



Type: Magazine Article

---

## The Grab Bag

Author(s): Hugh W. Nibley

Source: *Improvement Era*, Vol. 62, No. 7 (July 1959)

Published by: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

Page(s): 530–533, 546–548

---

**Abstract:** This article shows that Book of Mormon critics have made an art of explaining a very large and complex text by focusing only on a very small part of it.

## "Mixed Voices"

A Study in Book of Mormon Criticism

Part Two

# Just Another Book



Concluding last month's chapter  
by Hugh Nibley

1900's

The verdict of a much-reprinted book appearing first in 1900 is that "For *climacteric comicality* Mormonism should be awarded the palm. Its romancing is refreshing in its very audaciousness. Jules Verne dreaming is here eclipsed; Baron Munchausen marvels seem commonplace. Of absurdities Pelions are piled upon Ossas, but the pile rises ever higher.

Untruth was never more picturesque. From first to last the history of this cult is dramatic and spectacular. One feels that he has stumbled upon a scene in the Arabian Nights, rather than upon a sober chapter of real religion."<sup>46</sup>

An investigator in 1906 found that all the peculiarities of the Mormons "center in and are an outgrowth of their strange religious beliefs," beliefs which he can only describe as "grotesque and monstrous," yet which "at the same time have won a following unsurpassed in devotion."<sup>47</sup> If the Mormons could only cure themselves of their bizarre taste for the grotesque and monstrous, and purge their religion "of its gross errors of doctrine," all would be well.<sup>48</sup> "It seems almost beyond belief," one scholar wrote in 1919, "that such a hybrid of fraud and superstition as Mormonism could be brought forth by the most enlightened age of the world . . . a terrible canker has attacked the heart of Christianity at home. . . ."<sup>49</sup> Mormonism "may hope to survive," writes a typical representative of the new "liberal" school, "only if it is brave enough to jettison its out-of-date creed and face the future boldly,

shorn of its absurdities and blasphemies. . . . That the Mormon Church will become the force predicted for it by its leaders, early and present-day, is impossible. That its doctrine could attract intellectual men is an insult to intellect. That it can continue to exist as a religious force is to expect too much."<sup>50</sup>

"We talk much about 'respecting' this or that person's religion," wrote G. K. Chesterton in an essay on the Mormons, "but the way to respect a religion is to treat it as a religion: to ask what are its tenets and what are their consequences." For Chesterton: "The basic Mormon belief is one that comes out of the morning of the earth, from the most primitive and even infantile attitude," namely the idea regarding God, "not that He was materialized once, as all Christians believe . . . but that He was materially embodied from all time; that he has a local habitation as well as a name." This he calls a "barbaric but violently vivid conception," and bids us view the Mormons as "a number of dull, earnest, ignorant, black-coated men with chimney-pot hats, chin beards or mutton-chop whiskers, [who] managed to reproduce in their own souls

# The Grab Bag

by Hugh Nibley

How does the Book of Mormon critic of today go about his work? His point of departure is an article of faith: "Painstaking research can uncover the source of all his [Joseph Smith's] ideas."<sup>1</sup> Actually this statement of Mrs. Brodie's is nonsense, since no research can ever uncover the indisputable source of any man's ideas, let alone those of a man whose world, with all the myriad sights and sounds that *might* conceivably have given him those ideas, has passed away over a century ago. Armed with this naive credo and a determination to "uncover" something, the critic looks about him for something he has read or heard that reminds him of something in the Book of Mormon, and as soon as he has found it announces to the

world that he has at last discovered the indubitable source of the Book of Mormon.

Silly as it sounds, this is exactly how the experts operate.<sup>2</sup> They begin by declaring the book a typical product of its times; but if it is typical, it must be of a type—there must be other books like it. Where were they? Search as they would, the scholars could find nothing closer to the Book of Mormon than, of all things, the Koran, a writing about as far from Smith's time, place, and culture as it is possible to get.<sup>3</sup> The most casual reading will show, moreover, that it would be hard to name two writings less alike than those two. Many Moslems, for example, have rejected the popular nineteenth *sura* (chapter) of the

the richness and peril of an ancient Oriental experience."<sup>51</sup>

It is a gaudy picture, and a phony one, but it leaves us in no doubt as to how a top-flight intellectual of the 1920's classified the Mormons: the only parallel Chesterton can think of is not that of the ancient Hebrews but of his own weird idea of them.<sup>52</sup> It was at least an improvement on the psychic deductions of Theodore Schroeder who a few years before had found the whole key to Mormonism in the doctrine of a heaven "whose greatest and only advertised bliss will be intensified animalism, prolonged through eternity."<sup>53</sup>

