



Type: Book Chapter

Internal Evidences—The Originality of the Book of Mormon an Evidence in Support of its Claims (Continued)

Author(s): B.H. Roberts

Source: *New Witnesses for God: Volume III - The Book of Mormon*

Published: Salt Lake City; Deseret News, 1909

Pages: 180-230

CHAPTER XL.

INTERNAL EVIDENCES.—THE ORIGINALITY OF THE BOOK OF MORMON AN EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF ITS CLAIMS. (CONTINUED.)

VII.

The Fall of Adam—The Purpose of Man's Earth Existence.

In the matter of some Christian truths, it sets forth, as well as in some it emphasizes, the Book of Mormon is original; and in none more so than in dealing with the doctrine of Adam's fall, and the purpose of man's existence.

In the second book of Nephi, chapter ii, occurs the following direct, explicit statement:

Adam fell that men might be: and men are that they might have joy.

This sentence is the summing up of a somewhat lengthy discussion on the atonement, by the prophet Lehi. It is a most excellent and important generalization, and is worthy to be classed with the great generalizations of the Jewish scriptures, such for instance as that in the closing chapter of Ecclesiastes, "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man;" Paul's famous generalization: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive:" or the Apostle James' summing up of religion: "Pure religion, and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world." Or

of Messiah's great summing up of the whole law and gospel; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and all the prophets." I care not whether you regard the literary excellence of this Book of Mormon generalization or the importance of the great truths which it announces, I repeat, it is worthy in every way to stand with the great generalizations quoted above. It deals with two of the mightiest problems of theology:

1st, The reason for Adam's fall;

2nd, The purpose of man's existence.

Before entering into a consideration of these doctrines, however, I must establish the fact of their Book of Mormon originality; for I fancy there will be many who at first glance will be disposed to question their being original with that book. It must be conceded, of course, that the fact of man's fall is frequently mentioned in the Bible. The story of it is told at length in Genesis.^a It is the subject of some of Paul's discourses;^b and, indeed, it underlies the whole Christian scheme for the redemption and salvation of mankind. Yet, strange to say, there is not to be found a direct, explicit, and adequate statement in all the Jewish scriptures as to *why* Adam fell. The same may be said with reference to the second part of this passage. That is, there is nowhere in Jewish scriptures a direct, explicit, adequate statement as to the *object* of man's existence.

These statements with reference to the absence of anything in Holy scripture on these two important points, will, I know, be regarded as extremely bold; and especially when

^aGenesis iii.

^bI. Cor. xv: 21, 22; Romans v: 12-17.

made with reference to so large a body of literature as is comprised in the Bible. Yet I make them with confidence; and am helped to that conclusion from the fact that nowhere in the creeds of men, based upon Jewish and Christian scripture, is there to be found a direct statement upon these two subjects that has in it the warrant of explicit, scriptural authority. Nowhere in the creeds of men—the creeds of men! those generalizations of Christian truths as men have conceived those truths to be; those deductions from the teachings of Holy scripture—nowhere in them, I repeat are these two great theological questions disposed of on scriptural authority.

The Westminster Confession of Faith, which embodies the accepted doctrine of one of the largest sects of Protestant Christendom, while it indeed has a word, in fact several sections on the subject of Adam's fall and its consequences, it contents itself with stating the fact of it, the manner of it, as also, that God permitted it, "having purposed to order it to his own glory," yet in such manner as himself not to be chargeable with the responsibility of the sin; but nowhere is there an explanation of *why* Adam fell. With reference to the purpose of man's creation—included in the treatment of the purpose of creation in general—the creed ascribes the purpose of all the creative acts of God to be "The manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom and goodness."^c and in an authoritative explanation of this part of the creed it is said, "The design of God in creation was the manifestation of his own glory." And again: "Our confession very explicitly takes the position that the chief end of God in his eternal purposes and in their temporal execution in creation and providence is the manifestation of his own glory. The scriptures explicitly assert that this is the chief end of

^cWestminster Confession, chapter iv—of Creation—Section i.

God in creation.^e * * * * * The manifestation of his own glory is intrinsically the highest and worthiest end that God could purpose to Himself."^f

The only business I have here with this declaration of the purpose of God in creation—including the creation of man, of course—is simply to call attention to the fact that it nowhere has the direct warrant of scripture.

The creed of the "Episcopalian Church," whose chief doctrines are embodied in "The Book of Common Prayer," is silent upon the two subjects in question, viz., "why" Adam fell; the "object" of man's existence. The "Articles of Faith," it is true, speak of the "fall" of Adam, and its effects upon the human race, but nowhere is it said "why" Adam fell; or a "reason" given for man's existence. The creed proclaims faith in God, "the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible;" but nowhere declares the purpose of that creation, and consequently has no word as to the "object" of man's existence.

The exposition of the Catholic creed on the same points, as set forth in the Douay Catechism is as follows—and first as to the fall:

^eIn proof of this last declaration the expounder cites Col. i: 16: "All things were created by him [Christ] and for him."

Also Proverbs xvi: 4: 'The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.'

Also Rev. iv: 11: "For thou [the Lord] hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created;" and Rom. xi: 36: "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things." See Commentary on the "Confession of Faith," with questions for theological students and Bible classes, by the Reverend A. A. Hodge, D. D., Chapter iv. The reading of the passages will convince any one that if this is all the scripture proof that may be adduced in the way of an explanation of the purposes of God in creation, that what I have said in the text, that there is no direct, explicit, and adequate statement of the object of man's existence in holy writ is sufficiently vindicated.

^fCommentary on the Confession (Hodge), chapter iv.

Man was created in "the state of original justice, and perfection of all natural gifts;" this "original justice" was lost "by Adam's disobedience to God in eating the forbidden fruit;" but nowhere is there anything said as to the reason for this fall from the state of "original justice."

As to the purpose of man's creation, the Catechism has the following:

Ques. What signify the words creation of heaven and earth?

Ans. They signify that God made heaven and earth and all creatures in them of nothing, by his word only.

Ques. What moved God to make them?

Ans. His own goodness, so that he may communicate himself to angels and to man for whom he made all other creatures.‡

Speaking of the creation of the angels, the same work continues:

Ques. For what end did God create them (the angels).

Ans. To be partakers of his glory and to be our guardians.

Referring again to man's creation the following occurs:

Ques. Do we owe much to God for creation?

Ans. Very much, because he made us in such a perfect state, creating us for himself, and all things else for us."^h

From all which it may be summarized that the purposes of God in the creation of man and angels, according to Catholic theology, is—

First, that God might communicate himself to them;
Second, that they might be partakers of his glory.

‡Douay Catechism, chapter iii.

^hIbid.

Third, that he created them for himself, and all things else for them.

While this may be in part the truth, and so far excellent, it has no higher warrant of authority than human deduction, based on conjecture, not scripture; and it certainly falls far short of giving to man—as we shall see—that “pride of place” in existence to which his higher nature and his dignity as a son of God entitles him.

If in these creeds of the greater divisions of Christendom there is found no clear and adequate explanation of the reason of Adam’s fall, or the purpose of man’s existence, it may be taken for granted that none of the minor divisions of Christendom have succeeded where these have failed, since these larger divisions of Christendom embody in their creeds the hived theological wisdom and the highest scholarship of the Christian ages.

The originality of these two Book of Mormon Doctrines established, let us now consider if they are true and of what value they are, and what effect they will probably have upon the ideas of men. I shall treat them separately first, and in relation afterwards.

“Adam fell that men might be.”

I think it cannot be doubted when the whole story of man’s fall is taken into account that in some way—however hidden it may be under allegory—his fall was closely associated with the propagation of the race. Before the fall we are told that Adam and Eve were in a state of innocence;¹ but after the fall “The eyes of them both were opened and they knew that they were naked, and they sewed

¹Gen. ii: 25.

fig leaves together and made themselves aprons,"^j and also hid from the presence of the Lord.

In an incidental way Paul gives us to understand that Adam in the matter of the first transgression "was not deceived," but that the woman was.^k It therefore follows that Adam must have sinned knowingly, and perhaps deliberately; making choice of obedience between two laws pressing upon him. With his spouse, Eve, he had received a commandment from God to be fruitful, to perpetuate his race in the earth. He had also been told not to partake of a certain fruit of the Garden of Eden; but according to the story of Genesis, as also according to the assertion of Paul, Eve, who with Adam received the commandment to multiply in the earth, was deceived, and by the persuasion of Lucifer induced to partake of the forbidden fruit. She, therefore, was in transgression, and subject to the penalty of that law which from the scriptures we learn included banishment from Eden, banishment from the presence of God, and also the death of the body. This meant, if Eve were permitted to stand alone in her transgression, that she must be alone also in suffering the penalty. In that event she would have been separated from Adam, which necessarily would have prevented obedience to the commandment given to them conjointly to multiply in the earth. In the presence of this situation, therefore, it is to be believed that Adam was not deceived, either by the cunning of Lucifer or the blandishments of the woman, deliberately, and with a full knowledge of his act and its consequences, and in order to carry out the purpose of God in the existence of man in the earth, shared alike the woman's trans-

^jIbid iii: 7.

