Abstract

The object of God’s work is to “bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man.” To qualify for eternal life, each of His children must be born again into the kingdom of heaven as a son or daughter of God through the atonement of Christ, and “by keeping all the commandments and obeying all the ordinances of the house of the Lord” in similitude of their Redeemer, the Only Begotten of the Father. In chapter 3 of the Gospel of John, Jesus described spiritual rebirth as consisting of two parts: being “born of water and of the spirit.” To this requirement of being “born again into the kingdom of heaven, of water, and of the Spirit,” God’s word to Adam in Moses 6:59-60 specified, in addition, that one must “be cleansed by blood, even the blood of mine Only Begotten; ... For ... by the blood ye are sanctified.” In this presentation, we will discuss the symbolism of water, spirit, and blood in scripture as they are actualized in the process of spiritual rebirth. We will highlight in particular the symbolic, salvific, interrelated, additive, retrospective, and anticipatory nature of the ordinances of spiritual rebirth within the allusive and sometimes enigmatic descriptions of John 3 and Moses 6. In reading these passages, it should be remembered that Moses 6:51-68, with its dense infusion of temple themes, was revealed to the Prophet in December 1830, when the Church was in its infancy and more than a decade before the fulness of priesthood ordinances was made available to the Saints in Nauvoo. Our study of all these doctrines informs our closing perspectives on the meaning of the sacrament, which is consistent with the renewed teaching emphasis of Church leaders that the “sacrament is a beautiful time to not just renew our baptismal covenants, but to commit to Him to renew all our covenants.”
Greetings to each of you from the Democratic Republic of Congo. This photograph of the Kinshasa temple construction site was taken last Saturday, October 29. If you look carefully, you can see the rebar marking the walls where the masons began their work this week.
Thousands of Primary children from throughout this city of over twelve million people have written their names on painted rocks gathered from the stony banks of the Congo River. Sister Kriss Gates, a temple construction missionary who, with her husband, organized the project, had asked the Area Seventies to carry bags of rocks to thousands of additional Congolese Primary children in regions outside the capital city, but plans had to be changed when the risk of their arrest under suspicion of smuggling rare minerals was realized. These were indeed rare stones, but not of the ordinary kind.
These are some of the Primary children in our ward holding up pictures of the temple, with the Primary Presidency and Bishop Aimé Ngoy seated on the back row. The rocks are being incorporated into the temple structure itself. As the cement is poured, the rocks are poured in with it. Each time the children visit the temple they will remember that they are literally part of the temple walls, just as the temple will gradually become part of them.
Imagine what a blessing the temple will be to faithful families such as this one who, on an income of just a few dollars a day, could never afford the thousands of dollars needed to fly to South Africa to be sealed.
The presentation that Matt Bowen and I have prepared for today is centered on the ordinances of spiritual rebirth that draw on the companionship of the Holy Ghost and the power of the Atonement of Jesus Christ in order to sanctify and unite such families forever.
One of the most poignant and instructive stories of the Gospel of John tells of Nicodemus’ private visit to inquire of Jesus. Like the humble Peter, whose foibles and weaknesses are candidly presented in the Gospels, it seems that Nicodemus was not reluctant to share the story of his transformation from wondering skeptic to devoted disciple. Indeed, it is plausible that he was John’s eyewitness source for the account we will now discuss in more detail.

As the basis for Nicodemus’ belief that Jesus was a “teacher come from God,” he explained: “No one is able to do the miraculous signs that you do unless God is with him.”

Jesus discounted Nicodemus’ declaration with a parallel assertion: “No one is able to see the kingdom of God unless they are born again.” The Master was saying that Nicodemus was mistaken in taking His miracles as the basis for his confidence in Jesus as a divine teacher. Though Nicodemus had seen these signs, he did not see the kingdom of God.
To see the kingdom of God — and eventually to enter within it — said Jesus, one must be born again.  
Indeed, seeing the kingdom of God is a prerequisite for entering into it. Joseph Smith taught that even to see the kingdom of God, individuals “must have a change of heart” that would take “the vail from before their eyes.”
That said, Nicodemus’ astonishment at Jesus’ teaching was not an entirely negative thing, since, in later rabbinic literature, “marveling or wondering ... form[ed] an important part of the process of gaining knowledge.” For example, it was said of Rabbi Akiba that “his learning began with wonder and culminated with a crown, a symbol of his power ... to bring hidden things to light.” Thus, Jesus’ words to Nicodemus that night, “Marvel not,” should not be understood as a peremptory dismissal of his interlocutor’s initial doubts, but rather as a spur to his further faith and inquiry.
Up to that moment, however, Nicodemus had had no such change of heart. His eyes were still veiled. As a test of Nicodemus’ powers of spiritual perception, the Lord used a double entendre — or double meaning — in His discussion on the subject of being “born again.” The Greek expression can mean both “born again” — a second time — and also “born from above.” Each time Jesus repeated the requirement for those who would see and enter the kingdom of God to be “born from above” — in other words, “born of the Spirit” — Nicodemus heard only the most obvious, superficial meaning of Jesus’ saying, namely, that one must be “born again” — or, in other words, “born of the flesh,” mistakenly thinking that Jesus referred to one’s coming forth a “second time” from the “mother’s womb.”
At that point, Jesus explained fully what it meant, not only to be born of the water and the Spirit, but also to be fully “born of God.” Once again, the Lord’s elaboration simultaneously disclosed and obscured His meaning through the use of double entendre:

\[
\text{And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.}
\]

\[
\text{And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.}
\]

To comprehend the double meaning of “lifted up” in Jesus’ words, we must first realize that, in the story of Moses, both the serpents that bit the Israelites and the figure on the standard that was “lifted up” by Moses were not meant to be seen as ordinary desert snakes. Rather, in the rich symbolism of the Old Testament, they are portrayed as representations of the glorious seraphim, using the same Hebrew terms that are used elsewhere in scripture to describe the angelic attendants of God’s throne. If we fail to identify the seraphim of the heavenly temple with the “fiery flying serpents” that were presented as both the plague and the salvation of the children of Israel, we lack the interpretive key for the entire chapter.
Once we realize that in these verses Jesus has compared Himself, as the “Son of Man” or, more explicitly, as the Son of the “Man of Holiness” meaning the Son of God, to the seraphim that surround, in intimate proximity, the throne of the Father, the meaning of His statement that He was to be “lifted up” becomes apparent. In temple contexts, the essential function of the seraphim was analogous to the role of the cherubim at the entrance of the Garden of Eden: they were to be as sentinels or “keep[ers] [of] the way,” guarding the portals of the heavenly temple against unauthorized entry, governing subsequent access to increasingly secure compartments, and ultimately assisting in the determination of the fitness of worshipers to enter God’s presence. Thus Jesus, described by Nephi as “the keeper of the gate,” could legitimately and literally assert: “no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.”
Jesus’ application of the phrase “lifted up” to Himself is appropriate for additional reasons. For example, the imagery ties back to Isaiah 52:13, a verse in the messianic “servant song”: “Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.” Isaiah’s language describes the suffering and exaltation of Jesus Christ. Significantly, however, in the Book of Mormon the resurrected Jesus Christ Himself demonstrates that this prophecy also can be applied to the prophet of the Restoration. Thus, it becomes clear that others in addition to Jesus Christ can be “lifted up” — becoming sons of Man — through continued faithfulness in the face of suffering. This is consistent with the explicit teaching in the first chapter of the Gospel of John that “as many as received [Christ], to them gave he power to become the sons of God.” Note that the Greek phrase, “sons of God,” in this and other scriptural references in equivalent contexts that we will cite below, is gender neutral.
In short, whereas readers sometimes equate the lifting up of Christ exclusively with His death on the cross, more careful examination of the passage makes it clear that John is exploiting a double meaning in the term “lifted up.” Should there be any doubt of the subtle, almost implicit, literary art present in John’s account, consider the explicit confirmation of similar, deliberate wordplay found in 3 Nephi 27. In only two verses, Jesus shifts artfully and seemingly effortlessly among multiple senses of “lifted up,” including “lifted up upon the cross” in unrighteous judgment, “lifted up by the Father” in righteous judgment, and, significantly, “lifted up at the last day” in exaltation. Returning to the context of John 3, it is clear that the “lifting up” of Jesus has as much to do with His heavenly ascent and glorious enthronement as it does with his ignominious death. Hence, according to Herman Ridderbos, “the crucifixion is not presented [by John] as Jesus’ humiliation but as the exaltation of the Son of Man,” a “birth from above” that He intended to share with His disciples. Thus, those who “look” and “begin to believe in the Son of God” as He is typologically revealed in the seraphic figure that has been “lifted up” will themselves receive “eternal life,” being “lifted up” — meaning exalted — with their Lord.
Consistent with Jesus’ expectation that Nicodemus, as a “master of Israel”\(^5\) should have already been familiar with this line of interpretation, there is evidence that “some early Jewish [exegetes] in the more mystic tradition may have also understood ‘seeing God's kingdom’ in terms of visionary ascents to heaven, witnessing the enthroned king.”\(^6\) Moreover, the Jewish scholar “[Philosophical name], a near contemporary of Jesus Christ,” declares that the Sinai revelation worked in Moses a second birth which transformed him from an earthly to a heavenly man; Jesus, by [way of] contrast, came from above to begin with and grants others a birth ‘from above.’”\(^7\)
Several scholars have argued that ideas corresponding to those of Philo about the culminating steps of a second birth “from above” may have been reflected figuratively in Jewish ritual at Qumran and elsewhere. These rituals enacted the liturgical equivalent of actual heavenly ascent. As has been detailed elsewhere, these rituals seem to have been, at least in the case of the synagogue of Dura Europos, centered on the story of Ezekiel’s vision, in chapter 37, of the resurrection of the dry bones. Ezekiel 36 and 37, like John 3, speak of the cleansing and transforming power of water and spirit, and promise exaltation and eternal life to the faithful through a new and “everlasting covenant.”

In terminology reminiscent of royal investiture and exaltation with conceptual roots in the First Temple that will recall for Latter-day Saints the symbolism of modern temples, the Lord says in Ezekiel 16: “Then washed I thee with water; yea, I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil. I clothed thee with broidered work, and shod thee with badger’s skin, and I girded thee about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk, ... And I put ... a beautiful crown upon thine head.” In reflecting on Jesus’ words, Nicodemus might have begun to remember these and other prophetic passages that describe what is meant by being born of God ritually in anticipation of the eventual, literal fulfillment of God’s promise to Moses that Israel as a body eventually was to become “a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.”
By way of summary, a careful reading of John 3 based on modern linguistic evidence and adequate consideration of relevant threads in Jewish scripture and tradition makes it clear that being “born again” — perhaps better expressed as being “born from above” or “born of God” — is not a process that is completed when one is baptized by water and receives the gift of the Holy Ghost. Disciples of Jesus Christ are not fully reborn *ritually* until they have received and kept all the ordinances and covenants of the temple “to the end,” and are not fully reborn *in actuality* until they attain “the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,” both suffering in His likeness and also being “lifted up” to “eternal life” and exaltation as He was.
Continuing the theme of spiritual rebirth in the remainder of our presentation, we will examine issues and insights relating to the three key phrases of Moses 6:60 one by one: “by the water ye keep the commandment; by the Spirit ye are justified, and by the blood ye are sanctified.”
“BY WATER YE KEEP THE COMMANDMENT”

- Baptism as a commandment and an introduction to the law of obedience
- Baptism as the gate to the pathway that leads to eternal life
- The antiquity of water symbolism in religious rituals of rebirth
- The background of circumcision in Jesus’ discussion with Nicodemus about being “born again”
- Circumcision, covenant, and baptism in antiquity and in the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible
- Digression: Baptism as an illustration of the nature of all ordinances

“By the Water Ye Keep the Commandment”

Let us now survey six topics that provide some idea of the richness of ancient traditions and modern revelation relating to the ordinances of baptism and washing with water.
“BY WATER YE KEEP THE COMMANDMENT”

- Baptism as a commandment and an introduction to the law of obedience
- Baptism as the gate to the pathway that leads to eternal life
- The antiquity of water symbolism in washing rituals of rebirth
- The background of circumcision in Jesus’ discussion with Nicodemus about being “born again”
- Circumcision, covenant, and baptism in antiquity and in the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible
- Digression: Baptism and washing as illustrations of the nature of all ordinances

**Baptism as a commandment and an introduction to the law of obedience.** Several scriptural references characterize baptism by water as a commandment — both as a means to demonstrate obedience to the divine directive to be baptized and also as a sign of willingness to keep the law of obedience with respect to all God’s other commandments.⁶⁹
For example, Nephi cites the baptism of the Savior as a witness to His Father “that he would be obedient unto him in keeping his commandments.”71 Notably, the blessing on the sacrament bread, an ordinance that is intimately linked with baptism, also mentions that the eating of the bread is a witness that those who partake “are willing to ... keep his commandments.”72 The specific connection between the sacramental bread and baptism is reinforced by the pointed omission of a reference to being willing to take His name upon them and keeping the commandments in the companion blessing on the emblems representing the blood of Christ.73 More will be said later on about the distinctive symbolism of the two parts of the sacrament.
Baptism as the gate to the pathway that leads to eternal life. Latter-day Saints know that repentance and baptism are symbolized in scripture as a “gate,” the essential entry point to the “strait and narrow path which leads to eternal life.”
Associating the gate of baptism with all subsequent laws and ordinances of the Priesthood, Joseph Smith made it clear that baptism was not only a commandment but also a "sign":

Baptism is a sign ordained of God, for the believer in Christ to take upon himself in order to enter into the Kingdom of God. ... It is a sign of command which God hath set for man to enter. ...