In all this it would be hard to tell who rates the Mormons lower, the Liberals or the Fundamentalists. The cry of the latter is that "from first to last there is not one teaching peculiar to Mormonism which is not contrary to the Bible and to evangelical Christianity." Its "ghastly ideas" of a God who has a body, the necessity of good works for salvation, etc., "cannot but be viewed with abhorrence by all true Christians. . . . We ought to care greatly that such evil beliefs are even held by the Mormons themselves. . . ."<sup>54</sup> There

should be a limit to freedom of religion, and Mormonism is it. A very recent "study" deplores the fact that "Mormons are generally considered by many to be 'Fundamentalists,'" since nothing could be greater than the gap between the two: "Mormons deny the Scriptural doctrine of the Trinity and the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Mormonism denies the authority of the Bible. . . . Mormon theology denies the virgin birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . ."<sup>55</sup> Such conclusions may be absurd, but they make it clear enough that the "Fundamentalists" are as determined as anyone else to have no part of the Mormons.

Anyone familiar enough with the febrile literature from which we have been quoting to attempt writing his own book on the Mormons should recognize that nothing is more characteristic than the insistence of the critics on every side, that the Mormons are not like any other Christians or like any other people in the Western world. They may be compared with primitive Christians by freethinkers, or with primitive Hebrews or Moslems by people who have only the vaguest homemade conception of what the latter might

have been like, but all are agreed that their presence in our western civilization is completely and incredibly incongruous.

Critics may be permitted at this late date to try their hand at winning friends and influencing people by telling the Mormons of today that they are just ordinary folk with an ordinary church. But to say that such was also the case in the days of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young is neither honest nor sporting. The genial and forced camaraderie of some of the present-day critics of Mormonism is that of the man who finds it easier to pick your pocket by affectionately locking arms with you than by hitting you over the head. The new humane approach is simply an obvious maneuver to rob the Church of a glorious history and to play down every remarkable circumstance of its origin. When it reaches the point of being told that while the Book of Mormon may seem very strange to *us*, to the *contemporaries* of Joseph Smith it "would scarcely seem fanciful, possibly not even novel," it is high time to protest. For even the most superficial acquaintance with the literature will show (Continued on page 565)

Koran because it contains in the story of Joseph and his brethren an episode of human history: ". . . it is entirely worldly history [they protest], and it is unthinkable that this physical history should ever be part of the holy Book revealed by God."<sup>4</sup> The reader can soon convince himself that the Koran really is remarkably innocent of "physical history," while the Book of Mormon purports to contain whole books of it. That alone should indicate how much the two books have in common.

But while some saw in Smith "another Mohammed preparing another *Koran*,"<sup>5</sup> others found in his work typical "*Swedenborgian* illusions,"<sup>6</sup> a writer in Hastings' *Encyclopedia* even discovering in the Book of

Mormon "references to Swedenborgianism with its three heavens." The fact that there is no such doctrine mentioned in the book does not deter this investigator, who finds in the same source traces of "the *Washingtonian* movement for total abstinence."<sup>7</sup> Though religious men in every age have abstained from strong waters, yet the Mormons can only have got the Word of Wisdom (*not* mentioned in the Book of Mormon!) from the Washingtonians, because they happened to be active at the time. These two instances illustrate how the critics operate.

"The theological ideas of the Book of Mormon," according to J. H. Snowden, "are also easily traced to their sources . . . the Nephites were *Old School*





So Joachim or Anselm or Ethan Smith or Rabelais or somebody takes a stick and draws a circle in the sand, and forthwith the adroit and wily Joseph turns out a beautifully running mechanism that tells perfect time.