^k"Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression."—Tim. ii: 14.

gression and its effects, and this in order that the first great commandment he had received from God, viz.—“Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it”—might not fail of fulfillment. Hence “Adam fell that man might be.”

The effect of this doctrine upon the ideas of men concerning the great Patriarch of our race will be revolutionary. It seems to be the fashion of those who assume to teach the Christian religion to denounce Adam in unmeasured terms; as if the fall of man had surprised, if, indeed, it did altogether thwart, the original plan of God respecting the existence of man in the earth. The creeds of the churches generally fail to consider the “fall” as part of God’s purpose regarding this world, and, in its way, as essential to the accomplishment of that purpose as the “redemption” through Jesus Christ. Certainly there would have been no occasion for the “redemption” had there been no “fall;” and hence no occasion for the display of all that wealth of grace and mercy and justice and love—all that richness of experience involved in the gospel of Jesus Christ, had there been no “fall.” It cannot be but that it was part of God’s purpose to display these qualities in their true relation, for the benefit and blessing and experience and enlargement and ultimate uplifting of man; and since there would have been no occasion for displaying them but for the “fall,” it logically follows that the “fall,” no less than the “redemption,” must have been part of God’s original plan respecting the earth-probation of man. The “fall,” undoubtedly was a fact as much present to the foreknowledge of God as was the “redemption;” and the act which encompassed it must be regarded as more praiseworthy than blame-worthy, since it was essential to the accomplishment of the divine purpose. Yet, as I say, those who assume to teach Christianity roundly denounce

Adam for his transgression. An accepted teacher of Catholic doctrine says:

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

And again:

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

Still again, and this from the Catholic Douay Catechism:

Q. How did we lose original justice?

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

Q. How do you prove that?

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

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

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

^lCatholic Belief, p. 6. (Joseph Faa Di Bruno is the author.)

^mCatholic Belief, p. 330.

ⁿDouay Catechism, p. 13.

From a Protestant source I quote the following:

In the fall of man we may observe: (1) The greatest infidelity. (2) Prodigious pride. (3) Horrid ingratitude. (4) Visible contempt of God's majesty and justice. (5) Unaccountable folly. (6) A cruelty to himself and to all his posterity."^o

Another Protestant authority says:

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

From these several passages as also indeed from the whole tenor of Christian writings upon this subject, the fall of Adam is quite generally deplored and upon him is laid a very heavy burden of responsibility. It was he, they complain, who,

Brought death into the world, and all our woe.

One great division of Christendom in its creed, it is true, in dealing with the fall, concedes that "God was pleased according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit [the fall] having purposed to order it to his own glory."^r

And in an authoritative explanation of this section they say, "That this sin [the fall] was permissively embraced in the sovereign purpose of God." And still further in explanation:

Its purpose [i. e., of the fall] being God's general plan, and one eminently wise and righteous, to introduce all the new created

^oBuck's Theological Dictionary, p. 182.

^qOld Testament History (William Smith, LL. D.), chapter ii.

^rWestminster Confession, chapter vi, section 1.

subjects of moral government into a state of probation for a time in which he makes their permanent character and destiny depend upon their own action.

Still, this sin, described as being permissively embraced in the sovereign purpose of Deity, God designed "to order it to his own glory;" but it nowhere appears according to this confession of faith that the results of the fall are to be of any benefit to man. The only thing consulted in the theory of this creed seems to be the manifestation of the glory of God—a thing which represents God as a most selfish being—but just how the glory of God can be manifested by the "fall" which, according to this creed, results in the eternal damnation of the overwhelming majority of his "creatures," is not quite apparent.

Those who made this Westminster Confession, as also the large following which accept it, concede that their theory involves them at least in two difficulties which they confess it is impossible for them to overcome. These are, respectively: First, "How could sinful desires or volitions originate in the soul of mortal agents created holy like Adam and Eve;" and, second, "how can sin be permissively embraced in the eternal purpose of God and not involve him as responsible for the sin?" "If it be asked," say they, "why God, who abhors sin, and who benevolently desires the excellence and happiness of his creatures, should sovereignly determine to permit such a fountain of pollution, degradation, and misery to be opened, we can only say, with profound reverence, 'Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.'"^s

These difficulties, however, are the creed's and those

^sCommentary on the Confession of Faith (A. A. Hodge), pp. 105-108.

who accept it, not ours, and do not further concern our discussion at this point.

Infidels—under which general term (and I do not use it offensively) I mean all those who do not accept the Christian creeds, nor believe the Bible to be a revelation—infidels, I say, quite generally deride the fall of man as represented both in the creeds of Christendom and in the Bible. They regard the tremendous consequences attendant upon eating the forbidden fruit as altogether out of proportion with the act itself, and universally hold that a moral economy which would either design or permit such a calamity as the fall is generally supposed to be, as altogether unworthy of an all-merciful and just Deity. Thomas Paine referring to it says:

“Putting aside everything that might excite laughter by its absurdity, or detestation by its profaneness, and confining ourselves merely to an examination of the parts, it is impossible to conceive a story more derogatory to the Almighty, more inconsistent with his wisdom, more contradictory to his power, than this story is.^f”

In their contentions against the story of Genesis, no less than in their war upon “the fall” and “original sin” in the men made creeds of Christendom, infidels have denounced God in most blasphemous terms as the author of all the evil in this world by permitting, through not preventing, the fall; and they as soundly ridicule and abuse Adam for the part he took in the affair. He has been held up by them as weak and cowardly, because he referred his partaking of the forbidden fruit to the fact that the woman gave to him and he did eat; a circumstance into which they read an effort on the part of the man to escape censure, perhaps punishment, and to cast the blame for his transgression upon the

^fPaine's Theological Works, “Age of Reason,” p. 12.

woman. These scoffers proclaim their preference for the variations of this story of a "fall of man" as found in the mythologies of various peoples, say those of Greece or India." But all this aside. The truth is that nothing could be more courageous, sympathetic, or nobly honorable than the course of our world's great Patriarch in his relations to his wife Eve and the "fall." The woman by deception is led into transgression, and stands under the penalty of a broken law. Banishment from the presence of God; banishment from the presence of her husband, if he partakes not with her in the transgression; dissolution of spirit and body—physical death—all await her! Thereupon, the man, not deceived, but knowingly (as we are assured by Paul), also transgresses. Why? In one aspect of the case in order that he might share the woman's banishment from the dear presence of God, and with her die—than which no higher proof of love could be given—no nobler act of chivalry performed. But primarily he transgressed that "Man might be." He transgressed a less important law that he might comply with one more important, if one may so speak of any of God's laws. The facts are, as we shall presently see, that the conditions which confronted Adam in his earth-life were afore time known to him; that of his own volition he accepted them, and came to earth to meet them.

Man an Immortal Spirit.

Man is an immortal spirit. By saying that, I mean not only a never ending existence for the "soul" of man in the future, through the resurrection, but a proper immortal-

"See Ingersoll's Lectures, "Liberty of Man, Woman and Child," where the great orator, contrasts the story of the Fall given in the Bible with that of Brahma in the Hindoo mythology, and extravagantly praises the latter to the disparagement of the former.

ity that means the eternal existence of the "ego"—interchangably called "mind," "spirit," "soul," "intelligence." I mean existence before birth as well as existence after death. I believe that an "immortality" which refers to continued existence after death only is but half a truth. A real immortality is forever immortal, and includes an existence before life on earth as surely as an existence after death.^w This view of the intelligence or spirit of man is supported by the Bible. Without going into the subject at length I call attention to the fact that Jesus himself had very clear conceptions of his own spirit-existence before his birth into this world; a fact which is evident from the declaration he made to the Jews when he said, "Verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am."^x (i. e. existed). And again, in his prayer in Gethsemane, "O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."^y This spirit pre-existence extends also to all the children of men; who, in their physical structure and even in faculties of mind, so nearly resembled Jesus, though, of course, immeasurably below him in the developed excellence of those qualities. We read of the "sons of God shouting for joy" in heaven when the foundations of the earth were laid;^z of the war in heaven when Michael and his angels fought against the dragon (Satan), and the dragon and his angels fought, and he with them was cast out into the earth.^a These were the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, and who are reserved in everlasting chains unto the

^wSee "A Short View of Great Questions" (Orlando J. Smith), chapter 10; also his work on "Eternalism."

^xJohn viii: 58.

^yJohn xvii.

^zJob xxxiii: 4-7.