There are certain key words and signs belonging to the Priesthood which must be observed in order to obtain the blessing. ... Had [Cornelius] not taken [these] sign[s or] ordinances upon him ... he could not have healed the sick or commanded an evil spirit to come out of a man, and it obey him, for the spirits might say unto him, as they did to the sons of Sceva: "Paul we know and Jesus we know, but who are ye?"
The antiquity of water symbolism in washing rituals of rebirth. Some scholars, including among others David J. Larsen⁸² and Stephen D. Ricks,⁸³ have argued that the water symbolism of baptism is connected to rituals in ancient Israel wherein the king was washed and anointed both prior to both his initiation and also at regular renewals of his right to rule.
Relevant symbolism also can be found in the early religious literature of ancient Mesopotamia. For example, in the story of *Atrahasis* we can trace the basic conception that water, spirit, and blood — the latter derived from the body of a slain deity — were the life-giving elements used by the gods in the creation of humankind. In addition, we know that the use of water was as essential to the rites of kingship in Old Babylon as it was in the Old Testament.
David Calabro has explored the possibility that a text similar to the book of Moses may have been used in Solomon's Temple to instruct and guide initiates through different parts of the Israelite temple to specific areas where instruction was given and rituals were performed — including an association that might be made between the text of Moses 6 describing Adam's baptism and the “molten sea” that stood in front of the temple.
It is evident that two sorts of washings — namely baptism and priestly or kingly initiation in the temple — became confused in the first centuries after Christ, making it difficult to be sure what kind of ordinance is taking place when scripture and tradition mention the use of water in religious ritual.\textsuperscript{90}

For example, in some baptismal rites, the candidate was “stripped of the garments inherited from Adam and vested with the token of those garments he or she shall enjoy at the resurrection.”\textsuperscript{91} In other early Christian baptismal traditions, the idea of “reversing the blows of death” was represented by a special anointing with the “oil of mercy” prior to (or sometimes after) baptism or washing, as the candidate is signed upon the brow, the nostrils, the breast, the ears, and so forth.\textsuperscript{92}
Circumcision, covenant, and baptism are tightly linked, both in antiquity and in Joseph Smith’s translations.
For example, a pointed reference connecting the themes of circumcision and baptism can be found in a reference to the “blood of Abel” within Joseph Smith’s translation of the book of Genesis. The story of Abel has always been linked with the idea of proper sacrifice — indeed his name seems to be a deliberate pun on the richness of the sacrifice that he will make, in contrast to the stingy offering of Cain.
The Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible goes further in connecting the death of the righteous Abel to an anomalous ordinance of sprinkling blood coupled with “washing” or “baptism” for little children that is denounced in JST Genesis 17:3-7.96

And God talked to [Abram], saying, My people have gone astray from my precepts, and have not kept mine ordinances, which I gave unto their fathers;

And they have not observed mine anointing,97 and the burial, or baptism wherewith I commanded them;

But have turned from the commandment, and taken unto themselves the washing or baptism,98 of children, and the blood of sprinkling,99

And have said that the blood of the righteous Abel was shed for sins; and have not known wherein they are accountable before me.

To counteract this practice, we are told that the Lord established the covenant of circumcision at the age of eight days,100 “that thou mayest know for ever that children are not accountable before me till [they are] eight years old.”101
A related reference is Hebrews 12:24, which speaks of the saints coming “to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.” With regard to this scripture, Craig Koester cites the possibility that the author of Hebrews may be suggesting that “Abel’s blood brought a limited atonement, while Jesus’ blood brought complete Atonement.”
Paralleling the false notion described in the Joseph Smith Translation that “the blood of the righteous Abel was shed for sins,”[106] Serge Ruzer interprets early Christian and Islamic accounts as depicting a group that looked to Abel rather than to Christ for salvation.[107]
Additional evidence suggesting a belief in salvific power for Abel’s blood comes from a 1 Enoch description of Abel as a “red calf.” Patrick Tiller sees this as an allusion to the red heifer\textsuperscript{109} of Numbers 19:1-10.\textsuperscript{110} The red heifer was a pointedly young animal used in purification rites, comprising a washing and a sprinkling of blood,\textsuperscript{111} for those who had come into contact with “one ... found slain” and “lying in the field,”\textsuperscript{112} as was Abel. A widely varying set of Islamic accounts attempt to explain the origin of a related Qur’anic story\textsuperscript{113} — what these accounts have in common is the idea that the murderer denied his crime but was identified by the voice of the dead man who was touched by the sacrificial animal.\textsuperscript{114} Could this be an echo of the voice of the righteous Abel of whom it is said in scripture that his “blood cries unto [God] from the ground”\textsuperscript{115} — “he being dead yet speaketh”?\textsuperscript{116}
In summary, there is ample evidence from a variety of sources to support the plausibility of the account in the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible wherein anomalous rituals for little children purporting to cleanse them by washing and the sprinkling of blood are coupled with the erroneous idea that “the blood of the righteous Abel was shed for sins.”\textsuperscript{118} As a figure associated anciently with proper sacrifice, with baptism, and with innocent martyrdom, Abel arguably would have attracted mistaken religious notions of this character. Significantly, the rationales for the institution of circumcision in the Joseph Smith Translation of the Old Testament is consistent with Samuel Zinner’s conclusions about the symbolic connection between circumcision and baptism in its New Testament context, namely that baptism was not meant to replace “circumcision, but [rather] that it complements and perfects it.”\textsuperscript{119}
Digression: Baptism and washing as illustrations of the nature of all ordinances. Before concluding our discussion of the symbolism of water in salvation, we digress to show how baptism and washings provide a paradigmatic illustration of the nature of all priesthood ordinances.
We conclude from our brief study of baptism and washings that they, like other priesthood ordinances, are *symbolic, salvific, interrelated and additive, retrospective, and anticipatory*. 
PRIESTHOOD ORDINANCES ARE:

- Symbolic
- Salvific
- Interrelated and Additive
- Retrospective
- Anticipatory

Symbolic. Hugh Nibley defined the endowment as “a model, a presentation in figurative terms.”120 The same can be said for baptism, which Paul described as a symbol of death and resurrection.121
PRIESTHOOD ORDINANCES ARE:

- Symbolic
- Salvific
- Interrelated and Additive
- Retrospective
- Anticipatory

Salvific. While recognizing the superior forms of pedagogy embodied in the symbolism of the ordinances, Elder David A. Bednar taught that we err if we think that their value is limited to inspired instruction. He said, citing D&C 84:19-21: "The ordinances of salvation and exaltation administered in the Lord’s restored Church are far more than rituals or symbolic performances. Rather, they constitute authorized channels through which the blessings and powers of heaven can flow into our individual lives."
Interstitial and additive. Elder David A. Bednar has taught:⁰¹⁴ “The ordinances of baptism by immersion, the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the sacrament are not isolated and discrete events; rather, they are elements in an interrelated and additive pattern of redemptive progress.”
Retrospective. An appreciation of the retrospective regard of the ordinances clears up any confusion about the relationship between baptism and other washing ordinances. Since the time of Adam, baptism has been the first, introductory saving ordinance of the Gospel given in mortal life, and any similarities of baptism to later ordinances are meant to highlight and build upon that resemblance retrospectively.
Going further, the ordinance received by Aaron when he was “wash[ed],” “anoint[ed],” and clothed in “holy garments ... so that he [might] minister unto [the Lord] in the priest's office”\textsuperscript{129} retrospectively recapitulates his foreordination in the premortal world to this priesthood calling.\textsuperscript{130} President Spencer W. Kimball taught that in premortal life, faithful women were also given assignments to be carried out later on earth.\textsuperscript{131} Speaking of Christ as the prototype for all those who were foreordained to priestly offices, the \textit{Gospel of Philip} makes it clear that the meaning, symbolism, and sequence of the ordinances has always been the same: “He who ... [was begotten] before everything was begotten anew [in other words, “by the water”\textsuperscript{132}]. He [who was] once [anointed] was anointed anew [in other words, “by the Spirit”\textsuperscript{133}]. He who was redeemed in turn redeemed (others) [in other words, “by the blood”\textsuperscript{134}].”\textsuperscript{135}
Anticipatory. Because the round of eternity\textsuperscript{136} is embedded in the ordinances, we would expect them not only to be retrospective but also anticipatory in nature. For example, in Moses 5 Adam learns that the ordinance of animal sacrifice was instituted in explicit anticipation of the sacrifice “of the Only Begotten of the Father”\textsuperscript{137} — just as, of course, the ordinance of the sacrament looks back retrospectively on that same expiatory sacrifice.

Note also that the symbolism of death and resurrection in the ordinance and covenant of baptism anticipates the instruction and covenants of the temple endowment that further detail the responsibilities and blessings of those who will rise in first resurrection.\textsuperscript{138} Similarly, the initiatory ordinance of washing, anointing, and clothing\textsuperscript{139} provides an anticipatory capsule summary of all the ordinances. Indeed, one might say that in every detail, the performance of the initiatory ordinance reflects the threefold symbolism of water, spirit, and blood found in Moses 6, thus outlining the path of exaltation that is further elaborated in the endowment. The anticipatory nature of the initiatory ordinance is captured in Truman G. Madsen’s description of it as “a patriarchal blessing to every organ and attribute and power of our being, a blessing that is to be fulfilled in this world and the next.”\textsuperscript{140}
Going further, Elder John A. Widtsoe taught that earthly ordinances prefigure heavenly ordinances: \(^{142}\)

Great eternal truths make up the Gospel plan. All regulations for man’s earthly guidance have their eternal spiritual counterparts. The earthly ordinances of the Gospel are themselves only reflections of heavenly ordinances. ... There is no water baptism in the next estate nor any conferring of the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of earthly hands. The equivalents of these ordinances prevail no doubt in every estate, but only as they are given on this earth can they be made to aid, in their onward progress, those who have dwelt on earth.
“BY THE SPIRIT YE ARE JUSTIFIED”

• What does it mean to be justified?
• Does baptism itself produce a remission of sins?
• How do the ongoing processes of justification and sanctification complement and sustain one another?
• Do justification and sanctification come by the Spirit or through the Savior?

Now we turn our attention — all too briefly — to the phrase “by the Spirit ye are justified.”
"BY THE SPIRIT YE ARE JUSTIFIED"

- What does it mean to be justified?
- Does baptism itself produce a remission of sins?
- How do the ongoing processes of justification and sanctification complement and sustain one another?
- Do justification and sanctification come by the Spirit or through the Savior?

What does it mean to be justified? Simply put, individuals become “just” — in other words, innocent before God and ready for a covenant relationship with Him — when they demonstrate sufficient repentance to qualify for an “initial cleansing from sin” by the Spirit,” thus having had the demands of justice satisfied on their behalf through the Savior’s atoning blood.
“BY THE SPIRIT YE ARE JUSTIFIED”

• What does it mean to be justified?
• Does baptism itself produce a remission of sins?
• How do the ongoing processes of justification and sanctification complement and sustain one another?
• Do justification and sanctification come by the Spirit or through the Savior?

But don’t the scriptures refer specifically to “baptism for the remission of sins”?147 Although baptism by proper authority is absolutely necessary, it is but the outward sign of faith in Jesus Christ. A significant phrase in D&C 20:37 explains with precision that it is not the performance of the baptismal ordinance itself that cleanses, but rather the individuals’ having “truly manifest[ed] by their works that they have received of the Spirit of Christ unto a remission of their sins” — a requirement that is meant to precede water baptism.148
How do the ongoing processes of justification and sanctification complement and sustain one another?
To adapt imagery from C. S. Lewis, it might be said that the interwoven processes of justification and sanctification are as complementary and mutually necessary as the two blades of a pair of scissors. Without justification, “the companionship and power of the Holy Ghost” are not operative because “the Spirit of the Lord doth not dwell in unholy temples.”