*Presbyterians.*<sup>8</sup> Since that is such an easy and obvious conclusion, it is strange that Mr. John Hyde in a very thorough attack on the Book of Mormon comes to the opposite conclusion, that in the book "Calvinism repels him [Smith], and he opposes it," while actually "Universalism affects his sympathies."<sup>9</sup> Yet E. D. Howe insists that Universalism is not the hero but the villain of the book,<sup>10</sup> which shows strong influence of the seventeenth century *French Mystics*.<sup>11</sup> According to the same authority, in the Book of Mormon "the Arian doctrine is denied"; yet the Rev. H. Mattison insists that the book is simply "*Modern Arianism*."<sup>12</sup> Others find that "*Methodism* abounds in the Book of Mormon" and can flatly declare: "The Mormons are Wesleyans."<sup>13</sup> But Charles Francis Adams, who visited Joseph Smith in 1844, just as flatly declares, "His theological system is very nearly

Christian *Unitarianism*."<sup>14</sup> Today, however, Mr. Davis tells us that "it opposed deism, evangelism, and the Arminianism of Methodists and Unitarians alike."<sup>15</sup> Mr. Beers and others see in the Book of Mormon a rehash of *Millerism*, ignoring the fact that "Miller . . . began his lectures in 1831," after the book was well on its way.<sup>16</sup> Dr. Bierderwolk insists that the new Church was nothing but a *Baptist* community,<sup>17</sup> while the Baptists themselves insist that the Mormons were *Campbellites*, though Campbell for his part classed them with the first *Quakers*.<sup>18</sup> At the other extreme scholars not only charge Smith with "toying with *Catholicism*,"<sup>19</sup> but even insist that "the Church of the Latter-Day Saints . . . is in connection with the Church of Rome, and is even daughter to that great scarlet whore of Babylon."<sup>20</sup> With equal confidence others accuse the Book of Mormon of being an anti-



Catholic book.<sup>21</sup> "The doctrine of the book is wholeheartedly and completely *Arminian*,"<sup>22</sup> according to Dr. O'Dea, while Davis counters by describing Mormonism as the antithesis of Arminianism, especially in its rejection of "the omnipresent, inscrutable, 'Buddhistic' God of modern religions."<sup>23</sup> A German encyclopedia, the *Grosse Brockhaus*, see predominant *Gnostic* elements in both Mormonism and the Book of Mormon,<sup>24</sup> while a learned journal of fifty years ago found their doctrine "formed on *Buddhistic* principles."<sup>25</sup> The astute Gunnison thought Mormonism was strongly influenced by the teachings of the *Transcendentalists* and that Joseph Smith "and his followers have fallen in with the spiritual philosophy of the day, and added the doctrine of affinities of minds and sympathy of souls."<sup>26</sup> Others argued that the Book of Mormon "... must have been written by an *atheist*," as a sort of practical joke, the work of "a fearless infidel" undertaken as "... a ridicule upon the Holy Bible."<sup>27</sup> With the charges of atheism went those of "*Deism, Owenism, Socialism*. . ."<sup>28</sup> Chesterton sees the Mormon Church "... soaking itself solely in the Hebrew Scriptures."<sup>29</sup>

"Mormonism borrowed most of its ideas from the 'Campbellite,' or *Disciples of Christ Church*," according to the new Arbaugh, who proceeds to describe the basic Campbellite doctrines in a way that makes it clear that nothing could be less like Mormonism.<sup>30</sup> Certainly none was better qualified to speak for Campbellism than the elder Campbell, who in denouncing "—the infernal Book of Mormon—" stated as the basic proposition of his own faith "—the all-sufficiency and alone-sufficiency of the . . . Bible," which makes the Book of Mormon the embodied antithesis of Campbellism.<sup>31</sup> The Campbellites accused the Baptists of trying to fob off Mormonism on them and the latter returned the charge.<sup>32</sup> This is an amusing game of hot potato that the sects played among themselves, tossing the Book of Mormon at each other as a deadly missile. It is still going on, for in 1956 a Jesuit writer described the "whole body of new revelation as derived from the Reformation principle of religious freedom carried to the extreme." Mr. Davis on the contrary informs us that the Mormons were actually "opposed to individualism of any kind."<sup>33</sup> And while one school of thought sees in the new religion "a reaction against stern New England Calvinism," the same Mr. Davis assures us that the very opposite was the case: it was rather a reaction against "the rising tide of liberalism and individualism."<sup>34</sup>

This business of capitalizing on chance resemblances of detail to explain the Book of Mormon reaches the consummation of absurdity in the recent revival of the theory that the book was simply a steal from the writings of a thirteenth century monk, the Abbot