^aRevelation xii.

judgment of the last days.^b "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee," said the Lord to Jeremiah, "and sanctified thee and ordained thee a prophet unto the nations;"^c "We have had fathers of the flesh, and we give them reverence," said Paul to the Hebrews, "Shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the father of spirits and live?"^d All of which passages tend to prove that not only Jesus but the spirits of all men existed before they tabernacled in the flesh. This of course is but a brief glance at the question as supported by the Jewish scriptures.^e

The Book of Mormon while not in any formal manner teaching this doctrine of the pre-existence of the spirits of men, does so very effectually in an incidental way. For example: the Lord Jesus, long ages before his advent into earth-life, revealed himself to the Book of Mormon character known as the Brother of Jared, and in doing so he said:

Behold I am he who was prepared from the foundation of the world to redeem my people; * * * and never have I showed myself unto man whom I have created, for never has man believed in me as thou hast. Seest thou that ye are created after mine own image [likeness]? Yea, even all men were created in the beginning after mine own image. Behold this body which ye now behold, is the body of my spirit; and man have I created after the body of my spirit; and even as I appear unto thee to be in the spirit, will I appear unto my people in the flesh.^f

Here a great doctrine is revealed. Not only the fact of the pre-existence of the spirit of Jesus, the Christ, that

^bJude vi.

^cJeremiah i: 5.

^dHeb. xii.

^eThose who wish to extend their investigation on the subject are referred to the author's work on "The Gospel," especially the section of Man's Relationship to Deity, found in both the second and third edition.

^fEther iii.

is, the existence of his spirit in tangible, human form before his earthly existence, but a like existence for the spirits of all men is proclaimed. Moreover, it is made known that as Jesus appeared in the spirit to this Jaredite prophet, so would he appear unto his people in the flesh. That is to say, the bodily form of flesh and bone would conform in appearance to the spirit form; the earthly would be like unto the heavenly, the human, to the divine. And so with all men.

Christian theologians are thought to have discovered a great truth when in the preface of St. John's Gospel they found the doctrine of the co-eternity and co-divinity of the Father and the Son in the holy trinity; namely,

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. * * * And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.^g

The identity between the "Word" of this passage and Jesus—the "Word made flesh" is complete. And he was in the beginning with God—co-eternal with him; and the "Word was God."—that is, he was divine, he was more, he was Divinity—he was Deity.

In a revelation to Joseph Smith this same truth is repeated and more is added to it, as follows:

Verily, I say unto you, I was in the beginning with the Father, and am the first-born. * * * Ye [referring to the Elders in whose presence the revelation was given] were also in the beginning with the Father; that which is spirit [that is, that part of man which is spirit, that was in the beginning with the Father]. * * * Man [i. e., the race, the term is generic] was also in the

^gJohn i: 2-14.

beginning with God. Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be.^h

The doctrine in the foregoing quotation is in harmony with the Book of Mormon and with the Bible; but goes beyond them in that it gives us the understanding "that intelligence was not created or made, neither indeed can be." That is to say, the individual intelligence in all men was not created, or made, "neither indeed can be"—it is not only not created but is *uncreatable*.

There is something in man, then, that is eternal, uncreate. Just what that is, the form of it, or the mode of its existence, we may not know, since it has not pleased God so far to reveal these aspects of it. But he has revealed the fact of its existence, the fact of its eternity, the fact that it is an intelligence. One must needs think, too, that the name of this eternal entity—what God calls him—conveys to the mind some idea of his nature. He is called an "Intelligence;" and this I believe is descriptive of him. That is, intelligence is the entity's chief characteristic. If this be a true deduction, then the entity must be conscious; conscious of self and of other things than self. He must have the power to distinguish himself from other things—the "me" from the "not me." He must have power of deliberation, by which he sets over one thing against another; with power also to form a judgment that this or that is a better thing or state than some other thing or state. Also there goes with this idea of intelligence a power of choosing one thing instead of another, one state rather than another—the power to will to do this or that, else existence is meaningless, worthless, mockery. These powers are inseparably connected with any idea that may be formed of an intelligence. One cannot conceive of an intelligence existing without these qualities

^hDoc. & Cov., section xciii.

any more than he can conceive of an object existing in space without dimensions. The phrase, "the light of truth," is given in the revelation above quoted as the equivalent of an "Intelligence" here discussed; by which it is meant to be understood, as I think, that intelligent entities perceive truth, are conscious of truth, they know that which is, hence "the light of truth," that which cognizes truth—"intelligences." These intelligences are begotten^a spirits that exist in human form. They exist so before they tabernacle in the flesh. In this manner, first, and eternally, as an individual intelligence, and secondly as a begotten spirit in human form, Jesus existed; so the spirits of all men existed; so Adam existed, a Son of God, for so the scriptures declare him to be.^b •

In addition to teaching the doctrine of the pre-existence of man's spirit, the Book of Mormon teaches also the indestructibility of the spirit. The prophet Alma expressly says, that "the soul would never die;"^h which, according to Orson Pratt, in a foot note on the passage, means that the "soul" could "never be dissolved, or its parts be separated so as to disorganize the spiritual personage;"

^aI use the term "begotten" instead of "create" advisedly. I do not believe the spirit of man is "created" by God; I believe it is "begotten" of him, and in addition to its own native, underived inherent qualities, partakes also somewhat of the qualities or nature of him who begets it, hence an intelligence begotten of a spirit is a son of God by being begotten by a divine parent; by the nature of it also, since somewhat of the nature of the parent has been imparted to it. The distinction between a "created" thing and a being begotten is thus very clearly set forth by the Christian Father Athanasius: Let it be repeated that a created thing is external to the nature of the being who creates; but a generation (a begetting, as a Father begets a son) is the proper offspring of the nature. (Footnote, Shedd's "History of Christian Doctrine," Vol. I, p. 322.)

^bLuke iii: 38.

^hAlma xiii: 9.

and since the Book of Mormon teaches the pre-existence of this "soul," or "spirit," and also teaches its continued existence between death and the resurrection,ⁱ as also its indestructibility after the resurrection,^j it is very clear that the Book of Mormon teaches what I have called "proper immortality of the soul;" an immortality that extends pastward as well as forward in time; or, in other words, declares its essential, its eternal existence; hence its necessary existence, hence that it is a self-existing entity.

In thinking then upon this earth career of Adam's, it must be thought of in connection with that pre-existence of his, of that eternal existence of his, and of his knowledge of what would befall him when he came to the earth. He came on no fool's errand, to be betrayed by chance happenings. If redemption through Jesus Christ was a fore-known circumstance,—and it was—and he was appointed as the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,"^c to bring to pass man's redemption, then surely the circumstance of man's fall was known, doubtless pre-determined upon, and in some way essential to the accomplishment of the purposes of God; not an accidental or even a temporary thwarting of them; but as much a part of God's plan with reference to man's earth-existence, as any circumstance whatsoever connected with that existence.

Let us now consider the second part of Lehi's Generalization:

Men are that they might have joy.

ⁱAlma xi.

^jAlma xi: 9.

^cRev. viii: 80. What means the scripture here: "The Lamb slain from the foundations of the world"—if it does not mean that the Savior's mission and work of atonement, and the mode of it, were known before the foundation of the world?

That is to say, the purpose of man's earth-life is in some way to be made to contribute to his "joy," which is but another way of saying, that man's earth-life is to eventuate in his advantage.

"Men are that they might have joy!" What is meant by that? Have we here the reappearance of the old Epicurean doctrine, "pleasure is the supreme good, and chief end of life?" No, verily! Nor any other form of old "hedonism"^a—the Greek ethics of gross self-interest. For mark, in the first place, the different words "joy" and "pleasure." They are not synonymous. The first does not necessarily arise from the second, "joy" may arise from quite other sources than "pleasure," from pain, even, when the endurance of pain is to eventuate in the achievement of some good: such as the travail of a mother in bringing forth her offspring; the weariness and pain and danger of toil by a father, to secure comforts for loved ones. Moreover, whatever apologists may say, it is very clear that the "pleasure" of the Epicurean philosophy, hailed as "the supreme good and chief end in life," was to arise from agreeable sensations, or what ever gratified the senses, and hence was, in the last analysis of it—in its roots and branches—in its theory and in its practice—"sensualism." It was to result in physical ease and comfort, and mental inactivity—other than a conscious, self-complacence—being regarded as "the supreme good and chief end of life." I judge this to be the net result of this philosophy since these are the very conditions in which Epicureans describe even the gods to

^aHedonism is the form of eudemonism that regards pleasure (including avoidance of pain) as the only conceivable object in life, and teaches that as between the lower pleasures of sense and the higher enjoyments of reason, or satisfied self-respect, there is no difference except in degree, duration, and hedonic value of the experience, there being in strictness, no such thing as ethical or moral value."—Standard Dictionary.

exist;“ and surely men could not hope for more “pleasure,” or greater happiness than that possessed by their gods. Cicero even charges that the sensualism of Epicurus was so gross that he represents him as blaming his brother, Timocrates, “because he would not allow that everything which had any reference to a happy life was to be measured by the belly; nor has he,” continues Cicero, “said this once only, but often.”