For those who are clean, the “companionship and power of the Holy Ghost” are both available and necessary for the ongoing work of sanctification, whereby individuals are “enabled to keep the commandments of God and grow in holiness.” When those on the path of sanctification fail to keep the commandments, they must be justified again before they can continue onward. In this way, the complementary processes of justification (remission of sins) and sanctification (the gradual changing of one’s nature that allows individuals to become “new creatures in Christ) operate throughout our lives, preparing us eventually to be born again in the ultimate sense.

Aided by repeated preparation for and participation in the ordinance of the sacrament, we can “always retain [a justificatory] remission of our sins” and we can “always have the Spirit of the Lord to be with us” for the ongoing work of sanctification.
This figure superposes the sequence of justification, sanctification, and exaltation upon the layout of ordinance rooms on the second floor of the Salt Lake Temple. It is meant to illustrate how justification and sanctification can be seen from a different but equally valid perspective as sequential steps instead of as parts of an interwoven process. These steps are described in King Benjamin’s imagery as, first, “putt[ing] off the natural man” (without which one cannot be “clothed upon with robes of righteousness”) and then, second, “becom[ing] a saint.” These transformations are both made possible “through the atonement of Christ the Lord.”
From this perspective, we might consider the initial remission of sins through the Spirit, the washing ordinance of baptism, and the receiving of the gift of the Holy Ghost after confirmation as accomplishing the first step of justification. Through their continued faith in Jesus Christ and faithfulness in keeping the commandments individuals living in a telestial world may progress to a point where they can begin to be “quickened by a portion of the terrestrial glory.”
In the process of sanctification associated with the terrestrial glory, individuals continue to "receive of the same" unto "a fulness" through additional ordinances and the ongoing, sanctifying anointing as it were, of the Spirit of the Lord. Finally — having received a "fulness" of the terrestrial glory, having experienced a "perfect brightness of hope," demonstrating their capacity for supreme self-sacrifice as required by the law of consecration, and being filled with "charity[,] ... the pure love of Christ," — these individuals can be "sealed up unto eternal life, by revelation and the spirit of prophecy, through the power of the Holy Priesthood." In this manner, they are sanctified so that they might be "quickened by a portion of the celestial glory" and "behold the face of God."
In the process of exaltation, individuals who have been previously “cleansed by blood, even the blood of [the] Only Begotten; that [they] might be sanctified from all sin”\(^\text{172}\) may then go on to receive additional blessings in the celestial world, being “crowned with honor, and glory, and immortality”\(^\text{173}\) — and “eternal lives.”\(^\text{174}\) The Lord has said of these individuals that they shall be “clothed upon, even as I am, to be one with me, that we may be one.”\(^\text{175}\)
Do justification and sanctification come by the Spirit or through the Savior? Because justification and sanctification are accomplished through the constant companionship of the Holy Ghost and, at the same time, made possible through the Atonement of Christ, it is no contradiction when scripture testifies both that we are “sanctified by the reception of the Holy Ghost” and also that it is “by the blood [that we] are sanctified.” D&C 20:30-31 tells us that both “justification” and “sanctification” come “through the grace of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.”
The form of baptism, being performed in the likeness of death and resurrection, and the form of the physical action of the laying on of hands that is used in confirmation both suggest a retrospective regard toward the scriptural account of the creation of Adam wherein God “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.” As Joseph Smith highlighted the importance of the manner in which baptism is performed, describing it as a “sign,” so also he specifically referred to the means by which the Holy Ghost is given and the sick are healed through “the laying on of hands” as a “sign.” He said pointedly that if it were performed in any other way it “would fail.”
Both biblical and Egyptian sources associate the receiving of divine breath not merely with an infusion of life, but also with royal status. For example, Isaiah attributes the presence of the Spirit of the Lord to a prior messianic anointing: “The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me.” Anointing followed by an outpouring of the Spirit is documented as part of the rites of kingship in ancient Israel, such as when Samuel anointed David “and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward.”
Even in modern times one sees vestiges of the symbolism of anointing, royal status, and the Holy Spirit brought together. For example, prior to the British ceremonies of coronation, in the holiest rite of that service, the monarch is “divested of ... robes,” clothed in simple white linen, and “screened from the general view” in order to be “imbued with grace” through the Archbishop’s anointing with holy oil “on hand, breast and forehead.”188
Just as the separate yet interrelated rites of baptism and other washings with water became blurred in early Christianity, so also the distinctive ordinances of confirmation and anointing were confused.

However, from modern revelation we know that confirmation for the gift of the Holy Ghost is the first ordinance administered by the Melchizedek Priesthood. In “interrelated,” “additive” fashion, temple initiatory ordinances of washing and anointing echo and build upon the ordinances of baptism and confirmation, while also looking forward in anticipation to subsequent confirmatory anointings wherein we imitate the Christ.
Indeed, the title “Christ” is explained in Pseudo-Clement’s Recognitions 1:45:2 as an anointing of oil: “Him first God anointed ... : from that anointing therefore He is called Christ.” Confirming that this was an ordinance not meant to be restricted to the Lord Himself, Tertullian describes “a practice derived from the old discipline, wherein on entering the priesthood, men were wont to be anointed with oil from a horn, ever since Aaron was anointed by Moses. Whence Aaron is called ‘Christ,’ from the ‘chrism,’ which is the unction [or oil of anointing].” C. S. Lewis expressed the principle behind this practice succinctly: “Every Christian is to become a little Christ. The whole purpose of becoming a Christian is simply nothing else.”
Of course, becoming a “little Christ” is not a process that ends with an anticipatory anointing. There is a double meaning in the phrase “by the blood ye are sanctified,” as was expressed in the previously cited words about Christ from the Gospel of Philip: “He who was redeemed in turn redeemed (others).” Although redemption itself comes only “in and through the atonement of the Only Begotten Son,” it might be said similarly, with regard to those who, in the words of Alma 13, have been “ordained after the order of [the] Son”: “He who was redeemed with ‘a preparatory redemption’ in turn must assist ‘with all [his] heart, might, mind and strength’ to bring about the redemption of others.” In other words, those who would follow Christ “to the end,” must continue to move beyond the keeping of the “law of obedience and sacrifice” toward the complete dedication required by the “law of consecration.”

Before saying more on this point, let us first examine the essential role and symbolism of blood in the context of the ordinances — for “by the blood ye are sanctified.”
Because blood was a symbol of life, it was reserved for use on “the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.”

Exodus 24:8 recounts how blood was sprinkled on all the people in order to ratify the covenant, making it binding on Israel. At the same time the sprinkling of blood symbolized the sanctification of Moses and his fellows who immediately thereafter were enabled to see Jehovah. Following a similar description of the appearance of the Lord in the Kirtland Temple, Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery were told: “your sins are forgiven you [in other words, they were justified]; you are clean before me [in other words, they were sanctified].”
“Properly, of course, the sinner’s own blood must be used [in sacrificial ordinances],” explained Hugh Nibley, “unless a go’el, a representative substitute advocate or redeemer, could be found to take one’s place. The willingness of the candidate to sacrifice his own life (the akedah) is symbolized by the blood on the right thumb and right earlobe, where the blood would be if the throat had been cut.”

In the case of Isaac’s near sacrifice by Abraham, at the last moment a sacrificial ram was supplied in his stead. More important, however, as Hugh Nibley relates, is the fact that:

Isaac himself was a substitute. “In Jewish tradition,” writes Rosenberg, “Isaac is the prototype of the ‘Suffering Servant,’ bound upon the altar as a sacrifice.” Rosenberg has shown that the title of Suffering Servant was used in the ancient East to designate “the substitute king” — the noble victim. Accordingly, the “new Isaac” ... must be “a ‘substitute king’ who dies that the people might live.” The starting point ... is Isaiah 52:13 to 53:12, which “seems to constitute a portion of a ritual drama centering about a similar humiliation, culminating in death, of a ‘substitute’ for the figure of the king of the Jews.” ... The [rite of] sacrifice of the substitute king is found all over the ancient world.
We have already observed that the servant song of Isaiah 52 can be generalized — in other words, it is not only to be applied to Jesus Christ, but also to others who sooner or later may qualify to become sons of Man or sons of God, with a small “s.” While the initial blessing of justification comes exclusively by means of a substitutionary sacrifice — thus “relying wholly upon the merits of him who is mighty to save,” the culminating step of the process of sanctification is a joint effort that, in addition to relying on the merits of Christ, demands that individuals themselves meet the stringent measure of self-sacrifice enjoined by the law of consecration — “for we know that it is by grace that we are saved, after all we can do.” Speaking of the change in law that was emphasized by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, John W. Welch explained:

The old law of sacrifice was explicitly replaced by that of the “broken heart and contrite spirit,” and whereas previously the sacrificial animal was to be pure and without blemish [haplous], now the disciples themselves are to become “single” [haplous] to the glory of God.

Going further, Elder Neal A. Maxwell clarified that “real, personal sacrifice never was placing an animal on the altar. Instead, it is a willingness to put the animal in us upon the altar and letting it be consumed!”
We return to the statement of the Prophet Joseph Smith that being “born again comes by the Spirit of God through ordinances.” Through the ordinances we are repeatedly “reborn” as we experience the cleansing justification of the Spirit of Christ, the symbolism of death and resurrection through baptism of water, the new life granted us when we receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost, the spiritual and physical renewal of the initiatory ordinances, and the unfolding stages of the drama of our existence in the endowment. Indeed, the endowment itself enacts our individual progress through multiple “rebirths” — from the spirit world to mortal life, and from thence to becoming the sons and daughters of Christ — and ultimately of the Father Himself, receiving all the blessings of the Firstborn. Similarly, by the end of Moses 6, it is clear not only that Adam had been born of water and of the Spirit, but also that he had been “born of God,” as was Alma:

For because of the word which he has imparted unto me, behold, many have been born of God, and have tasted as I have tasted, and have seen eye to eye as I have seen; therefore they do know of these things of which I have spoken, as I do know; and the knowledge which I have is of God.
For each change of state that accompanies one’s progression through the ordinances, the Father grants a corresponding change in name and relationship to Him. To paraphrase C. S. Lewis, “God turns tools into servants[,] servants into friends[,] and [friends] into sons.” Moses 6:67–68 makes it clear that to receive the fulness of the priesthood is, when also accompanied by a divine, personal ratification, to become “a son of God” “after the order of him who was without beginning of days or end of years.” Reflecting the experience of Adam in Moses 6, this idea recalls the royal rebirth formula of Psalm 2:7: “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.”

In Mosiah 5:7, King Benjamin uses a temple setting and context to explain this same concept: “And now, because of the covenant which ye have made ye shall be called the children of Christ, his sons, and his daughters; for behold, this day he hath spiritually begotten you; for ye say that your hearts are changed through faith on his name; therefore, ye are born of him and have become his sons and his daughters.”

Significantly, King Benjamin not only goes on to say that those who keep the covenant will be “found at the right hand of God,” thus, in essence, receiving the name of their king, “Benjamin” (meaning “son of the right hand”), but also that they were taking upon them, as royal sons and daughters, a title of the true “Son of the right hand,” namely “Christ.” In so doing, they were also to become, in likeness of the son of Benjamin, little Mosiahs (meaning “saviors”) and, in likeness of the Only Begotten Son of God, little messiahs (meaning “anointed ones”). Having thus qualified, the Father might appropriately “seal” them “his.”
Margaret Barker describes how the concept of becoming a son of God can well relate both to ordinances in the earthly temple and to actual ascents to the heavenly temple:

The high priests and kings of ancient Jerusalem entered the holy of holies and then emerged as messengers, angels of the Lord. They had been raised up, that is, resurrected; they were sons of God, that is, angels; and they were anointed ones, that is, messiahs. ... Human beings could become angels, and then continue to live in the material world. This transformation did not just happen after physical death; it marked the passage from the life in the material world to the life of eternity.

Speaking of the figurative heavenly journey that was enacted in ancient temple ordinances, Matthew Bowen has argued elsewhere that both the king and the high priest, emerging from the Holy of Holies, were seen and worshiped as Yahweh, the Lord. Consistent with this identification, Alma 13 states that high priests were ordained “in a manner that thereby the people might know in what manner to look forward to [God’s] Son for redemption” and that the ancient “ordinances” of the high priesthood associated with the temple specifically were given “that thereby the people might look forward on the Son of God ... for a remission of their sins.”
Significantly, the last verse of Moses 6 includes the words “and thus may all become my sons.” This statement relating to Adam’s exaltation presages the account in Moses 7 of Enoch’s adoption as a son of God, with a right to God’s throne. At the end of verse 3 we read: “and as I stood upon the mount, I beheld the heavens open, and I was clothed upon with glory.”