Joachim of Flora, because Joachim uses the expression "... the everlasting Gospel, . . ." which is found in the Bible but *not* in the Book of Mormon!<sup>35</sup> It seems that the Book of Mormon incorporates "... many of the almost forgotten tales of the monk Cyril and the Abbot Joachim, . . ."<sup>36</sup> though Smith could only have found out about them from Mosheim, whose work did not appear in English until 1839, who quotes none of the "forgotten tales" in his unflattering paragraph on Joachim, who never mentions Cyril.<sup>37</sup>

One expert confidently assures us that it was the great French satirist Rabelais who inspired the Book of Mormon, for in his *Gargantua* Rabelais tells of "... a man digging in the earth, and suddenly alighting upon a brazen tomb, in which were deposited nine gold flagons, upon which were engraved innumerable Egyptian hieroglyphics, and with them a large pair of golden spectacles, by the employ of which the said man was enabled to decipher the said mysterious characters. With this fancy of the Frenchman Smith had become acquainted; and being full of craft and cunning, at once appropriated it to his deceptive purposes, and out of it concocted the story of his golden bible and spectacles."<sup>38</sup>

Others have pointed to suspicious doctrinal parallels between the Book of Mormon and the writings of St. Anselm—though they are unwilling to read the one and unable to read the other. Even so these scholars have missed the really striking resemblance between Joseph Smith and Anselm for the latter "as a simple, innocent boy" firmly believed and "publicly asserted before others" that he had climbed the mountains near his home one day and seen God face to face.<sup>39</sup> Isn't that Joseph Smith all over?

If you want parallels we can give you dozens of them. In the approach to the Book of Mormon we quoted a long passage from Solon of Athens that might have come right out of the Book of Mormon—why not take that as proof positive that the book is simply a steal from the Greeks?—the evidence is just as good as any other.<sup>40</sup> The old cycle, prosperity, pride, sin, and destruction is found again and again in Greek and other literature, ancient and modern; there is no need for Dr. O'Dea to brand it Arminianism when it occurs in the Book of Mormon—it would be just as accurate to label it by any of a dozen other names.

The Book of Mormon critics have made an art of explaining a very big whole by a very small part. The game is to look for some mysterious person or document from which Joseph Smith might have got the few simple and obvious ideas and then cry triumphantly, "At last we have it! Now we know where the Book of Mormon came from!"

"If someone will only (Continued on page 546)

medan sensualism, and the fanaticism of the *early church*; and its good and evil . . . with the convenient idea of transmigration of souls, from the *Persian*.<sup>41</sup> It is all as easy as that—the student “will not fail to remark” these parallels. Why a feeling of dependence on God must come from the Brahmins instead of Schleiermacher, or what resemblance there is between Gnostic aeons and Mormon dispensations, or why anthropomorphism is identical with sensualism, or when and where any Mormon has ever preached trans-

## BOY AND GIRL

by Ruby Zagoren

Until a boy is just past two  
He likes to cuddle close to you.

A girl, no matter what her years,  
Will try to kiss away your tears;

When she has scarcely learned to  
walk  
There is some mother in her talk.

migration of souls, our authority does not explain. An eminent encyclopedia of religion can tell us that in the Book of Mormon “Calvinism, Universalism, Methodism, chiliasm, Catholicism, deism, and free masonry are discussed, . . . not by name,” of course, but “in a manner that strikingly corresponds to Smith’s relations to these systems,” thereby proving the Book of Mormon a fraud. But just where will one find out exactly what Smith’s “relations to these systems” were, in order to make the “striking” comparison?

# Principles and . . . personal peace

Richard L. Evans

## The Grab Bag

(Continued) show me how to draw a circle,” cries the youthful Joseph Smith, “I will make you a fine Swiss watch!” So Joachim or Anselm or Ethan Smith or Rabelais or somebody takes a stick and draws a circle in the sand, and forthwith the adroit and wily Joseph turns out a beautifully running mechanism that tells perfect time!

This is not an exaggeration. The Book of Mormon in structure and design is every bit as complicated, involved, and ingenious as the works of a Swiss watch, and withal just as smoothly running. With no model to follow and no instruction of any kind (Where was the model? Who could instruct?) the writer of that book brought together thousands of ideas and events and knit them together in a most marvelous unity. Yet the critics like to think they have explained the Book of Mormon completely if they can just discover where Joseph Smith *might* have got one of his ideas or expressions!