This is not the “joy,” it is needless to say, contemplated in the Book of Mormon. Nor is the “joy” there contemplated the “joy” of mere innocence—mere innocence, which say what you will of it, is but a negative sort of virtue. A virtue that is colorless, never quite sure of itself, always more or less uncertain, because untried.^v Such a virtue—if mere absence of vice may be called virtue—would be unproductive of that “joy” the attainment of which is set forth in the Book of Mormon as the purpose of man’s existence; for in the context it is written, “They [Adam and Eve] would have remained in a state of ‘innocence.’ Having no joy, for they knew no misery; doing no good, for they knew no sin. From which it appears that the “joy” contemplated in our Book of Mormon passage is to arise from something more than mere innocence, which is, impliedly, unproductive

^vIn Cicero’s description of the Epicurean conception of the gods he says: “That which is truly happy cannot be burdened with any labor itself, nor can it impose any labor on another, nor can it be influenced by resentment or favor, because things which are liable to such failings must be weak and frail. * * * Their life [i. e., of the gods] is most happy and the most abounding with all kinds of blessings which can be conceived. They do nothing. They are embarrassed with no business; nor do they perform any work. They rejoice in the possession of their own wisdom and virtue. They are satisfied that they shall ever enjoy the fulness of eternal pleasure. * * * Nothing can be happy that is not at ease. (Tusculan Disputations, The Nature of the Gods.)

^vII. Nephi ii: 23.

of "joy." The "joy" contemplated in the Book of Mormon passage is to arise out of man's rough and thorough knowledge of evil, of sin; through knowing misery, sorrow, pain and suffering; through seeing good and evil locked in awful conflict; through a consciousness of having chosen in that conflict the better part, the good; and not only in having chosen it, but in having wedded it by eternal compact; made it his by right of conquest over evil. It is a "joy" that will arise from a consciousness of having "fought the good fight," of having "kept the faith." It will arise from a consciousness of moral, spiritual and physical strength. Of strength gained in conflict. The strength that comes from experience; from having sounded the depths of the soul; from experiencing all emotions of which mind is susceptible; from testing all the qualities and strength of the intellect. A "joy" that will come to man from a contemplation of the universe, and a consciousness that he is an heir to all that is—a joint heir with Jesus Christ and God; from knowing that he is an essential part of all that is. It is a joy that will be born of the consciousness of existence itself—that will revel in existence—in thoughts of and realizations of existence's limitless possibilities. A "joy" born of the consciousness of the power of eternal increase. A "joy" arising from association with the Intelligences of innumerable heavens—the Gods of all eternities. A "joy," born of a consciousness of being, of intelligence, of faith, knowledge, light, truth, mercy, justice, love, glory, dominion, wisdom, power; all feelings, affections, emotions, passions; all heights and all depths! "Men are that they might have joy;" and that "joy" is based upon and contemplates all that is here set down.

We may now consider the "fall of man" and the "purpose of his existence" as related subjects—as standing somewhat in the relationship of means to an end. We shall now

be able to regard the "fall of man," not as an accident, not as surprising, and all but thwarting, God's purposes, but as part of the divinely appointed program of man's earth-existence.

Here, then, stands the truth so far as it may be gathered from God's word and the nature of things: There is in man an eternal, uncreate, self-existing entity, call it "intelligence," "mind," "spirit," "soul"—what you will, so long as you recognize it, and regard its nature as eternal. There came a time when in the progress of things, (which is only another way of saying in the "nature of things") an earth-career, or earth existence, because of the things it has to teach, was necessary to the enlargement, to the advancement of these "intelligences," these "spirits," "souls." Hence an earth is prepared; and one sufficiently advanced and able, by the nature of him to bring to pass the events, is chosen, through whom this earth-existence, with all its train of events—its mingled miseries and comforts, its sorrows and joys, its pains and pleasures, its good, and its evil—may be brought to pass. He comes to earth with his appointed spouse. He comes primarily to bring to pass man's earth-life. He comes to the earth with the solemn injunction upon him: "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." But he comes with the knowledge that this earth-existence of eternal "Intelligences" is to be lived under circumstances that will contribute to their enlargement, to their advancement. They are to experience joy and sorrow, pain and pleasure; witness the effect of good and evil, and exercise their agency in the choice of good or of evil. To accomplish this end, the local, or earth harmony of things must be broken. Evil to be seen, and experienced, must enter the world, which can only come to pass through the violation of law. The law is given—"of the tree of the

knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eatest of it thou shalt surely die." The woman forgetful of the purpose of the earth mission of herself and spouse is led by flattery and deceit into the violation of that law, and becomes subject to its penalties—merely another name for its effect. But the man, not deceived, but discerning clearly the path of duty, and in order that earth-existence may be provided for the great hosts of "spirits" to come to earth under the conditions prescribed—he also transgresses the law, not only that men might be, but that they might have that being under the very circumstances deemed essential to the enlargement, to the progress of eternal Intelligences. Adam did not sin because deceived by another. He did not sin maliciously, or with evil intent; or to gratify an inclination to rebellion against God, or to thwart the Divine purposes, or to manifest his own pride. Had his act of sin involved the taking of life rather than eating a forbidden fruit, it would be regarded as a "sacrifice" rather than a "murder." This to show the nature of Adam's transgression. It was a transgression of the law—"for sin is the transgression of the law"^k—that conditions deemed necessary to the progress of eternal Intelligences might obtain. Adam sinned that men might be, and not only "be," but "be" under conditions essential to progress. But Adam did sin. He did break the law; and violation of law involves the violator in its penalties, as surely as effect follows cause. Upon this principle depends the dignity and majesty of law. Take this fact away from moral government and your moral laws become mere nullities. Therefore, notwithstanding Adam fell that men might be, in his transgression there was at bottom a really exalted motive—a motive that contemplated nothing less than bringing to pass

^kI. John iii: 4.

the highly necessary purposes of God with respect to man's existence in the earth—yet his transgression of law was followed by certain moral effects in the nature of men and in the world. The harmony of things was broken; discord ruled; changed relations between God and men took place, darkness, sin and death stalked through the world, and conditions were brought to pass in the midst of which the eternal Intelligences might gain those experiences that such conditions have to teach.

Now as to the second part of the great truth—"men are that they might have joy"—viewed also in the light of the "Intelligence" or "spirit" in man being an eternal, uncreated, self-existing entity. Remembering what I have already said in these pages as to the nature of this "joy" which it is the purpose of earth-existence to secure, remembering from what it is to arise—from the highest possible development—the highest conceivable enlargement of physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual power—what other conceivable purpose for existence in earth-life could there be for eternal Intelligences than this attainment of "joy" springing from progress? Man's existence for the manifestation alone of God's glory, as taught by the creeds of men, is not equal to it. That view represents man as but a thing created, and God as selfish and vain of glory. True, the Book of Mormon idea of the purpose of man's existence, is accompanied by a manifestation of God's glory; for with the progress of Intelligences there must be an ever widening manifestation of the glory of God. It is written that the "glory of God is Intelligence;" and it must follow, as clearly as the day follows night, that with the enlargement, with the progress of Intelligences, there must ever be a constantly increasing splendor in the manifestation of the glory of God. But in the Book of Mormon doctrine, the manifestation of that

glory is incidental. The primary purpose is not in that manifestation, but in the "joy" arising from the progress of Intelligences. And yet that fact adds to the glory of God, but our book represents the Lord as seeking the enlargement and "joy" of kindred Intelligences, rather than the mere selfish manifestation of his own, personal glory. "This is my work and my glory," says the Lord, in another "Mormon" scripture, "to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man," as man;^l and therein is God's "joy." A "joy" that grows from the progress of others; from bringing to pass the immortality and eternal life of "man." Not the immortality of the "spirit" of man, mark you, for that immortality already exists, but to bring to pass the immortality of the spirit and body in their united condition, and which together constitutes "man."^m And the purpose for which man is, is that he might have "joy;" that "joy" which, in the last analysis of things, should be even as God's "joy," and God's glory, namely, the bringing to pass the progress, enlargement, and "joy" of others.

It is gratifying to know that this Book of Mormon definition of life and its purpose, so far as it affects the human race, is receiving unconscious support from some of the first philosophers of modern days, among whom I may mention Lester F. Ward, author of "Outlines of Sociology" and other scientific and philosophical works; a Lecturer in the School of Sociology of the Hartford Society for Education Extension. His "Outlines of Sociology" was

^lPearl of Great Price, Book of Moses, ch. i: 39.