The pseudepigraphal books of 2 and 3 Enoch also purport to describe the process by which Enoch was literally “clothed upon with glory” in some detail. As a prelude to Enoch’s introduction to the secrets of creation, both accounts describe a “two-step initiatory procedure” whereby “the patriarch was first initiated by angel(s) and after this by the Lord” himself. In 2 Enoch, God commanded his angels to “extract Enoch from (his) earthly clothing. And anoint him with my delightful oil, and put him into the clothes of my glory.” Philip S. Alexander speaks of this event as an “ontological transformation [that] blurred the distinction between human and divine,” amounting to “deification.” In the first chapter of the book of Moses, Moses underwent a similar transformation. He explained that if he had seen God without such a change, he would have “withered and died in his presence; but his glory was upon me; and ... I was transfigured before him.” After Enoch was changed, he is said to have resembled God so exactly that he was mistaken for Him. Summarizing the ancient Jewish literature relevant to this passage, Charles Mopsik concludes that the exaltation of Enoch is not meant to be seen as a unique event. Rather, he writes that the “enthronement of Enoch is a prelude to the transfiguration of the righteous — and at their head the Messiah — in the world to come, a transfiguration that is the restoration of the figure of the perfect Man.”

In LDS theology, such a transfiguration is not the result of an arbitrary, capricious act of God but rather a sign of love and trust made in response to individuals’ demonstration of their determination to serve God “at all hazard.” Only such will be privileged to hear the personal oath from the Father Himself that they shall obtain the fulness of the joys of the celestial kingdom “for ever and ever.”
Hugh Nibley sums up the principle of sanctification “by the blood”\textsuperscript{252} as follows:\textsuperscript{253}

The gospel is more than a catalogue of moral platitudes; these are matters of either eternal life or nothing. Nothing less than the sacrifice of Abraham is demanded of us.\textsuperscript{254} But how do we make it? In the way Abraham, Isaac, and Sarah all did. Each was willing and expected to be sacrificed, and each committed his or her all to prove it. In each case the sacrifice was interrupted at the last moment and a substitute provided: to their relief, someone else had been willing to pay the price, but not until after they had shown their good faith and willingness to go all the way — “lay not thy hand on the lad ... for now I know.”\textsuperscript{255} Abraham had gone far enough; he had proven to himself and the angels who stood witness (we are told) that he was actually willing to perform the act. Therefore the Lord was satisfied with the token then, for he knew the heart of Abraham. This is the same for Isaac and Sarah and for us. And whoever is willing to make the sacrifice of Abraham to receive eternal life will show it by the same signs and tokens as Abraham, but he or she must do it in good faith and with real intent.
Understanding the self-sacrifice required in order to become “a saint” enhances the meaning one can take away when participating in the ordinance of the sacrament. Although, as we have argued earlier, the eating of the broken bread is tightly linked in its symbolism to the initial covenant of baptism through their common witness of one’s intention to “keep [God’s] commandments,” we are persuaded that the drinking in the second part of the sacrament can be seen profitably as an epitome of the covenants and ordinances that follow baptism. In particular, we might see it as an expression of the last and most difficult covenant of consecration, symbolizing the blood by which we are sanctified. As Ugo A. Perego succinctly expressed it, “through the partaking of consecrated bread and wine, we also consecrate ourselves.” This understanding of the covenant we are making is consistent with the recent teaching emphasis of Church leaders that the “sacrament is a beautiful time to not just renew our baptismal covenants, but to commit to Him to renew all our covenants.”

In the second part of the sacrament, the Saints not only witness that they are willing to take the Savior’s name upon them in the essential but strictly limited sense of accepting the blessing of justification made possible by His submitting His will to the will of His Father “even unto death,” but also by their personal willingness “to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon [them], even as a child doth submit to his father,” — thus qualifying themselves for the blessings of sanctification in the spirit of the law of consecration. In the carefully measured, specifically tailored manner that God has ordained for those who would endeavor to follow Jesus to the end, disciples of Christ must be willing to suffer themselves, sometimes unjustly and always uncomplainingly, “that they, in likeness of Christ, might bring [others] to God.” In the sacramental symbolism of drinking the emblems of sanctifying blood, they must not only express their gratitude for the “bitter cup” that the Savior drank on their behalf but also acknowledge that they are willing to drink the individually prepared cup they have themselves been given to the dregs. Moreover, in doing this, they must covenant not only to “give away all [their] sins to know [God]” but also to undertake a deliberate and sustained effort to know Him through giving their all. All this, so that when the Lord comes again “in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory,” they may be among the sanctified who will “drink of the fruit of the vine, the emblems of His blood, with [Him and with all His Saints] on the sanctified earth.”
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Endnotes

1 Moses 1:39.
2 Mosiah 5:7. See also Psalm 2:7; 110:4; John 1:12-13; Romans 8:19; Ephesians 4:13; Hebrews 7:3; 1 John 3:1-3; 3 Nephi 9:17; Moroni 7:48; D&C 128:23; Moses 6:22, 68; 7:1; 8:13. See also Joseph Smith’s description of the “sons of God who exalt[ed] themselves to be gods even from before the foundation of the world” (J. Smith, Jr., Words, Thomas Bullock Report, 16 June 1844, p. 381; cf. J. Smith, Jr., Teachings, 16 June 1844, p. 375).
3 J. Smith, Jr., Words, 11 June 1843, Wilford Woodruff Journal, p. 213. See also J. W. Welch, Sermon, pp. 77-78.

Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook note (in J. Smith, Jr., Words, p. 286 n. 25):

Undoubtedly the Church historians decided to amplify this statement based on D&C 124:28, and their knowledge of the Prophet’s teachings on temple ordinances: “If a man gets a fullness of the priesthood of God he has to get it in the same way that Jesus Christ obtained it, and that was by keeping all the commandments and obeying all the ordinances of the house of the Lord” (J. Smith, Jr., Teachings, 11 June 1843, p. 308; changed words italicized). The essence of the Church historians’ amplification, which is confirmed by the Franklin D. Richards report, is additionally supported in the following statement of Brigham Young in the Nauvoo Temple which includes the Prophet’s teachings on the highest ordinances of the Temple:

Those who come in here and have received their washing & anointing will [later] be ordained Kings & Priests, and will then have received the fullness of the Priesthood, all that can be given on earth. For Brother Joseph said he had given us all that could be given to man on the earth (Heber C. Kimball Journal kept by William Clayton, 26 December 1845, Church Archives).

6 Compare 1 John 5:5-8.


8 Photo © Jeffrey M. Bradshaw. Image: DSC01031.jpg (27 August 2016).


11 See John 3:2.


14 See John 3:3, 5.
The verb “is ὁραω which means simply ‘to see’; it appears 73 times in the Greek of John’s gospel, and never means ‘to enter into’ (e.g., John 1:18, 29, 33, 34, 39 [x2], 46, 47, 48, 50, 51; 3:11, 26, 32, 36, etc)” (R. Boylan, Some Comments).

J. Smith, Jr., Words, 15 October 1843, Joseph Smith Diary by Willard Richards, p. 256. The Prophet’s statement in context reads: “[It is] one thing to see the kingdom and another to be in it. [One] must have a change of heart to see the kingdom of God and subscribe [to] the articles of adoption to enter therein.”

These additional statements of the Prophet are from the recollections of Daniel Tyler (D. Tyler, Recollections, pp. 93-94):

The birth here spoken of... was not the gift of the Holy Ghost, which was promised after baptism, but was a portion of the spirit, which attended the preaching of the gospel by the elders of the Church. The people wondered why they had not previously understood the plain declarations of scripture, as explained by the elders, as they had read them hundreds of times. When they read the Bible it was a new book to them [cf. Joseph Smith — History 1:74]. This was being born again to see the Kingdom of God. They were not in it, but could see it from the outside, which they could not do until the Spirit of the Lord took the vail from before their eyes. It was a change of heart but not of state; they were converted, but were yet in their sins.

IMG_2877-1.jpg. With permission of the artist.

S. Zinner, Vines of Joy. See, e.g., “Now this caused us to marvel, for it was given unto us of the Spirit. And while we meditated upon these things, the Lord touched the eyes of our understandings and they were opened, and the glory of the Lord shone round about” (D&C 76:18-19).

Ibid..

John 3:7. Cf., e.g., Mark 5:20; John 5:20, 28, 7:21; Acts 3:12; Revelation 17:7; Jacob 4:12; Mosiah 27:25; Alma 19:24; 39:17; Helaman 5:49; 7:15; 3 Nephi 15:3; D&C 10:35; 18:8; 27:5; 76:18; 136:37. Samuel Zinner observes that “Thomas’ use of “marvel” is closer to Qumranic usage than to Greco-Roman philosophy, and ... the two Coptic verbs ... are ultimately derived not from Plato, but from the Book of Daniel [Daniel 2:3-4; 4:2, 6, 16; 5:6, 9, 19; 7:28; 8:17, 27; 12:6]” (ibid., referring to mysteries that can only be made known through revelation).

See Mosiah 5:7-8, where the idea of being “born of him” and the assertion that “under this head (Hebrew rōʾš) ye are made free” (cf. “born from the head”) are mentioned in two successive verses: “And under this head ye are made free, and there is no other head whereby ye can be made free. There is no other name given whereby salvation cometh; therefore, I would that ye should take upon you the name of Christ, all you that have entered into the covenant with God that ye should be obedient unto the end of your lives” (Mosiah 5:8). See below for more on this passage from King Benjamin’s discourse.

See Born Again Narrative, Born Again Narrative for a discussion of the Aramaic and Greek terms behind this conversation as well as a critique of Bart Ehrman’s claim regarding the impossibility of its having taken place as reported. “The Greek word translated “from above” in v. 3 can also mean “anew” ... This is the source of Nicodemus’ misunderstanding” (H. W. Attridge et al., HarperCollins Study Bible, p. 1819 n. 3:4. See also C. S. Keener, John, 1:538-539). Christ is speaking of a being born of God, whereas Nicodemus thinks, incorrectly, that He is speaking of being born again.

John 3:6, emphasis added.

John 3:6, emphasis added.

In defense of Nicodemus’ interpretation, the idea of birth “of the water and the spirit” is a clear allusion to Genesis 1:2, as Samuel Zinner points out (S. Zinner, Vines of Joy):

The Apocalypse of Paul 45 seems to presuppose the idea of the holy spirit as a mother bird who moves over the waters of creation, but who after creation comes to rest (like a bird) on the tree of life, yet who periodically blows (like wind) through the tree, which causes waters to flow from the tree. This passage may shed light on John 3’s maternal spirit who blows, like wind through the trees, and
who is by allusion associated with the waters of Genesis 1:2. The hidden nature of the wind’s origin is compared to the concealed state of a developing fetus in a pregnant woman’s womb in Ecclesiastes 11:5, which may have relevance for the understanding of the spirit as both wind and mother in John 3: “Just as you do not know how the wind blows, like [developing] limbs in the womb of the pregnant woman, so you do not know how God works, which causes everything.” The “wind” can also be understood as “life breath” (Cf. the JPS version: “Just as you do not know how the life breath passes into the limbs within the womb of the pregnant woman, so you cannot foresee the actions of God, who causes all things to happen.” As the JPS notes, “into” reads “like” in most manuscripts. The “wind” as “life breath” makes the passage even more relevant to John 3.)

Note that John 3:6-7 joins the themes of flesh and spirit with the term “marvel.” This constellation corresponds precisely with Thomas logion 29’s central components which describe the fleshly, earthly birth and the spiritual heavenly birth, just as we find in John 3:6-7 and 12. That which is born of the spirit is spirit, or divine, and this leads smoothly into logion 30 with its theme of “gods.” The Thomasine connection with the traditions behind John 3 is strengthened by logion 28’s isomorphism with further Johannine traditions as reflected in John 1:14. However, it is important to insist that logion 28 is connected more with pre-Christian wisdom traditions than with the actual text of John 1:14, as a comparison with 1 Enoch 42 and logion 28 will reveal. Compare logion 28’s theme of thirst with 1 Enoch 42:3’s “thirsty land” and logion 28’s theme of finding with the same trope in 1 Enoch 42:3. This is not to overlook other features not present in 1 Enoch but shared between logion 28 and John 1, namely the fleshly dwelling in the world.

Regarding John 3:5’s spirit and water, usually understood with reference to Genesis 1:2, the waters could naturally have been expanded to include the waters of the four rivers of paradise, which seem to be the waters referred to in Apocalypse of Paul 45 as flowing from the tree of life.

