods in which time is not measured at all that way. Then we come to the Lamech story. Why is that significant? Of course, there is Cain and the problem of evil. What is the pact with the devil? Who made it? What was Cain's motive? What was his message? What was his defense?

Then what was Enoch's mission? Who were the Watchers? Why is baptism central to the Book of Abraham? What evidence is there that supports the authenticity of the Book of Enoch?

|p12

What's the message of the Book of Enoch? What was the last straw that brought on the Flood? Violence, of course. How does Noah repeat the experience of Adam, as he does? How does Abraham resume the work of Noah? What is the basic pattern of dispensations presented in the Pearl of Great Price? Why must the founder of each dispensation stand alone? Why are his instructions binding on others? What were the trials of Abraham? The merits of Abraham? The merits of every dispensation? Abraham is typical, you see. How does each dispensation end? We're dealing with this dispensation thing. By 6:00 p.m. on the Friday, the eleventh, have something written on this subject to hand in so we'll know how to give you some kind of grade, which is absurd.