^mOr "the soul;" for, in the revelations of God in this last dispensation, the spirit and the body are called the "soul." "Through the redemption which is made for you is brought to pass the resurrection from the dead. And the spirit and the body is the soul of man. And the resurrection from the dead is the redemption of the soul." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 88: 14-16.)

published in 1904, and in the chapter of that work, in which he discusses the relation of sociology to psychology, (chapter v), he deals with the question of life and its object. For the purpose of clearly setting forth his thought, he says:

“The biological [i. e. that which pertains merely to the life] must be clearly marked off from the psychological [i. e. as here used, that which pertains to feeling] standpoint. The former,” he continues, “is that of function, the latter that of feeling. It is convenient, and almost necessary, in order to gain a correct conception of these relations to personify Nature, as it were, and bring her into strong contrast with the sentient [one capable of perception is here meant] creature. Thus viewed, each may be conceived to have its own special end. The end of Nature is function, i. e. life. It is biological. The end of the creature is feeling, i. e. it is psychic. From the standpoint of Nature, feeling is a means to function. From the standpoint of the organism, function is a means to feeling. Pleasure and pain came into existence in order that a certain class of beings might live, but those beings, having been given existence, now live in order to enjoy.”

Throughout the chapter he maintains that the purpose of man's existence is for pleasure, but of course, holds that this pleasure is that of the highest order, and not merely sensual pleasure. Finally, applying the principles he lays down to the human race, its existence, the purpose of that existence, and the means through which the end is to be obtained—he adopts the following formula:

The object of nature is function [i. e., life].

The object of man is happiness.

The object of society is effort.

Now, with very slight modifications, this formula may be made to express the doctrine of Lehi in the Book of Mormon, as representing the divine economy respecting man:

Earth-life became essential to the progress of intelligences.
 Adam fell that man's earth-life might be realized.
 The purpose of man's existence is that he might have joy.
 The purpose of the gospel is to bring to pass that joy.

In condensed form it may be made to stand as follows:

The object of God in man's earth-life is progress.
 The object of man's existence is joy.
 The object of the gospel and the church is effort.

A formula which so closely resembles this philosopher's—and his philosophy is that of many other advanced modern thinkers—that it justifies me in making the claim that the trend of the best modern thought on these lines is coming into harmony with the truths stated in the Book of Mormon.

VIII.

The Agency of Man.

Respecting the “free agency” of man the Book of Mormon is quite pronounced as to the fact of it, as the following quotations attest:

I know that he granteth unto men according to their desire, whether it be unto death or unto life; yea, I know that he alotteth unto men, according to their wills; whether they be unto salvation or unto destruction.ⁿ

ⁿAlma xxix: 4.

Again,

The Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself. Men are free according to the flesh; and all things are given them which are expedient unto man. And they are free to chose liberty and eternal life, through the great mediation of all men, or to choose captivity and death, according to the captivity and power of the devil; for he seeketh that all men might be miserable like unto himself.^o

The doctrine of the free agency of man could scarcely be more strongly set forth than it is in these passages.

A word in relation to this question of free agency. Of course it is recognized as one of the great theological questions that has puzzled mankind. By the phrase, free agency is here meant to represent that power or capacity of the mind or spirit to act freely and of its own volition, with reference to these matters, that are within the power of its achievement. That is to say, it is not meant that by an act of will man may overcome the force we call gravitation, and leave the earth at his pleasure; or that he can pluck down the moon by an act of will; or influence a mass of people at his will and against theirs; or create two mountains without a valley between them; but what is meant is, that man possesses the quality of determining his own actions, his own course with reference to things that are within the realm of the possibility of his achievement, and more especially, with reference to moral questions; that man has the power to take a course in harmony with those moral ideals that he has created by his own intellectual force or that have been created for him by his education, or the environment in which he has lived; that he can decide for himself to walk in harmony with these ideals, or that wontingly, and against

^oII. Nephi ii: 27.

all that he conceives to be to his best interest, he can violate them and walk contrary to what in his heart he knows to be right and true. This constitutes his freedom, his agency, and it is because of this fact that he is morally responsible for his conduct.

I have nowhere else found a statement of the facts involved in free agency so clearly set forth as in Guizot's "History of Civilization," from which I summarize the following:

1. *Power of Deliberation*—The mind is conscious of a power of deliberation. Before the intellect passes the different motives of action, interests, passions, opinions, etc. The intellect considers, compares, estimates, and finally judges them. This is a preparatory work which precedes the act of will.

2. *Liberty, Free Agency or Will*—When deliberation has taken place—when man has taken full cognizance of the motives which present themselves to him, he takes a resolution, of which he looks upon himself as the author, which arises because he wishes it and which would not arise unless he did wish it—here the fact of agency is shown; it resides in the resolution which man makes after deliberation; it is the resolution which is the proper act of man, which subsists by him alone; a simple fact independent of all the facts which precede it or surround it.

3. *Free Will, or Agency Modified*—At the same time that man feels himself free, he recognizes the fact that his freedom is not arbitrary, that it is placed under the dominion of a law which will preside over it and influence it. What that law is will depend upon the education of each individual, upon his surroundings, etc. To act in harmony with that law is what man recognizes as his duty; it will be the task of his liberty. He will soon see, however, that he never fully acquits himself of his task, never acts in full harmony with his moral law. Morally capable of conforming himself to his law, he falls short of doing it. He does not accomplish all that he ought, nor all that he can. This fact is evident, one of which all may give witness; and it often happens that the best men, that is, those who have best con-

formed their will to reason, have often been the most struck with their insufficiency.

4. *Necessity of External Assistance*—This weakness in man leads him to feel the necessity of an external support to operate as a fulcrum for the human will, a power that may be added to its present power and sustain it at need. Man seeks this fulcrum on all sides; he demands it in the encouragement of friends, in the councils of the wise; but as the visible world, the human society, do not always answer to his desires, the soul goes beyond the visible world, above human relations, to seek this fulcrum of which it has need. Hence the religious sentiment develops itself; man addresses himself to God, and invokes his aid through prayer.

5. *Man Finds the Help He Seeks*—Such is the nature of man that when he sincerely asks this support he obtains it; that is, seeking it is almost sufficient to secure it. Whosoever, feeling his will weak, invokes the encouragement of a friend, the influence of wise councils, the support of public opinion, or who addresses himself to God by prayer, soon feels his will fortified in a certain measure and for a certain time.

6. *Influence of the Spiritual World on Liberty*—There are spiritual influences at work on man—the empire of the spiritual world upon liberty. There are certain changes, certain moral events which manifest themselves in man without his being able to refer their origin to an act of his will, or being able to recognize the author. Certain facts occur in the interior of the human soul which it does not refer to itself, which it does not recognize as the work of its own will. There are certain days, certain moments in which it finds itself in a different moral state from that which it was last conscious of under the operations of its own will. In other words, the moral man does not wholly create himself; he is conscious that causes, that powers external to himself, act upon and modify him imperceptibly—this fact has been called the grace of God, which helps the will of man.

After giving full weight to all the facts here set forth—and certainly each one enters as a factor into the question of man's freedom—the Book of Mormon doctrine

stands true. There is such a quality of man's mind. He is conscious of it. Conscious of the power of deliberation; conscious of the existence of moral obligation pressing upon him; conscious of his own weakness that makes him feel unable to rise to the high level of his full duty; conscious of his need of external assistance; conscious of his will being made stronger by appealing to the counsel of his friends, and appealing to God for help through prayer; conscious of the fact that he is in different states of moral feeling at different times, owing, doubtless, to this appeal that he makes to external aids—yet, in the last analysis of it all, he remains conscious of the fact that what he does, not only can be, but is, a self-determining act, and he remains conscious of the power that he could do otherwise if he would. This consciousness and this freedom are the most stupendous facts in human existence, and upon their reality—upon their truth—depends all the glory of that existence. Arriving here the outlook concerning man's possibilities for the future is immense. Sir Oliver Lodge speaking of man, after arriving at this point in his development, the attainment of consciousness and free will, recently said:

On this planet man is the highest outcome of the process so far (i. e., the process of development), and is, therefore, the highest representation of Deity that here exists. Terribly imperfect as yet, because so recently evolved, he is nevertheless a being which has at length attained to consciousness and free-will, a being unable to be coerced by the whole force of the universe, against his will; a spark of the divine Spirit, therefore, never more to be quenched. Open still to awful horrors, to agonies of remorse, but to floods of joy also, he persists, and his destiny is largely in his own hands; he may proceed up or down, he may advance towards a magnificent ascendancy, he may recede towards depths of infamy. He is not coerced: he is guided and in-

fluenced, but he is free to choose. The evil and the good are necessary correlatives; freedom to choose the one involves freedom to choose the other.^a

This is the doctrine then of the Book of Mormon: the existence in man as a quality of his mind or spirit freedom and power to will, to determine for himself his course. He may choose good or evil. The freedom of righteousness, or the bondage of sin. If man finds his will strengthened in favor of choosing the good by appealing for help to external aids, to God through prayer, and that help comes in the form of the grace of God, and becomes a factor in helping man into a state of righteousness, it should be remembered that the act of appealing for external help was the exercise of man's free agency. He willed to do good and sought help to carry out his determination; and the assistance of the grace of God so obtained in no way operates to destroy the freedom of man's will. In concluding this subject, it may be said that the Book of Mormon in an authoritative way settles conclusively the great theological question of the free agency of man.^a

W. H. Mallack, in his work on "The Reconstruction of Religious Belief" (1905), has a most fascinating chapter on human freedom^b in which he illustrates on broad lines the universal though unconscious assumption of the fact of human freedom in both literature and history. Of the characters created by the great poets, he remarks: "They interest us as born to freedom, and not naturally slaves, and they pass before us like kings in a Roman triumph. Once let us suppose these characters to be mere puppets of heredity and circumstance, and they and the works that

^aHibbert Journal, April, 1906, p. 656.