26 Below we discuss in more detail the distinction that might be made between being “born of water and the spirit” and that of being “born of God.” In John 3:13, Jesus linked His identity as the “Son of man” to His having descended from and ascended to heaven. Alma also described the experience of being “born of God” in somewhat similar terms. After telling of his vision of “God sitting upon his throne” and his subsequent missionary labors (Alma 36:22-24), he testifies that “many have been born of God, and have tasted [of exceeding joy] as I have tasted, and have seen [God] eye to eye as I have seen; therefore do know of these things of which I have spoken, as I do know; and the knowledge which I have is of God” (Alma 36:26; cf. Mosiah 27:28). By way of contrast, 1 John 3:9 and 5:1 seem to use the term “born of God” in a more general fashion.

27 For an excellent discussion of this topic generally as it relates to the Gospel of John, see S. Hamid-Khani, Revelation.

28 John 3:13-15. Samuel Zinner points out the linkage of “new spirit birth with the ascent of the Son of man to heaven” is also found in “John 6:62, immediately before verse 63’s teaching on the flesh and spirit, which as we have seen is related to Thomas logion 53 as well.” He further observes (S. Zinner, Vines of Joy):

The joining of the two tropes of new birth and the ascent of the Son of man is intriguing. The implication in John 3:12-13 seems to be that the Son of man’s ascent would cause a greater wonder or marvel than the new spirit birth. Similarly John 6:62-63 seems to imply that the Son of man’s ascent is a greater wonder or marvel than the bread of life discourse. And since verses 62 and 63 seem to constitute a unitive block, the verses naturally suggest that the ascent of the Son of man and the teaching on the flesh that profits nothing and the spirit which is life (which alludes to the same teaching on new spirit birth as we find in John 3) represent equivalent entities.

29 See Numbers 21:4-9.

30 See Isaiah 6. The Hebrew verb saraph means “burn.” Most commentators on Numbers 21 associate this description with the serpent’s deadly poison, but it could equally apply to their fiery appearance (i.e.,

Ezekiel 1 and Revelation 4:6-9 describe beings with a similar function. “The seraphim have wings, faces, feet, and human features; these characteristics have confused some scholars who assume they thus cannot be serpents. Near Eastern iconography ... is replete with images of serpents with faces, feet, wings, and human features” (ibid., p. 444).

The only explicit references in the Bible to seraphim in the Holy of Holies are in Isaiah 6:2, 6. However, Nickelsburg suggests, based on a midrash on Genesis 3:24 that cites Psalm 104:4 (H. Freedman et al., Midrash, 1:178) that the “flaming sword” of Genesis 3:24 (Moses 4:31) might be associated more correctly with seraphim rather than cherubim (G. W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 296 n. 7). He also sees the “those who were there ... like a flaming fire” in 1 Enoch 17:1 and the “serpents” of 1 Enoch 20:7 as good candidates for the appellation of seraphim (ibid., 17:1, p. 276; 20:7, p. 294).

32 John 3:13. We capitalize “Man” to be consistent with Moses 6:57.
33 Moses 6:57.
34 See Genesis 3:24 and G. W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, p. 296 n. 7. The sword mentioned in scripture is described by Sarna as a “separate, protective instrument, not said to be in the hands of the cherubim” (N. M. Sarna, Genesis, p. 30). While the function of the cherubim is to selectively admit those authorized to enter, Nibley argues that the fire and steel combined in the sword are specifically meant to repulse the serpent, forever preventing its return to the Garden (H. W. Nibley, Message 2005, pp. 319-320). For additional discussion of the sword of the cherubim, see J. M. Bradshaw, God’s Image 1, commentary Moses 4:31-d, pp. 280-281. For related discussion of similar symbolism in the sickle of the laborer (D&C 4:4), the sword of the Spirit (Hebrews 4:12–13. Cf. D&C 6:2; 11:2; 12:2; 14:2; 33:1–2), and the veil of the temple (J. M. Bradshaw, Tree of Knowledge), see J. M. Bradshaw, He That Trusteth in His Sickle, pp. 174-176. All these symbols share a common feature: they divide the righteous from the unrighteous — saving the former and condemning the latter.
36 D&C 132:19; D. W. Parry, Garden, p. 139; B. Young, 6 April 1853 - B, p. 31. See also J. Gee, Keeper.
37 2 Nephi 9:41.
40 See 3 Nephi 20:43. Cf. 3 Nephi 21:10. Like Alma, one of the “hidden seed” of the Lord prophesied by Isaiah (see Isaiah 53:8, 10; 54:17), who was the sole individual among Noah’s priests to whom “to whom” or “upon whom” (ʿal-mî) the Lord was “reveal[ing]” his arm as Abinadi’s prophetic successor (Mosiah 17:2 and Mosiah 14:1, quoting Isaiah 53:1. See M. L. Bowen, Alma; A. P. Schade et al., To Whom), Joseph (like Jesus Christ Himself) was not known among his brethren for a time, but eventually revealed himself to them as the one that God had sent away in order to assure their (temporal) salvation (Genesis 45:5).
41 See also Samuel Zinner’s extensive discussion of the plurality of “sons of man” in the mystical sense of the term in Gospel of Thomas Logion 106 (S. Zinner, Vines of Joy).
42 John 1:12.
43 Although we could have substituted the term “children of God,” we prefer in such cases to use “sons of God” — or exceptionally, when citing the discourse of King Benjamin, “sons ... and daughters” (Mosiah 5:7) of God. This allows us to distinguish between the ordinary sense of the term in which every mortal “in the beginning” (D&C 93:23, 38) can be described as a child “of heavenly parents” (G. B. Hinckley et al.,
The family: A proclamation to the world. Proclamation of the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve presented at the General Relief Society Meeting, September 23, 1995, paragraph 2) and the special sense used in the Gospel of John and elsewhere in which only certain of God’s faithful offspring are given “power to become the sons of God” (John 1:12).


45 Compare 1 Nephi 11:33; 19:10; Moses 7:24, 47, 55; 3 Nephi 27:14-15; 28:6; Ether 4:1.

46 3 Nephi 27:14.

47 3 Nephi 27:14.

48 3 Nephi 27:14.

49 3 Nephi 27:22.

50 Compare Isaiah 6:1; 1 Nephi 13:30, 37; 16:2; Alma 13:29; 36:3; 37:37; 38:5; Helaman 8:14-15; 3 Nephi 27:14-15, 22; Mormon 2:19; Ether 4:19; Moses 7:24, 47, 55, 59. It should be noted that the basic Aramaic/Syriac verb meaning “to crucify,” *zqp, literally means to “raise,” “lift up,” “elevate.”

51 H. N. Ridderbos, John, P. 137.

52 Alma 33:19, 22. B. A. Gardner, Second Witness, 4:472-473 notes that, by way of contrast to John, Alma 33:19-22 “emphasizes the healing that resulted from looking upon the symbol. He does not emphasize the ‘raising up.’ While the Nephite prophets had [received divine foreknowledge] of the Savior’s crucifixion (1 Nephi 19:13; 2 Nephi 6:9; 10:3; 25:13; Mosiah 3:9), they did not have direct experience with crucifixion on or its social implications, unlike John. Alma’s listeners, with their reliance on the brass plates, did not have the Nephite prophets’ understanding of ‘raising up.’ Thus, the symbolic association so important to John is entirely missing in Alma’s analysis.”


54 http://dwellingintheword.wordpress.com/category/bible/uncategorized/page/6/

55 John 3:10.

56 C. S. Keener, John, 1:538.

57 Ibid., 1:563. See John 3:3.

58 C. H. Kraeling et al., Synagogue, Plates 70 and 71.

59 See J. M. Bradshaw, Ezekiel Mural. Donald Carson argues against exegetes who see Jesus as “arguing against the ritual washings of the Essenes …, or perhaps against Jewish ceremonies in general. What is necessary is Spirit-birth, not mere water-purification. But ‘water’ and ‘Spirit’ are not contrasted in [John 3:5]: they are linked, and together become the equivalent of ‘from above’ (v. 3)” (D. A. Carson, John, p. 193).
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63 From J. F. Dolkart, James Tissot, p. 150.

64 1 John 3:9; 5:1; Mosiah 27:28; Alma 36:26.


explicitly in terms of the end of mortal life, rather than implicitly, as the end of probation, or the time of judgment.

67 Ephesians 4:13.

68 E.g., Matthew 10:38; 16:24; Mark 8:34; 10:21; Luke 9:23; 14:27; Acts 5:41; 9:16; Romans 8:17; Philippians 4:12; 2 Timothy 2:12; 3:12; Jacob 1:8; 3 Nephi 12:30; D&C 23:6; 56:2; 101:35; 112:14. Nevertheless, the followers of Christ are not called to endure the suffering for sin that has already been borne by Jesus Christ (D&C 19:16), though they are sometimes required to suffer “anguish of soul because of the wickedness of the people” (Alma 8:14).

69 Elder Robert D. Hales once asked (R. D. Hales, Covenant of Baptism, p. 8): “How many of our children — how many of us — really understand that when we were baptized we took upon us not only the name of Christ but also the law of obedience?” Elsewhere he explained similarly, citing King Benjamin (R. D. Hales, If Ye Love Me, p. 35): “When we are baptized, we ‘take upon [us] the name of Christ’ and enter ‘into the covenant with God that [we will] be obedient unto the end of [our] lives’ (Mosiah 5:8).”

Commenting further, L. B. Spendlove, Comment carefully draws a distinction between the act of baptism and the covenant itself by drawing from examples in the Book of Mormon:

I do not disagree with Elder Hales’s comments that “when we are baptized, we “take upon [us] the name of Christ” and enter “into the covenant with God that [we will] be obedient unto the end of [our] lives.” However, the Book of Mormon is not so clear on this doctrine. In fact, it may teach this doctrine differently.

Alma Sr. taught: “what have you against being baptized in the name of the Lord, as a witness before him that ye have entered into a covenant with him” (Mosiah 18:10). It sounds like the covenant that he spoke of was made prior to their baptism, and that the baptism was merely a “witness” of the covenant. When baptizing Helam Alma said: “I baptize thee, having authority from the Almighty God, as a testimony that ye have entered into a covenant to serve him until you are dead as to the mortal body” (Mosiah 18:13).

We also read that Limhi and his people “had entered into a covenant with God to serve him and keep his commandments” without the benefit of baptism (Mosiah 21:31). Additionally, we read: “since the coming of Ammon, king Limhi had also entered into a covenant with God, and also many of his people, to serve him and keep his commandments. And it came to pass that king Limhi and many of his people were desirous to be baptized; but there was none in the land that had authority from God. And Ammon declined doing this thing, considering himself an unworthy servant” (Mosiah 21:32-33). Their baptism only came after they had joined the Nephites in Zarahemla (Mosiah 25:17), and well after they had entered into the covenant.

Further, during King Benjamin’s speech it appears that the people likewise entered into a covenant with God and “had taken upon them the name of Christ,” to “be obedient unto the end of your lives” (Mosiah 5:8 and 6:2). There is no mention of baptism at the time of this covenant.

So, it appears that the covenant is separate from the act of baptism. This does not minimize the ordinance of baptism. It is a necessary witness or testimony of the covenant. Instead, I believe that it elevates the covenant. Many of those hearing King Benjamin’s speech had no doubt already been baptized. The covenant can and should be made throughout our lives, without the necessity of baptism or rebaptism. This is essential in the missionary efforts of the church. New converts can and should covenant with God even before their baptism, like Limhi and his people. Their lives need to be on the path of change well before they are baptized.

In addition, R. T. Swenson, ibid. insightfully points out that Alma’s reference to being willing to “mourn with those that mourn” (Mosiah 18:9) is perhaps not best “explained as the promise we make to comfort people who are grieving for the loss of a loved one.” He points out that, in the Savior’s Sermon at the Mount (Matthew 5:4) and especially in His Sermon at the Temple (3 Nephi 12:4), “mourning” is introduced “in a covenant-making context, and the blessings come to those who make the covenant to
follow the Savior.” He argues that Moses 7:45-47 (cf. Matthew 9:15; James 4:9; Moses 7:49) Joseph Smith — Matthew 1:36) provides an important key to what it means to mourn in this covenant sense:

And it came to pass that Enoch looked; and from Noah, he beheld all the families of the earth; and he cried unto the Lord, saying: When shall the day of the Lord come? When shall the blood of the Righteous be shed, that all they that mourn may be sanctified and have eternal life?

And the Lord said: It shall be in the meridian of time, in the days of wickedness and vengeance.