It does not relieve the absurdity of the situation very much to point to more than one possible source for the Book of Mormon. “The ecclesiastical student will not fail to remark that Mormonism is an eclectic religious philosophy, drawn from *Brahmin mysticism*—the dependence of God, the *Platonic* and *Gnostic* notion of Eons . . . Moham-



Some recent weeks ago we talked of being in the world, but not of it, and of the impossibility of pleasing all people. And now currently we recall this quotation accredited to a significant source: “I cannot give you the formula for success, but I can give you the formula for failure—try to please everybody.”<sup>1</sup> The fact is that people of principle cannot please all people—nor in fact can people without principle. And there is the further fact that people cannot abandon principles and live their lives in peace. “Nothing can bring you peace but the triumph of principles,”<sup>2</sup> said Emerson. We all have to decide on what principles we will make our decisions, on what principles we will live our lives. Every person has to decide sooner or later, and the sooner he decides the simpler will be his decisions. And to those who are yet young this reminder comes out of the experience of the past: “The principles now implanted in thy bosom will grow, and one day reach maturity; and in that maturity thou wilt find thy heaven or thy hell.”<sup>3</sup> Horace Mann said it in these sentences: “In vain do they talk of happiness who never subdued an impulse in obedience to a principle. He who never sacrificed a present to a future good, or a personal to a general one, can speak of happiness only as the blind do of colors.”<sup>4</sup> “Expedients are for the hour; principles for the ages.”<sup>5</sup> And the whole question of right or wrong is involved in a choice between the two. There must be standards that can be counted on—or there isn’t anything that anyone can count on. And the sooner in life we learn to live by principles, the sooner we shall have that peace of which Emerson spoke—the peace that comes with the triumph of principles, with the living of law, with the keeping of commandments, with the setting aside of a selfish and indulgent self.

<sup>1</sup>Motto attributed to the late Herbert Bayard Swope.

<sup>2</sup>Emerson, *Self Reliance*.

<sup>3</sup>David Thomas.

<sup>4</sup>Horace Mann.

<sup>5</sup>Henry Ward Beecher.

“The Spoken Word,” from Temple Square presented over KSL and the Columbia Broadcasting System, April 26, 1959. Copyright 1959.



Why, in the Book of Mormon, naturally, since there is no other source!

Mr. Van Pelt informs us that in the Book of Mormon "there are passages also which betray a dependence upon other books, such as the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Methodist Discipline."<sup>43</sup> Since the passages in question are quite short, one wonders why our authority does not produce them; the reason for the omission is quite plain: the passages actually "betray a resemblance" no greater than any two texts chosen at random on the same subject would betray.<sup>44</sup> Yet another religious encyclopedia, taking up where the Schaff-Herzog leaves off, informs an unsuspecting world that "... the speech of Nephi [which speech?] contains quotations from the Westminster Confession of Faith."<sup>45</sup> With such a fine start a contemporary treatise takes up the cry: "Nephi who purports to be a pre-Christian prophet, uses *verbatim* quotations from the 17th Century Westminster Confession of Faith."<sup>46</sup>

Finally Father Rumble assures us that "Mormon managed . . . to engrave on his golden plates quotations word for word from the Westminster Confessions."<sup>47</sup> What started out as passages that "betray a dependence" of one text on another—a purely subjective judgment—finally emerge after passing from hand to hand with no checking of original sources, as nothing less than word for word quotations. This is a highly characteristic procedure in Book of Mormon criticism, converting cautious speculation to damning certitude by the simple process of whispering from ear to ear.

To prove that Campbellite teaching "prevades the Mormon Bible," one critic has only to point out that in both "baptism was important . . . and expectation of the coming and millennial reign of Christ, are unequivocally reproduced."<sup>48</sup> Of course these things have been basic in Jewish and Christian eschatology from the beginning—but Joseph Smith could only have got them from the Campbellites, because this particular writer wants it that way. One seminarist has sought to demonstrate that "In its theological position and coloring the Book of Mormon is a volume of Disciple theology." Only to support his thesis he must argue that the book underwent "two several redactions" [sic]

## LEFT-OVER PROBLEM

by Ida M. Pardue

Some housewives are very shrewd

At using up those bits of food.