^bChapter iv.

deal with them lose all intelligible content, and we find ourselves confused and wearied with the fury of an idiot's tale." On the criticism of historical characters he says: "All this praising and blaming is based on the assumption that the person praised or blamed is the originator of his own actions, and not a mere transmitter of forces." And further, all debating on the value of historical characters would be meaningless, "if it were not for the inveterate belief that a man's significance for men resides primarily in what he makes of himself, not in what he has been made by an organism derived from his parents, and the various external stimuli to which it has automatically responded." Our author also points out the truth that forgiveness itself among men (and he might well have extended his argument to the forgiveness God imparts to men also) assumes the fact of human freedom—else what is there to be forgiven! The believer in freedom says to the offending party, "I forgive you for the offense of not having done your best." The assumption is that the offender could have refrained from giving one offense—he had freedom and power to have done otherwise. One not believing in human freedom would say to the offending party: "I neither forgive nor blame you; for, although you have done your worst, your worst was your best also"&having no freedom, he was under no obligation; his action was indifferent, neither good nor bad; there was no blame or praise possible; he is neither a subject for mercy nor justice to act upon.

In the course of the discussion to which attention is called, our author has contributed an idea worthy of all acceptation and is valuable for the reason that it goes outside the beaten paths followed in the free will controversy: "When most people talk of believing in moral freedom, they mean by freedom a power which exhausts itself in acts of

choice between a series of alternative courses; but, important though such choice, as a function of freedom is, the root idea of freedom lies deeper still. It consists in the idea, not that a man is, as a personality, the first and the sole cause of his choice between alternative courses, but that he is, in a true, even if in a qualified sense, the first cause of what he does, or feels, or is, whether this involves an act of choice, or consists of an unimpeded impulse. Freedom of choice between alternatives is the consequence of this primary faculty. It is the form in which the faculty is most noticeably manifested; but it is not the primary faculty of personal freedom itself."

I believe this fact in relation to man's freedom; that it is a quality capable of manifesting itself in other modes than choice between alternatives; that it may project an unimpeded line of conduct, and yet in this world its chief manifestations are in a choice between things opposite and we shall see later, according to the Book of Mormon, that conditions in this world are so ordained in the existence of opposites—antinomies—that man may exercise this quality of freedom in the choice of alternatives.

IX.

The Atonement.

After giving an account of the fall of man, substantially as found in Genesis, the Nephite prophet Alma, is represented in the Book of Mormon as teaching his son Corianton the doctrine of the atonement, as follows:

Alma's Doctrine of Atonement.

And now we see by this, that our first parents were cut off, both temporally and spiritually, from the presence of the Lord;

and thus we see they became subjects to follow after their own will.

Now, behold, it was not expedient that man should be reclaimed from this temporal death, for that would destroy the great plan of happiness;

Therefore, as the soul could never die, and the fall had brought upon all mankind a spiritual death as well as a temporal; that is, they were cut off from the presence of the Lord, it was expedient that mankind should be reclaimed from this spiritual death;

Therefore, as they had become carnal, sensual, and devilish, by nature, this probationary state became a state for them [in which] to prepare; it became a preparatory state.

And now remember, my son, if it were not for the plan of redemption (laying it aside), as soon as they were dead, their souls were miserable, being cut off from the presence of the Lord.

And now there was no means to reclaim men from this fallen state which man had brought upon himself, because of his own disobedience;

Therefore, according to justice, the plan of redemption could not be brought about, only on conditions of repentance of men in this probationary state; yea, this preparatory state; for except it were for these conditions, mercy could not take effect except it should destroy the work of justice. Now the work of justice could not be destroyed; if so, God would cease to be God.

And thus we see that all mankind were fallen, and they were in the grasp of justice; yea, the justice of God, which consigned them forever to be cut off from his presence.

And now the plan of mercy could not be brought about, except an atonement should be made; therefore God himself atoneth for the sins of the world, to bring about the plan of mercy, to appease the demands of justice, that God might be a perfect, just God, and a merciful God also.

Now repentance could not come unto men, except there were a punishment, which also was eternal as the life of the soul should be, affixed opposite to the plan of happiness, which was as eternal also as the life of the soul.

Now, how could a man repent, except he should sin? How

could he sin, if there was no law, how could there be a law, save there was a punishment?

Now there was a punishment affixed, and a just law given, which brought remorse of conscience unto man.

Now, if there was no law given—if a man murdered he should die, would he be afraid he would die if he should murder?

And also, if there was no law given against sin, men would not be afraid to sin.

And if there was no law given if men sinned, what could justice do, or mercy either; for they would have no claim upon the creature?

But there is a law given, and a punishment affixed, and a repentance granted; which repentance, mercy claimeth; otherwise justice claimeth the creature, and executeth the law, and the law inflicteth the punishment; if not so, the works of justice would be destroyed, and God would cease to be God.

But God ceaseth not to be God, and mercy claimeth the penitent, and mercy cometh because of the atonement; and the atonement bringeth to pass the resurrection of the dead; and the resurrection of the dead bringeth back men into the presence of God; and thus they are restored into his presence, to be judged according to their works; according to the law and justice;

For, behold, justice exerciseth all his demands, and also mercy claimeth all which is her own; and thus, none but the truly penitent are saved.

What! do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice? I say unto you, nay! Not one whit. If so, God would cease to be God.

And thus God bringeth about his great and eternal purposes, which were prepared from the foundation of the world. And thus cometh about the salvation and the redemption of men, and also their destruction and misery;

Therefore, O my son, whosoever will come, may come, and partake of the waters of life freely; and whosoever will not come, the same is not compelled to come; but in the last day, it shall be restored unto him, according to his deeds.^c

Summarizing the foregoing we have the following as the result: The effect of Adam's transgression was

^cAlma 42. The same subject is treated in II. Nephi ii.

to destroy the harmony of things in this world. As a consequence of his fall man is banished from the presence of God—a spiritual death takes place and man becomes sensual, devilish, unholy, is cursed, we say, with a strong inclination to sinfulness. Man is also made subject to a temporal death, a separation of the spirit and body. Much might have been gained by this union of his spirit with his body of flesh and bone could it have been immortal, but that is now lost, by this temporal death, this separation of spirit and body. These conditions would have remained eternally fixed as the result of the operation of law—inexorable law, called “the justice of God,” admitting of nothing else; for the law was given to eternal beings and by them violated, and man is left in the grasp of eternal justice, with all its consequences upon his head and the head of his progeny. And the justice of the law admitted the conditions, admitted that the penalties affixed should be effective, but this is justice—stern, unrelenting justice; justice untempered by mercy. But mercy must in some way be made to reach man, yet in a way also that will not destroy justice; for justice must be maintained, else all is confusion—ruin. If justice be destroyed—if justice be not maintained—“God will cease to be God.” Hence mercy may not be introduced into the divine economy of this world without a vindication of the broken law by some means or other, for divine laws as well as human ones are mere nullities if their penalties be not in force.

The penalty of the law then, transgressed by Adam, must be executed, or else an adequate atonement must be made for man’s transgression. This the work of the Christ. He makes the atonement. He comes to earth and assumes responsibility for this transgression of law, and gathers up into his own soul all the suffering due to the trans-

gression of the law by Adam. All the suffering due to individual transgression of law—the direct consequences of the original transgression—from Adam to the end of the world. The burden of us all is laid upon him. He will bear our griefs and carry our sorrows. He will be wounded for our transgressions, and be bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace will be upon him; on him is laid the iniquity of us all; by his stripes shall we be healed.^a That is to say, having gathered into himself all the suffering and sorrows due to all the sinning that shall be in the world, he is able to dictate the terms upon which man may lay hold of mercy—by which mercy may heal his wounds—and these terms he names in the conditions of the gospel, the acceptance of which brings complete redemption. The Christ brings to pass the resurrection of the dead. The spirit and the body are eternally re-united; the temporal death—one of the effects of Adam's transgression—is overcome. There is no more physical death; the "soul"^b—the eternally united spirit and body are now to be immortal as spirit alone before was immortal. The man so immortal is brought back into the presence of God, and if he has accepted the terms of the gospel by which he is redeemed from the effects of his own, as well as from Adam's transgression, his spiritual death is ended, and henceforth he may be spiritually immortal as well as physically immortal—eternally with God in an atmosphere of righteousness—the spiritual death is overcome.

Such I make out to be the Book of Mormon doctrine of the atonement, and the redemption of man through the gospel.