And behold, Enoch saw the day of the coming of the Son of Man, even in the flesh; and his soul rejoiced, saying: The Righteous is lifted up, and the Lamb is slain from the foundation of the world; and through faith I am in the bosom of the Father, and behold, Zion is with me.

Swenson concludes:

“All they that mourn” are those who look forward to the great personal sacrifice of the Redeemer. We look back to His suffering body, marred with nail holes and a sword, and the blood He shed for us.

Of course, the mourning of the righteous for their sins and for the sufferings of Christ should be contrasted with the mourning of the wicked (Matthew 24:30; Luke 6:25; D&C 45:49; 87:6; 97:21; Revelation 18:11). The “sorrowing of the damned” is attributed by Mormon to their realization that “the Lord would not always suffer them to take happiness in sin” (Mormon 2:13).
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In the early 1830’s, when the Lord was talking to the Prophet about what is called the new and everlasting covenant—that is, about the fulness of the gospel—he revealed this further truth relative to this great law of justification, and I think these following words are a perfect one sentence summary of the whole law of the whole gospel. The Lord said (D&C 132:7):

All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations, that are not made and entered into and sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, of him who is anointed, both as well for time and for all eternity, and that too most holy, by revelation and commandment through the medium of mine anointed, whom I have appointed on the earth to hold this power . . . are of no efficacy, virtue, or force in and after the resurrection from the dead.

One more expression in the revelations has bearing on this. The Lord said (D&C 76:53):

the Holy Spirit of promise, which the Father sheds forth upon all those who are just and true.

Now, to justify is to seal, or to ratify, or to approve; and it is very evident from these revelations that every act that we do, if it is to have binding and sealing virtue in eternity, must be justified by the Spirit. In other words, it must be ratified by the Holy Ghost; or in other words, it must be sealed by the Holy Spirit of Promise.

All of us know that we can deceive men. We can deceive our bishops or the other Church agents, unless at the moment their minds are lighted by the spirit of revelation; but we cannot deceive the Lord. We cannot get from him an unearned blessing. There will be an eventual day when all men will get exactly and precisely what they have merited and earned, neither adding to nor subtracting from. You cannot with success lie to the Holy Ghost.

Now let us take a simple illustration. If an individual is to gain an inheritance in the celestial world, he has to enter in at the gate of baptism, that ordinance being performed under the hands of a legal administrator. If he comes forward prepared by worthiness, that is, if he is just and true, and gains baptism under the hands of a legal administrator, he is justified by the Spirit in the act which has been performed; that is, it is ratified by the Holy Ghost, or it is sealed by the Holy Spirit of Promise. As a result it is of full force and validity in this life and in the life to come.
If an individual thereafter turns from righteousness and goes off and wallows in the mire of iniquity, then the seal is removed, and so we have this principle which keeps the unworthy from gaining unearned blessings. The Lord has placed a bar which stops the progress of the unrighteous; he has placed a requirement which we must meet. We must gain the approval and receive the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost if eventually and in eternity we are to reap the blessings that we hope to reap.

The same thing that is true of baptism is true of marriage. If a couple comes forward worthily, a couple who is just and true, and they enter into that ordinance under the hands of a legal administrator, a seal of approval is recorded in heaven. Then assuming they do not thereafter break that seal, assuming they keep the covenant and press forward in steadfastness and in righteousness, they go on in the next world as husband and wife; and in and after the resurrection, that ordinance performed in such a binding manner here has full force, efficacy, and validity.

I think perhaps this doctrine, as almost all other doctrines that we teach in the Church, leads us back to the same central conclusion, which is that it is obligatory upon us to keep the commandments of God if we ever expect to inherit the blessings that he has promised the Saints. We should remind ourselves again and again of these words which he has spoken (D&C 59:23):

he who doeth the works of righteousness shall receive his reward, even peace in this world, and eternal life in the world to come.

147 D&C 138:33, emphasis added.

148 In addition to clarifying that it is by the Spirit of Christ that individuals are justified through their faith in Jesus Christ, D&C 20:37 clearly dictates this initial justification is a requirement that ought to be fulfilled prior to baptism, rather than afterward. The revelation states that only those who have “received of the Spirit of Christ unto the remission of their sins ... shall be received by baptism into his church.” This requirement became a point of contention for Oliver Cowdery, who apparently felt this passage was in error. The explanation below draws from an account of this and similar instances of contention between Oliver Cowdery and the Prophet that can be found in J. M. Bradshaw et al., God's Image 2, excursus 1: Revelatory Experiences of Oliver Cowdery, pp. 441-448.

In June 1829, two months after his failed effort to translate portions of the Book of Mormon, Oliver apparently was given another chance to participate in the revelatory process when he was assigned to prepare a summary of principles and practices for the use of missionaries and for the guidance of the Church. Having asked for help in how to proceed, the Lord gave instructions through the Prophet Joseph Smith that he should rely on what was already written in the Book of Mormon as his guide (D&C 18:1-5). A subsequent document entitled “Articles of the Church of Christ,” phrased as a revelation from the Lord to Oliver and dated 1829, “contains directions about ordinations, the sacrament, and baptism” (R. L. Bushman, Beginnings, p. 156. Oliver Cowdery’s revelation is reprinted in full in R. J. Woodford, Historical Development, 1:287-290 and S. H. Faulring, Examination, pp. 178-181). Consistent with the Lord’s instructions, many of the verses were based directly on passages in the Book of Mormon. Although some portions of Oliver’s revelation were eventually carried over into Joseph Smith’s later revelation on church organization and government recorded in D&C 20, the Prophet in essence received a new revelation. “Roughly one-fifth of section 20 relies on the Book of Mormon for its text, while more than half of Cowdery’s Articles are either direct quotations or paraphrases with slight deviations from the Book of Mormon” (ibid., p. 167).

Concerning those who should be baptized, Oliver’s revelation read very simply as follows (ibid., p. 178):

Now therefore whosoever repenteth and humbleth himself before me and desireth to be baptized in my name shall ye baptize them.

Doctrine and Covenants 20:37 greatly elaborated and extended these conditions, in particular adding the requirement that those who were to be baptized should have already received a remission of sins.
In Oliver’s study of the Book of Mormon, he had surely encountered the following verses, which seem to imply that the remission of sins does not precede baptism but follows it (2 Nephi 31:17-18):

Wherefore, do the things which I have told you I have seen that your Lord and your Redeemer should do; for, for this cause have they been shown unto me, that ye might know the gate by which ye should enter. For the gate by which ye should enter is repentance and baptism by water; and then cometh a remission of your sins by fire and by the Holy Ghost.

And then are ye in this strait and narrow path which leads to eternal life; yea, ye have entered in by the gate; ye have done according to the commandments of the Father and the Son; and ye have received the Holy Ghost, which witnesses of the Father and the Son, unto the fulfilling of the promise which he hath made, that if ye entered in by the way ye should receive.

Oliver also would have been familiar with Moroni 6:1-4. These verses contain parallels to the elaborated wording in D&C 20:37, yet imply that the spiritual cleansing by the Holy Ghost follows baptism:

And now I speak concerning baptism. Behold, elders, priests, and teachers were baptized; and they were not baptized save they brought forth fruit meet that they were worthy of it.

Neither did they receive any unto baptism save they came forth with a broken heart and a contrite spirit, and witnessed unto the church that they truly repented of all their sins.

And none were received unto baptism save they took upon them the name of Christ, having a determination to serve him to the end.

And after they had been received unto baptism, and were wrought upon and cleansed by the power of the Holy Ghost, they were numbered among the people of the church of Christ; and their names were taken, that they might be remembered and nourished by the good word of God, to keep them in the right way, to keep them continually watchful unto prayer, relying alone upon the merits of Christ, who was the author and the finisher of their faith.

Despite the seeming contradiction of D&C 20:37 with the passages cited above, there are several Book of Mormon examples of the cleansing power of the Holy Ghost operating on repentant individuals before baptism. For example, there is the account of King Lamoni who before his baptism had “the dark veil of unbelief... cast away from his mind” in a dramatic manner (see Alma 19:6), and the father of King Lamoni who desired to have “this wicked spirit rooted out of [his] breast” (see Alma 22:15). We do not know if Alma the Younger had already been baptized before his conversion experience — if not, his spiritual rebirth recounted in Mosiah 27 and Alma 36 qualifies as an example of remission of sins prior to baptism. If on the other hand, he had previously been baptized, at the very least we can say that the detailed description that he gives seems to be of the same kind as King Lamoni and Alma the Elder.

The Prophet Joseph Smith describes the controversy about verse 37 and its resolution as follows (J. Smith, Jr., Documentary History, July 1830, 1:104-105. For additional details about this controversy, see G. Underwood, Oliver Cowdery’s Correspondence, pp. 114-116):

Whilst thus employed in the work appointed me by my Heavenly Father, I received a letter from Oliver Cowdery, the contents of which gave me both sorrow and uneasiness. Not having that letter now in my possession, I cannot of course give it here in full, but merely an extract of the most prominent parts, which I can yet, and expect long to, remember. He wrote to inform me that he had discovered an error in one of the commandments—Book of Doctrine and Covenants: “And truly manifest by their works that they have received of the Spirit of Christ unto a remission of their sins.”

The above quotation, he said, was erroneous, and added: “I command you in the name of God erase those words, that no priestcraft be amongst us!”

As explanation to Cowdery’s mention of priestcraft, ibid., p. 115 explains: “By including in the Articles and Covenants an additional requirement not specified in the Book of Mormon — especially when Cowdery’s own 1829 ‘Articles of the Church of Christ’ hewed so closely to Book of Mormon wording — Joseph had,
as Oliver saw it, overstepped his bounds. To Cowdery, such arrogation on Joseph’s part was nothing less than priestcraft.”

Joseph Smith’s account continues as follows:

I immediately wrote to him in reply, in which I asked him by what authority he took upon him to command me to alter or erase, to add to or diminish from, a revelation or commandment from Almighty God.

A few days afterwards I visited him and Mr. Whitmer’s family, when I found the family in general of his opinion concerning the words above quoted, and it was not without both labor and perseverance that I could prevail with any of them to reason calmly on the subject. However, Christian Whitmer at length became convinced that the sentence was reasonable, and according to Scripture; and finally, with his assistance, I succeeded in bringing, not only the Whitmer family, but also Oliver Cowdery to acknowledge that they had been in error, and that the sentence in dispute was in accordance with the rest of the commandment. And thus was this error rooted out, which having its rise in presumption and rash judgment, was the more particularly calculated (when once fairly understood) to teach each and all of us the necessity of humility and meekness before the Lord, that He might teach us of His ways, that we might walk in His paths, and live by every word that proceedeth forth from His mouth.

Note that nothing is mentioned about confirmation in Oliver’s revelation. However, D&C 20:41 gives instructions on confirmation “for the baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost.” This verse, not in the original manuscript of the revelation but added in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, “codified in scripture the usage so firmly established in the church” (R. P. Howard, Restoration 1995, p. 158).

Regarding the means of bestowal of the gift of the Holy Ghost, Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, as an Apostle, wrote “We may correctly believe that the Lord may bestow the gift of the Holy Ghost by other means than by the laying on of hands if occasion requires it” (J. F. Smith, Jr., Answers 2, 4:95). President Joseph F. Smith, as a counselor in the First Presidency, wrote in 1900:

As to the means through which the Holy Ghost confirms the ordinance of baptism, this is by the laying on of hands. If it be asked why this is so, the answer is, simply because God has so ordained. There are two instances on record when the Spirit confirmed baptism without the laying on of hands, (so far as we know). The one was that of Christ, the other that of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery. In the case of the Savior, the Holy Ghost manifested itself in the sign of a dove, and a voice from heaven said, ‘This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.’ In the case of Joseph and Oliver, ‘the ordinance of baptism by water was immediately followed by a most glorious baptism of the Holy Ghost.’ Divine joy and inspiration fell upon the two brethren and each in turn exercised to a remarkable degree the spirit of prophecy. (See Millennial Star, vol. 3, p. 148.)

It will be noticed, however, that these two exceptions mark the beginning of dispensations. There was at hand no one with authority to confer the Holy Ghost by laying on of hands. But even if we had not these good reasons, the simple fact that God ordained that confirmation is to be by laying on of hands must forever dispose of the question.” (“Editor’s Table,” Improvement Era, 4 [Nov. 1900]: 52-53), cited in G. A. Prince, Power, p. 93).

Writes Gregory Prince: “Once the church was organized, and, aside from the special case of Smith and Cowdery, there is no record of members receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost by other means” (ibid., pp. 93-94).

149 C. S. Lewis applied this imagery to the relationship between faith and works. To him, the debate about the role of faith vs. works seemed like (C. S. Lewis, Mere, p. 130):

asking which blade in a pair of scissors is most necessary... The Bible really seems to clinch the matter when [in Philippians 2:12-13] it puts the two things together into one amazing sentence. The first half is, “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling”-which looks as if everything depended on us and our good actions: but the second half goes on, “For it is God who worketh in you”-which looks as if God did everything and we nothing... [This seems puzzling at first, but this is only because we are
trying] to separate into water-tight compartments, what exactly God does and what man does when God and man are working together. And, of course, we begin by thinking it is like two men working together, so that you could say, “He did this bit and I did that.” But... God is not like that. He is [working] inside you as well as outside: even if we could understand who did what, I do not think human language could properly express it. In the attempt to express it different Churches say different things. But you will find that even those who insist most strongly on the importance of good actions tell you you need Faith; and even those who insist most strongly on Faith tell you to do good actions.

150 D. A. Bednar, Always Retain, p. 61.
151 Helaman 4:24. See also Mosiah 2:37; Alma 7:21; 34:36; D&C 97:17.
152 D. A. Bednar, Always Retain, p. 61.

Indeed, one who receives the Holy Ghost and then rebels against it, failing to continue in the process of sanctification to the end, his “last state ... is worse than [his] first” (Luke 11:26). JST Matthew 12:37-38 explains:

Then came some of the Scribes and said unto him, Master, it is written that, Every sin shall be forgiven; but ye say, Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven. And they asked him, saying, How can these things be?

And he said unto them, When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest and findeth none; but when a man speaketh against the Holy Ghost, then he saith, I will return into my house from when I came out; and when he is come, he findeth him empty, swept and garnished; for the good spirit leaveth him unto himself.

154 Mosiah 27:36. See also 2 Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15.
155 The Prophet explained that it is the First Comforter, the Holy Ghost, which “shall teach you” until the joyous moment when, at last, as the Savior promised, “ye [shall] come to Me and My Father” (J. Smith, Jr., Words, p. 15, punctuation modernized, words in brackets added. Cf. D&C 84:45-47). Encouraging each of us to follow the example of the importunate widow, Joseph then said (ibid., p. 15, punctuation and capitalization modernized):

God is not a respecter of persons. We all have the same privilege. Come to God. Weary Him until He blesses you.

156 D. A. Bednar, Always Retain, p. 62. See Mosiah 4:11-12.
158 Compare photograph of original 1893 plans in C. M. Hamilton, Salt Lake Temple, p. 78.
159 Cf. “Heaven is a place, but also a condition” (S. W. Kimball, Glimpses, p. 39).
161 Mosiah 3:19.
162 See J. M. Bradshaw, Faith, Hope, and Charity (book).
163 See D&C 88:34.
164 D&C 88:30, emphasis added.
165 D&C 88:30.
166 1 Samuel 16:13; Isaiah 61:1; Luke 4:18.
167 2 Nephi 31:20, emphasis added.
169 D&C 131:5.
170 D&C 88:29.
172 Moses 6:59.
173 D&C 75:5.
174 D&C 132:24, 55.
176 See D&C 121:46.
177 3 Nephi 27:20. Cf. D&C 84:33: “sanctified by the Spirit unto the renewing of their bodies.” For more on this promise, see J. M. Bradshaw, Temple Themes in the Oath, pp. 28-29.
178 Moses 6:60.
179 Hyrum Andrus provides this succinct explanation (H. L. Andrus, Doctrinal, p. 253):

The process of being justified by the Holy Spirit is ... directly related to the process of being sanctified by the Holy Spirit, for the divine agent acts to bring man to realize both objectives in the Gospel. To be sanctified by the blood of Jesus Christ means that though the Holy Spirit leads man to the condition of justification and is the sanctifying power by which he is cleansed from the effects of sin, the divine plan rests upon the blood of Christ, which He shed in making His infinite atonement.

181 Acts 8:14-17; Articles of Faith 1:4.
182 Moses 3:7. In Genesis, two Hebrew words *nishma* (e.g., Genesis 2:7; 7:22) and *ruach* (e.g., Genesis 6:17; 7:15, 22) are associated with the “breath of life.” While *ruach* is applied to God, man, and animals, the use of *nishma* is reserved for God and man alone (V. P. Hamilton, Genesis 1-17, p. 159).

What is the sign of the healing of the sick? The laying on of hands is the sign or way marked out by James [James 5:14-15] and the custom of ancient saints as ordered by the Lord, and we should not obtain the blessing by pursuing any other course except the way which God has marked out. What if we should attempt to get the Holy Ghost through any other means except the sign or way which God hath appointed. Should we obtain it? Certainly not. All other means would fail. The Lord says do so and so, and I will bless so and so. There are certain key words and signs belonging to the priesthood which must be observed in order to obtain the blessings. The sign of Peter was to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, with the promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost, and in no other way is the gift of the Holy Ghost obtained. ... Had [Cornelius] not taken [these] sign[s or] ordinances upon him ... and received the gift of the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of hands, according to the order of God, he could not have healed the sick or commanded an evil spirit to come out of a man, and it obey him [cf. Moses 1:21: “Moses received strength, and called upon God, saying: In the name of the Only Begotten, depart hence, Satan.”] for the spirits might say unto him, as they did to the sons of Sceva: “Paul we know and Jesus we know, but who are ye?” [see Acts 19:13-15].

184 With permission. From C. H. Kraeling et al., Synagogue, plate LXVI.
185 E.g., Lamentations 4:20. See V. P. Hamilton, Genesis 1-17, pp. 158-159.
186 Isaiah 61:1, emphasis added. See also Luke 4:17-22.
187 1 Samuel 16:13.
188 B. Nichols, Coronation, pp. 18, 14. About ablutions and anointing of kings in other cultures, see S. D. Ricks et al., King, pp. 241-244, 254-255. See also J. M. Bradshaw, God’s Image 1, excursus 52: Washing, Anointing, and Clothing Among Early Christians, p. 661.

190 D. A. Bednar, Always Retain, p. 62.

191 Basilica di S. Giovanni Battista in Monza, Italy.


193 Tertullian, Baptism, 7, p. 672.

194 C. S. Lewis, Mere, p. 154. For each change of state that accompanies one’s progression through the ordinances, the Father grants a corresponding change in name and relationship to Him. To paraphrase C. S. Lewis, “God turns tools into servants[,] servants into friends[,] and [friends] into sons” (C. S. Lewis, Screwtape, Preface, p. 7**). Moses 6:67–68 makes it clear that to receive the fulness of the priesthood, when accompanied by a divine, personal ratification, is to become “a son of God” “after the order of him who was without beginning of days or end of years” (see also J. M. Bradshaw, Temple Themes in the Oath, pp. 53–65; B. R. McConkie, Mortal Messiah, 1:229; B. R. McConkie, Ten Blessings, p. 33). Reflecting the experience of Adam in Moses 6, this idea recalls the royal rebirth formula of Psalm 2:7: “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.”

In Mosiah 5:7, King Benjamin uses a temple setting and context to explain this same concept: “And now, because of the covenant which ye have made ye shall be called the children of Christ, his sons, and his daughters; for behold, this day he hath spiritually begotten you; for ye say that your hearts are changed through faith on his name; therefore, ye are born of him and have become his sons and his daughters.”

Significantly, King Benjamin not only goes on to say that those who keep the covenant will be “found at the right hand of God” (Mosiah 5:9), thus, in essence, receiving the name of their king, “Benjamin” (meaning “son of the right hand”), but also that they were taking upon them, as royal sons and daughters, a title of the true “Son of the right hand,” namely “Christ.” In so doing, they were also to become, in likeness of the son of Benjamin, little Mosiachs (meaning “saviors”) and, in likeness of the Only Begotten Son of God, little messiahs (meaning “anointed ones”) (see M. L. Bowen, Onomastic Wordplay, p. 269). Thus having qualified, the Father might appropriately “seal” them “his” (Mosiah 5:15; Alma 34:35. See also **John Gee reference).


196 Moses 6:60.

197 W. W. Isenberg, Philip, 70:36-71:3, p. 152.

198 Alma 13:5.

199 Alma 13:2, emphasis added.

200 Alma 13:3.

201 D&C 4:2. See J. M. Bradshaw, He That Thrusteth in His Sickle, pp. 166-159, where it is argued that “a careful examination of the Hebrew of Deuteronomy 6:5, a companion scripture to D&C 4:2, will reveal that it is essentially a statement of the law of consecration, the crowning law of the ordinances.”


203 E. T. Benson, Vision. Besides the statements by President Benson cited in this chapter, other summaries of the temple covenants by General Authorities can be found in J. E. Faust, Who Shall Ascend,
204 Moses 6:60.
206 E.g., Genesis 9:4; Leviticus 17:14; Deuteronomy 12:23. See also John 6:53-54.
207 Leviticus 17:11. See Leviticus 17:11-14; Deuteronomy 12:23-24, which provide “the basis of Jewish dietary laws governing the koshering of meat, the purpose of which is to ensure the maximum extraction of blood from the flesh before cooking” (N. M. Sarna, Genesis, p. 61).
208 See Exodus 24:9-11.
209 D&C 110:5.
211 H. W. Nibley, Return, p. **.
215 Ibid., pp. 383, 385.
217 2 Nephi 31:19.
218 2 Nephi 25:23. In our opinion, the word “after” should not be read mistakenly in a temporal sense, but rather in line with the atemporal Old English sense of “more away, further off” (cf. Greek apotero) — meaning essentially that “all we can do” is always necessary but never sufficient. In spirit, this is similar to Stephen E. Robinson’s line of thinking (S. E. Robinson, Believing, pp. 91-92):

   I understand the preposition "after" in 2 Nephi 25:23 to be a preposition of separation rather than a preposition of time. It denotes logical separateness rather than temporal sequence. We are saved by grace "apart from all we can do," or "all we can do notwithstanding," or even "regardless of all we can do." Another acceptable paraphrase of the sense of the verse might read, "We are still saved by grace, after all is said and done."

Although Alma 24:10-11 defines “all we could do” [note the past tense] solely in terms of repentance, we are of the opinion that one of the purposes of the process of sanctification is to allow us to grow in holiness, gradually acquiring a capacity for doing “more” — specifically, becoming “good” like our Father (see Matthew 19:17; Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19) and "doing good" (Acts 10:38) like the Son, the kind of transformation of our natures that some non-LDS Christians might consider impossible. Despite all this, of course, it must never be forgotten that even repentance itself, which is “all we can do” at the time we first accept Christ, would be impossible had not the merciful plan of redemption been laid before the foundation of the world (Alma 12:22-37). And, of course, it is His continuous grace that lends us breath, “preserving [us] from day to day, ... and even supporting [us] from one moment to another” (Mosiah 2:21).
219 3 Nephi 12:19; D&C 59:8. See also 2 Nephi 2:7; 4:32; 3 Nephi 9:20; Ether 4:15; Moroni 6:2. These scriptures make it clear that this sacrifice is to be directly connected with baptism.
221 N. A. Maxwell, Deny, p. 68.


224 See Romans 6:4-6; ibid., 9 July 1843, p. 314.


You have all been born as spirit children, and as such have a divine nature. You have now been born of mortal parents, and have been privileged, then, with a body, which is a step forward in your progression, not a step back... We are... to proceed to watch and pray, that it may be developed into the very likeness of our spirits, which are divine, and ultimately, then, to become, as it were, a product of another birth, which is the birth we call Jesus, who becomes, in the process of ordinances, our father. That's a proper use of the word “father” for Jesus, for he says in [D&C] 93:22, “all those who are begotten through me (through the ordinances) are partakers of the glory of the same (meaning his role as first-born), and are the Church of the Firstborn.” Imagine. He has sacrificed for us in order that we can inherit what He alone could have claimed to be, the first-born. He's saying, “It will be as if you were [the Firstborn]; all of the blessings and powers that have been bestowed upon Me are now transmitted to you, if you are willing to come to Me.” They are “begotten through me” and are “partakers of the glory of the same.”

...[T]here will be another birth ahead of us, and that's called the resurrection. And then the promise that we can be like him will be literal and complete.


227 Appears in J. W. Welch *et al.*, *Book of Mormon Paintings*, p. **.

228 C. S. Lewis, *Screwtape*, Preface, p. 7.** The original statement reads: “God turns tools into servants and servants into sons, so that they may be at last reunited to Him in the perfect freedom of a love offered from the height of the utter individualities which he has liberated them to be.” For more on this topic, see J. M. Bradshaw, *Temple Themes in the Oath*, pp. 75-79.