^aIsaiah liii.

^bDoc. & Cov., Sec. xxxviii: 15.

x.

The Doctrine of Opposite Existences.

Closely connected with the doctrine of the agency of man, the purpose of his existence and his redemption from the fallen state, is what I shall call the Book of Mormon doctrine of "opposite existences," what the scholastics would call "antinomies." The doctrine as stated in the Book of Mormon—the time of its publication—1830—remembered, especially when taken in connection with the consequences it supposes in the event of abolishing the existence of evil, is strikingly original and philosophically profound; and reaches a depth of thought beyond all that could be imagined as possible with Joseph Smith or any of those associated with him in bringing forth the Book of Mormon.

The statement of the doctrine in question occurs in a discourse of Lehi's on the subject of the atonement. The aged prophet represents happiness or misery as growing out of the acceptance or rejection of the atonement of the Christ, and adds that the misery consequent upon its rejection is in opposition to the happiness which is affixed to its acceptance:

For it must needs be [he continues] that there is an opposition in all things. If [it were] not so * * * righteousness could not be brought to pass; neither wickedness; neither holiness nor misery; neither good nor bad. Wherefore [that is, if this fact of opposites did not exist] all things must needs be a compound in one; wherefore, if it [the sum of things] should be one body, it must needs remain as dead, having no life, neither death, nor corruption nor incorruption, happiness nor misery, neither sense nor insensibility. Wherefore, it must needs have been created for a thing of naught; wherefore there would have been no purpose in the end of its creation. Wherefore, this thing [i. e., the absence of opposite existences which Lehi is supposing] must

needs destroy the wisdom of God, and his eternal purposes; and also the power, and the mercy, and the justice of God.^c

The inspired man even goes beyond this, and makes existences themselves depend upon this law of opposites:

And if ye shall say there is no law, ye shall also say there is no sin. If ye shall say there is no sin, ye shall also say there is no righteousness. And if there be no righteousness, there is no happiness. And if there be no righteousness nor happiness, there be no punishment nor misery. And if these things are not, there is no God. And if there is no God, we are not, neither the earth: for there could have been no creation of things; neither to act nor to be acted upon, wherefore, all things must have vanished away.^d

^cII. Nephi ii. It is a pleasure to note that this process of reasoning, remarkable as it is, and startling as it is in its conclusion, is in harmony with modern thought. Mr. Lester F. Ward, whose works I have already quoted in this chapter, by a closely analogous order of reasoning, reaches the same conclusion. This the passage: "The pleasure of 'doing good' is among the most delicious of which the human faculties are capable, and becomes the permanent stimulus to thousands of worthy lives. It is usually looked upon as the highest of all motives, and by some as the ultimate goal toward which all action should aspire. It should first be observed that the very act of doing good presupposes evil, i. e., pain. Doing good is necessarily either increasing pleasure or diminishing pain. Now, if all devoted themselves to doing good, it is maintained that the sufferings of the world would be chiefly abolished. Admitting that there are some evils that no human efforts could remove, and supposing that by united altruism all removable evils were done away, there would be nothing left for altruists to do. By their own acts they would have deprived themselves of a calling. They must be miserable since the only enjoyment they deemed worthy of experiencing could be no longer possible, and this suffering from ennui would be among those which lie beyond human power to alleviate. An altruistic act would then alone consist in inflicting pain on one's self for the sole purpose of affording others an opportunity to derive pleasure from the act of relieving it. I do not put the matter in this light for the purpose of discouraging altruism, but simply to show how short sighted most ethical reasoning is.

^dII. Nephi ii.

This may be regarded as a very bold setting forth of the doctrine of antinomies, and yet I think the logic of it, and the inevitableness of the conclusion unassailable. In his work, "Origin and Development of Religious Beliefs" S. Baring-Gould says:

The world presents us with a picture of unity and distinction; unity without uniformity, and distinction without antagonism. * * * Everywhere, around us and within us, we see that radical antinomy. The whole astronomic order resolves itself into attraction and repulsion—a centripetal and a centrifugal force; the chemical order into the antinomy of positive and negative electricity, decomposing substances and recomposing them. The whole visible universe presents the antinomy of light and darkness, movement and repose, force and matter, heat and cold, the one and the multiple. The order of life is resumed in the antinomy of the individual and the species, the particular and the general; the order of our sentiments in that of happiness and sorrow, pleasure and pain; that of our conceptions in the antinomy of the ideal and the real; that of our will in the conditions of activity and passivity.^w

The existence of evil in the world has ever been a vexed problem for both theologians and philosophers, and has led to the wildest speculations imaginable. It will be sufficient here, however, if I note the recognition by high authority of the difficulties involved in the problem. Of those who have felt and expressed these difficulties, I know of no one who has done so in better terms than Henry L. Mansel in his contribution to the celebrated course of "Bampton Lecturers," in "The Limits of Religious Thought" (1858), in the course of which he says:

The real riddle of existence—the problem which confounds all philosophy, aye, and all religion, too, so far as religion is a

^w"Origin and Development of Religious Belief," Vol. II., pp. 22, 23.

thing of man's reason, is the fact that evil exists at all; not that it exists for a longer or a shorter duration. Is not God infinitely wise and holy and powerful now? and does not sin exist along with that infinite holiness and wisdom and power? Is God to become more holy, more wise, more powerful hereafter; and must evil be annihilated to make room for his perfections to expand? Does the infinity of his eternal nature ebb and flow with every increase or diminution in the sum of human guilt and misery? Against this immovable barrier of the existence of evil, the waves of philosophy have dashed themselves unceasingly since the birthday of human thought, and have retired broken and powerless, without displacing the minutest fragment of the stubborn rock, without softening one feature of its dark and rugged surface.*

This writer then proceeds by plain implication to make it clear that religion no more than philosophy has solved the problem of the existence of evil:

But this mystery [i. e., the existence of evil], vast and inscrutable as it is, is but one aspect of a more general problem; it is but the moral form of the ever-recurring secret of the Infinite. How the Infinite and the finite, in any form of antagonism or other relation, can exist together; how infinite power can coexist with finite activity; how infinite wisdom can coexist with finite contingency; how infinite goodness can coexist with finite evil; how the Infinite can exist in any manner without exhausting the universe of reality—this is the riddle which Infinite Wisdom alone can solve, the problem whose very conception belongs only to that Universal Knowledge which fills and embraces the Universe of Being.†

In the presence of these reflections it cannot be doubted, then, that the existence of moral evil is one of the world's serious difficulties; and any solution which the Book of Mormon may give of it that is really helpful, will be a

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

†Ibid. pp. 197-8.

valuable contribution to the world's enlightenment, a real revelation—a ray of light from the “inner fact of things.” Let us consider if it does this.

In view of the utterances of the Book of Mormon already quoted I am justified in saying that evil as well as good is among the eternal things. Its existence did not begin with its appearance on our earth. Evil existed even in heaven; for Lucifer and many other spirits sinned there; “rebelled against heaven's matchless King,” waged war, and were thrust out into the earth for their transgression.^z

Evil is not a created quality.^a It has always existed as the back ground of good. It is as eternal as goodness; it is as eternal as law; it is as eternal as the agency of intelligence. Sin, which is evil active, is transgression of law;^b and so long as the agency of intelligences and law have existed, the possibility of the transgression of law has existed; and as the agency of intelligences and law have eter-

^zSee Rev. xii:7. Jude 6.

^aLest some text-proofer should retort upon me and cite the words of Isaiah—“I make peace and create evil”—the only text of scripture ascribing the creation of evil to God—I will anticipate so far as to say that it is quite generally agreed that no reference is made in the words of Isaiah to “moral evil;” but to such evils as may come as judgments upon people for their correction, such as famine or tempest or war; such an “evil” as would stand in natural antithesis to “peace,” which word precedes, “I create evil,” in the text—“I make peace and create”—the opposite to peace, “The evil of afflictions and punishments, but not the evil of sin” (Catholic Comment on Isaiah 45:7). Meantime we have the clearest scriptural evidence that moral evil is not a product of God's: “Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man.” That is to say, God has nothing to do with the creation of moral evil; “But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.” (James i: 13-15). “The evil and the good are necessary co-relatives.” (Sir Oliver Lodge in Hibbert Journal, April, 1906, p. 657.)

^bI. John iii: 4.

nally existed, so, too, evil has existed eternally, either potentially or active and will always so exist.

Evil may not be referred to God for its origin. He is not its creator, it is one of those independent existences that is *uncreate*, and stands in the category of qualities of eternal things. While not prepared to accept the doctrine of some philosophers that "good and evil are two sides of one thing."^c I am prepared to believe that evil is a necessary antithesis to good, and essential to the realization of the harmony of the universe. "The good cannot exist without the antithesis of the evil—the foil on which it produces itself and becomes known."^d As remarked by Orlando J. Smith, "Evil exists in the balance of natural forces. * * * * * It is also the background of good, the incentive to good, and the trial of good, without which good could not be. As the virtue of courage could not exist without the evil of danger, and as the virtue of sympathy could not exist without the evil of suffering, so no other virtue could exist without its corresponding evil. In a world without evil—if such a world be really conceivable, all men would have perfect health, perfect intelligence, and perfect morals. No one could gain or impart information, each one's cup of knowledge being full. The temperature would stand forever at seventy degrees, both heat and cold being evil. There could be no progress, since progress is the *overcoming of evil*. A world without evil would be as toil without exertion, as light without darkness, as a battle with no antagonist. It would be a world without meaning."^e Or, as Lehi puts it, in still stronger

^cEternalism, Orlando J. Smith, p. 205-6.

^dScotus Erigena, quoted by Neander, "Hist. Christian Religion and Church," Vol. III. p. 465.

^eEternalism, pp. 30, 31.

terms—after describing what conditions would be without the existence of opposites:—

Wherefore, all things must needs be a compound in one; wherefore, if it [i. e. the sum of things] should be one body [i. e., of one character—so called good without evil] it must needs remain as dead, having no life, neither death, nor corruption, nor incorruption, happiness nor misery, neither sense nor insensibility. Wherefore, it [the sum of things] must needs have been created for a thing of naught; wherefore there would have been no purpose in the end of its creation. Wherefore, this thing [the absence of opposites] must needs destroy the wisdom of God, and his eternal purposes; and also, the power, and the mercy, and the justice of God.^f

As there can be no good without the antinomy of evil, so there can be no evil without its antinomy, or antithesis—good. The existence of one implies the existence of the other; and, conversely, the non-existence of the latter would imply the non-existence of the former. It is from this basis that Lehi reached the conclusion that either his doctrine of antinomies, or the existence of opposites, is true, or else there are no existences. That is to say—to use his own words—

If ye shall say there is no law, ye shall also say there is no sin. If ye shall say there is no sin, ye shall also say there is no righteousness. And if there be no righteousness, there be no happiness. And if there be no righteousness nor happiness, there be no punishment nor misery. And if these things are not, there is no God, and if there is no God, we are not, neither the earth; for there could have been no creation of things, neither to act nor to be acted upon: wherefore, all things must have vanished away.^g

^fII. Nephi ii: 11.

^gII. Nephi ii: 13.

But as things have not vanished away, as there are real existences, the whole series of things for which he contends are verities. "For there is a God," he declares, "and he hath created all things, both the heavens and the earth, and all things that in them is; both things to act, and things to be acted upon."^h

After arriving at this conclusion, Lehi, proceeding from the general to the particular, deals with the introduction of this universal antinomy into our world as follows:

To bring about his [God's] eternal purposes in the end of man, after he had created our first parents * * * it must needs be that there was an opposition; even the forbidden fruit in opposition to the tree of life; the one being sweet and the other bitter; Wherefore, the Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself. Wherefore man could not act for himself, save it should be that he was enticed by the one or the other.ⁱ And I, Lehi, according to the things which I have read, must needs suppose that an angel of God, according to that which is written, had fallen from heaven; wherefore he became a devil, having sought that which was evil before God. And because he had fallen from heaven, and had become miserable forever, he

^hIbid. ii: 14.

ⁱOn such a proposition Dr. Jacob Cooper, of Rutgers College, at the head of an article on "Theodicy" (the justification of the divine providence by the attempt to reconcile the existence of evil with the goodness and sovereignty of God), says (August, 1903), "There must be an alternative to any line of conduct, in order to give it a moral quality. We have to deal with, not an imaginary, but a real world; not with a state of things wholly different from those by which character is developed. If there are to be such qualities as righteousness, virtue, merit, as the result of good action, there must be a condition by which these things are possible. And this can only be where there is an alternative which may be embraced by a free choice. If the work of man on earth is to build up character, if his experience is disciplinary, by which he constantly becomes better fitted for greater good and a wider sphere of action, then he must have the responsibility of choosing for himself a course different from one which appeals to the lower qualities in his nature."

said unto Eve, yea, even that old serpent, who is the devil, who is the father of all lies; wherefore he said, Partake of the forbidden fruit, and ye shall not die, but ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil. And after Adam and Eve had partaken of the forbidden fruit they were driven out of the garden of Eden, to till the earth. And they have brought forth children; yea, even the family of all the earth.^j

Then follows Lehi's treatise upon the reason for the fall, the purpose of man's existence, which have already been noticed.

Summary of the Foregoing Doctrines.

This then is the order of things—(though in this summary the order in which the various doctrines have been presented is not strictly followed, but one more in harmony with the proper order of the related things; but which order could not well be set forth until the foregoing discussion of them was had) :—

1. The intelligent "Ego" in man, which we have called an "Intelligence," meaning, however, not a quality but the "Ego" itself, is an eternal entity; uncreate and uncreateable—an essential, a necessary, self-existent being.

2. These "Intelligences" the begotten of God, spirits; so that men are of the same race with God, are of the same "essence" or "substance," and are the sons of God by virtue of an actual relationship.

3. There came a time in the course of the existence of these spiritual personages when an earth-existence, a union of the spiritual personage with a body of flesh and bone, became necessary for his further development, for his enlargement; an existence where good and evil were in actual conflict, where the mighty and perhaps awful

^jDoc. & Cov., Sec. xciii: 33, 35.

lessons which such conditions have to teach could be learned.

4. There are eternal opposites in existences, light—darkness; joy—sorrow; pleasure—pain; sweet—bitter; good—evil; and so following. Evil is an eternal existence, the necessary co-relative of the good, uncreate and may not be referred to God for its origin.

5. The spirits of men came to earth primarily to obtain bodies through which their spirits may act through all eternity. They came to effect a union of spirit and element essential to all their future development and their joy and their glory; secondly they came to obtain such experiences as this earth-life has to give—to be taught by the things which they suffer; learning the lessons that sorrow and sin and death have to teach, finding both the strength and weakness of their own natures—proving the fidelity, valor and honor of their own spirits; making proof of their worthiness for that exceeding great and eternal weight of glory which God has designed for those who overcome and in all things prove faithful.

6. To lead the way in this great work, one sufficiently developed for such a task—Adam—is appointed to come to earth to open the series of dispensations designed of God for man in his earth-probation. He introduced those changes in the harmony of things necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes of God in the earth-life of man—he fell that man might be; and not only “be,” but have that being, under the very conditions that have since prevailed.

7. Evil was introduced into this world through the transgression of Adam, and man falls under the censure of eternal and inexorable justice.

8. Through the Atonement of Christ, however, man

is freed from the effects of Adam's transgression. The resurrection redeems him from the temporal death—the separation of the spirit and body, and he is brought back into the presence of God.

9. Through the Atonement of Christ mercy also has been brought into the world's moral economy; and, as well as justice, operates upon man. God's righteous law has been given to man. Man is a free moral agent and may choose to obey the law, or may choose to follow after wickedness. If he choose the latter, he falls under the justice of the law.

10. Through the Atonement the privilege of repentance is granted, and mercy claims the truly penitent, rescuing him from the otherwise inexorable claims of the law, and setting him in the way of salvation through obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel.

Such, in brief is the outline of the gospel of Christ in the Book of Mormon so far as it relates to the nature and eternal existence of man, the purpose of his earth-existence, the fall, the atonement, the existence of good and evil, and the development that shall come of contact with these forces.

In concluding this chapter, apart from the matter of originality in the doctrines set forth, which originality, be it remembered is one of the evidences here sought to be established as a sort of proof for the divinity of the book, I desire to call attention to another argument which these doctrines are capable of bearing; namely the nature of the doctrines themselves, the order in which they are set forth, and their deep philosophical character; and to the candid reader I submit this question: Was the unaided native intelligence of Joseph Smith, or the intelligence or learning of any of those associated with him in bringing forth the Book

of Mormon, equal to the task of formulating the principles of moral philosophy and theology that are found in that book and discussed in this chapter? Was the intelligence or learning of Solomon Spaulding, or any other person to whom the origin of the book is ascribed, equal to such a task? There can be but one answer to that question, and the nature of it is obvious.

Beyond controversy neither the native intelligence nor learning of Joseph Smith can possibly be regarded as equal to such a performance as bringing forth the knowledge which the Book of Mormon imparts upon these profound subjects; nor can the intelligence or learning of those who assisted him in translating the book be regarded as sufficient for such a task. Nor was the intelligence and learning of any one to whom the origin of the book has ever been ascribed equal to such an achievement. Indeed the book sounds depths on these subjects not only beyond the intelligence and learning of this small group of men referred to, but beyond the intelligence and learning of the age itself in which it came forth. Therefore it is useless to ascribe the knowledge it imparts on these subjects to human intelligence or learning at all. What is said by it on these subjects, so full of interest to mankind, is a word truly from the "inner fact of things"—a message written by ancient prophets of America inspired of God to bear witness to the truth of these great things which it most concerns man to know.