Note that within modern revelation, the highest order of the priesthood is known by different names. For example, in the Doctrine and Covenants we read about “they who are priests and kings, who have received of his fulness, and of his glory” (D&C 76:56). They are described in relation to variously named orders as being “after the order of Melchizedek, which was after the order of Enoch, which was [ultimately] after the order of the Only Begotten Son” (D&C 76:57. Compare B. Young, 26 June 1874, p. 113).


230 Mosiah 5:9.


232 Mosiah 5:15; Alma 34:35. See also **John Gee reference.


235 M. L. Bowen, *They Came*, pp. 72-73. Ben Sira 50:1-21 describes such a scene, which is reminiscent of 3 Nephi 11-19; 17:9-10; and Hebrews 1:5; 5:1–10; 7:1–28; 9:1–28:

[1] Simon the high priest, the son of Onias, who in his life repaired the house again, and in his days fortified the temple:
And by him was built from the foundation the double height, the high fortress of the wall about the temple:

In his days the cistern to receive water, being in compass as the sea, was covered with plates of brass:

He took care of the temple that it should not fall, and fortified the city against besieging:

How was he honoured in the midst of the people in his coming out of the sanctuary!

He was as the morning star in the midst of a cloud, and as the moon at the full:

As the sun shining upon the temple of the most High, and as the rainbow giving light in the bright clouds:

And as the flower of roses in the spring of the year, as lilies by the rivers of waters, and as the branches of the frankincense tree in the time of summer:

As fire and incense in the censer, and as a vessel of beaten gold set with all manner of precious stones:

And as a fair olive tree budding forth fruit, and as a cypress tree which growtheth up to the clouds.

When he put on the robe of honour, and was clothed with the perfection of glory, when he went up to the holy altar, he made the garment of holiness honourable.

When he took the portions out of the priests’ hands, he himself stood by the hearth of the altar, compassed about, as a young cedar in Libanus; and as palm trees compassed they him round about.

So were all the sons of Aaron in their glory, and the oblations of the Lord in their hands, before all the congregation of Israel.

And finishing the service at the altar, that he might adorn the offering of the most high Almighty,

He stretched out his hand to the cup, and poured of the blood of the grape, he poured out at the foot of the altar a sweetsmelling savour unto the most high King of all.

Then shouted the sons of Aaron, and sounded the silver trumpets, and made a great noise to be heard, for a remembrance before the most High.

Then all the people together hasted, and fell down to the earth upon their faces to worship their Lord God Almighty, the most High.

The singers also sang praises with their voices, with great variety of sounds was there made sweet melody.

And the people besought the Lord, the most High, by prayer before him that is merciful, till the solemnity of the Lord was ended, and they had finished his service.

Then he went down, and lifted up his hands over the whole congregation of the children of Israel, to give the blessing of the Lord with his lips, and to rejoice in his name.

And they bowed themselves down to worship the second time, that they might receive a blessing from the most High.

236 Alma 13:2.

237 Alma 13:16. Some LDS scholars have conjectured that an ancient text somewhat like the book of Moses may have been used as a foundation for some of the narrative portions of temple liturgy in former times (J. M. Bradshaw, LDS Book of Enoch; D. Calabro, Joseph Smith and the Architecture of Genesis; M. J. Johnson, The lost prologue: Moses chapter one and the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible as ancient text). The second half of Alma 12, which opens with a question about the resurrection of the dead and a reference to the “mysteries of God” (Alma 12:8-9), segues to the story of Adam and Eve’s transgression in the Garden of Eden (cf. Moses 3-4), the plan of redemption as revealed by angels to them (Alma 12:28-35; cf. Moses 5:5-8, 58), and the ordinances of the high priesthood after the order of the son of God (Alma
A careful study of the relationship between the book of Moses and Alma 12-13 is overdue.


239 Cf. John 1:12-13; Romans 8:14-21; D&C 39:4.


242 F. I. Andersen, 2 Enoch, 22:8 [J], p. 138. See also {Collins, 2009 #4421, p. 239.

243 P. S. Alexander, From Son of Adam, pp. 103, 105.

244 See Moses 1:2, 11, 13–15, 18, 25, 31.

245 Moses 1:11.


247 {Mopsik, 1989 #1330’, p. 214}. Regarding arguments by scholars discounting the possibility that the Enoch Son of Man and the Jesus/Pauline Son of Man concepts grew out of the same soil, see the discussion in J. M. Bradshaw et al., God’s Image 2, pp. 190–91, ENDNOTE M7–14.


249 2 Nephi 31:20. For extensive discussions of this and related topics, see B. R. McConkie, NT Commentary, 3:325–50; B. R. McConkie, Promised Messiah, 1:570–95; J. M. Bradshaw, Now That We Have the Words; J. M. Bradshaw, Temple Themes in the Oath, pp. 59-65.

250 See Revelation 11:15 (“he shall reign for ever and ever”) and compare Revelation 22:5 (“they shall reign for ever and ever”).


252 Moses 6:60.

253 H. W. Nibley, Return, p. **.


255 Genesis 22:12.

256 Published in J. D. Cornish, Gate, p. 46.

257 Mosiah 3:19.

258 See, e.g., D&C 20:77 and Alma 7:15.

259 While not explicitly associating the second part of the sacrament with the law of consecration, U. A. Perego, Changing Forms, p. 12 cites the following statement by President Heber J. Grant (H. J. Grant, Ninety-First, p. 650, emphasis added):

I rejoice in the inspiration of Joseph Smith, in translating the Book of Mormon, and giving to us those two wonderful sacramental prayers, those two marvelous covenants that all Latter-day Saints make when they assemble together and partake of the sacrament.


261 Elder Neil L. Andersen, “Witnessing to Live the Commandments,” General Conference Leadership Training on the Sabbath Day Observance at Church (April 2015, available to priesthood leaders), cited in ibid., p. 14, emphasis added. The entire statement by Elder Andersen on this topic reads as follows:
The title ‘renewing our baptismal covenants’ is not found in the scriptures. It is not inappropriate. Many of you [gesturing to audience of Seventies and Auxiliary leaders] have used it in talks. We [gesturing to other apostles sitting on the stand behind him] have used it in talks, but it is not something that is used in the scriptures. And it can’t be the keynote of what we say about the sacrament. Spirituality is not stagnant and neither are covenants. And hopefully, what we pray, is that all of us as members are moving along a progressive growth both in our spirituality and in our covenants. Covenants bring not only commitments, but they bring spiritual power. We should teach our members that we are moving towards our Heavenly Father. The sacrament is a beautiful time to not just renew our baptismal covenants, but to commit to Him to renew all our covenants, all of our promises, and to approach Him in a spiritual power that we did not have previously as we move forward.

For other statements that explicitly state or imply that the sacrament is meant to renew more than the baptismal covenant, see, e.g., J. E. Talmage, Articles of Faith (1899), p. 179; J. F. Smith, Jr., Doctrines, 2:345-346; D. L. Stapley, This Pearl, p. 1112; N. E. Tanner, Keep Your Covenants, p. 1136; S. W. Kimball, Teachings 1982, pp. 112, 220, 226-227, 503; A. T. Tuttle, Covenants; D. B. Haight, Remembering; J. E. Mackay, What Covenants Do We Renew; G. B. Hinckley, Teachings 1997, p. 561; R. M. Nelson, Worshiping, p. 25; L. T. Perry, As Now, p. 41; C. M. Stephens, Do We Know, p. 12.

For an excellent discussion of Elder Andersen’s renewed emphasis as part of the current understanding of the sacrament, see U. A. Perego, Changing Forms, especially pp. 11-14. For a different view of this question, see M. Clayton, Covenant Renewal.


263 Building upon the insights of Elder Dallin H. Oaks, Elder David A. Bednar has clarified this point as follows (D. A. Bednar, Name, pp. 97-98):

Elder Dallin H. Oaks has explained that in renewing our baptismal covenants by partaking of the emblems of the sacrament, “we do not witness that we take upon us the name of Jesus Christ. [Rather], we witness that we are willing to do so (see D&C 20:77). The fact that we only witness to our willingness suggests that something else must happen before we actually take that sacred name upon us in the [ultimate and] most important sense” (D. H. Oaks, Taking Upon Us, p. 81). The baptismal covenant clearly contemplates a future event or events and looks forward to the temple.

Elder Oaks further explained (ibid., p. 83):

Our willingness to take upon us the name of Jesus Christ affirms our commitment to do all that we can to be counted among those whom he will choose to stand at his right hand and be called by his name at the last day. In this sacred sense, our witness that we are willing to take upon us the name of Jesus Christ constitutes our declaration of candidacy for exaltation in the celestial kingdom. Exaltation is eternal life, “the greatest of all the gifts of God” (D&C 14:7)

That is what we should ponder as we partake of the sacred emblems of the sacrament.

264 Mosiah 3:19.

265 Alma 24:19; Moroni 9:10; D&C 101:36.

266 1 Peter 2:19-20; 3:18. For a recent analysis of the concept of reciprocity and suffering in these verse, see T. B. Williams, Reciprocity and Suffering. On p. 438, he observes insightfully:

Evaluated from the perspective of the ancient system of reciprocity, 1 Peter portrays unjust suffering as a binding responsibility which has been placed on the readers in view of the bountiful munificence which God (their divine benefactor) has lavished upon them. ... In this way, the Christian identification with suffering takes on a new dynamic. Patient endurance during times of trial is not simply a means of achieving divine favor; it has become the very definition of how a Christian relates to God.

267 1 Peter 3:18.
268 3 Nephi 11:11; D&C 19:18. See also Matthew 26:39, 42; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42; John 18:11
269 “For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matthew 26:28). Referring to this verse, Ugo Perego writes (U. A. Perego, Changing Forms, p. 4):

As biblical scholar Margaret Barker has stated, “his phrase ‘for the remission of sins’ immediately identifies [the sacrament] as the temple covenant, the covenant renewed by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement” (M. Barker, Creation theology. See Leviticus 16). Barker continues placing particular emphasis on the necessity of saving the Creation through the Lord’s own life and preserving the eternal covenant by the removal of sins. Thus, on the Day of the Atonement, the High Priest would first wash himself and then take the blood of the sacrificial goat (representing the life the Lord gave in our behalf) to sprinkle on the Mercy Seat and on the drapes of the Holy of Holies. Additionally, a second goat was released in the wilderness, symbolically carrying away the sins of Israel and mending the spiritual gap caused by the Fall.

271 Alma 22:18, emphasis added.
272 Francis Webster was remembered for his eloquent testimony that he and others in his handcart company became “acquainted with [God] in our extremities,” by this means obtaining an “absolute knowledge that God lives” (C. M. Orton, Francis Webster, p. 140). Citing the experience of Stephen, who saw the Lord “in the agonies of death,” Elder Orson Hyde taught (O. Hyde, 6 October 1853, p. 125):

True it is, that in the most trying hour, the servants of God may then be permitted to see their Father, and elder Brother. "But," says one, "I wish to see the Father, and the Savior, and an angel now." Before you can see the Father, and the Savior, or an angel, you have to be brought into close places in order to enjoy this manifestation. The fact is, your very life must be suspended on a thread, as it were. If you want to see your Savior, be willing to come to that point where no mortal arm can rescue, no earthly power save! When all other things fail, when everything else proves futile and fruitless, then perhaps your Savior and your Redeemer may appear; His arm is not shortened that He cannot save, nor His ear heavy that He cannot hear; and when help on all sides appears to fail, My arm shall save, My power shall rescue, and you shall hear My voice, saith the Lord.

274 U. A. Perego, Changing Forms, p. 15 cites Truman G. Madsen as follows (T. G. Madsen, Savior, Sacrament, Self-Worth):

... the fullest flow of the Spirit of God comes to us through His appointed channels or ordinances. The sacrament is the central and oft-repeated ordinance that transmits that power to us. Indeed, it is the ordinance that gives focus to all other ordinances. ... Eventually, through a lifetime, His spirit can sanctify the very elements of our bodies until we become capable of celestial resurrection. In baptism we are born once — born of the water and of the spirit. In the sacrament, we are reborn, over and over, of the bread and of the wine or water and we are truly what we eat.

275 See Genesis 2:3; D&C 77:1, 12; 130:9; Moses 3:3; 7:45-69; Abraham 5:3; Articles of Faith 1:10.
276 D&C 27:5. President John Taylor stated, “In the sacrament we shadow forth the time when He will come again and when we shall meet and eat bread with Him in the kingdom of God” (J. Taylor, 20 March 1870, cited in U. A. Perego, Changing Forms, p. 4). For a short description of how this eschatological event was anticipated in the practice of the early Saints in sometimes “partaking of bread and wine in a quantity similar to a normal meal,” see ibid., pp. 7-8).