In feeding six—I find it rough

Just to cook and serve enough.

which cleverly conceal the fact.<sup>49</sup> Mormons have no right to resent such tricks, however, since the Bible is treated with the same perfect liberty by the same critics: "Every scholar goes his own way and according to his private predilection chooses what is genuine and what is secondary in the book."<sup>50</sup> "Private predilection" is the key to the grab-bag method.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>See F. M. Brodie, *No Man Knows My History*, pp. 68-70.

<sup>2</sup>The method is discussed by S. Zeitlin, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLII (1952), who notes, p. 150: "One can always find for one's purpose ideas parallel with those in ancient writings," or modern.

<sup>3</sup>The parallel between Joseph Smith and Mohammed was frequently noted even by contemporaries of the Mormon prophet, writes Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Geschichte der Mormonen* (Halle, 1912), p. 67. A recent reflection on this is worth quoting: it is G. B. Arbaugh's remark, in *Gods, Sex and Saints* (Augustana Press, 1957), p. 10, that Mormonism "in fundamental respects is more alien to Christianity than is Islam," i.e., modern Christianity is closer to Islam than Mormonism is. How true!

<sup>4</sup>I. Goldzieher, *Vorlesungen uber den Islam* (Heidelberg, 1925), p. 194.

<sup>5</sup>T. W. Young, *Mormonism: Its Origin, Doctrines and Dangers* (Ann Arbor: Geo. Wahr, 1900), pp. 7-8.

<sup>6</sup>C. W. Ferguson, *The Confusion of Tongues, A Review of Modern Isms* (New York: Doran & Co., 1928), p. 369.

<sup>7</sup>Hastings *Encyclopedia of Religion & Ethics*, Vol. XI, p. 85.

<sup>8</sup>J. H. Snowden, *The Truth about Mormonism* (New York: Doran, 1926), p. 113.

<sup>9</sup>John Hyde, Jr., *Mormonism, Its Leaders and Designs* (New York: W. P. Fetridge, 1857), p. 281.

<sup>10</sup>E. D. Howe, *History of Mormonism* (Painesville: 1840), p. 70.

<sup>11</sup>Howe, in *The Painesville Telegraph*, February 15, 1831 (Cit. F. Kirkham, *op. cit.*, II, 58.)

<sup>12</sup>Howe, *History*, p. 40; H. Mattison, *A Scriptural Defence of the Doctrine of the Trinity, or a Check to Modern Arianism*, etc. (New York: Huntington & Savage, 1851.)

<sup>13</sup>J. Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 281. Editor of

*Galaxy Magazine* (New York), II (1866), p. 356: The *Encyclopedia Illustrada* in its article on Mormons, p. 1126 describes the Book of Mormon as a mixture of the Spaulding manuscripts "and Joseph Smith's fanatical Wesleyan ideas."

<sup>14</sup>Henry Adams, Jr., "Charles Francis Adams Visits the Mormons in 1844," in *Proceedings of the Mass. Historical Soc.*, LXVIII (Oct., 1944-May 1947) (Boston, 1952), p. 286.

<sup>15</sup>D. B. Davis, "The New England Origins of Mormonism," *New England Quarterly* XXVI (1953), p. 158.

<sup>16</sup>R. W. Beers, *The Mormon Puzzle and How to Solve It* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1887), p. 34: "Millerism in particular was attracting great attention at that time, and so they incorporated into the 'Book of Mormon' its leading tenets." The remark as to the date of Miller's teaching, which began "when the Mormon Church was only a year old," is from J. D. Kingsbury, *Mormonism* (New York: Congreg. Home Missionary Soc., No date), p. 6.

<sup>17</sup>W. E. Biederwolf, *Mormonism under the Searchlight* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. 3: "The first 2,000 converts came, nearly every one of them, out of the Baptist churches of Western Pennsylvania and Eastern Ohio." This is strictly untrue. The *Galaxy Magazine* article, *loc. cit.*, calls the Mormons "Wesleyan Baptists."

<sup>18</sup>A. Campbell, quoted in *Painesville Telegraph*, February 15, 1831; (Kirkham, II, 93).

<sup>19</sup>J. Remy, *Journey to Great Salt Lake City* (London, 1861), I, 231-2.

<sup>20</sup>J. Theobald, *Mormonism Harpooned* (London: W. Horsell, 1855), p. 24.

<sup>21</sup>Thus F. M. Brodie, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60.

<sup>22</sup>T. F. O'Dea, *The Mormons* (Ithaca, 1956), p. 28.

<sup>23</sup>Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

<sup>24</sup>*Der Grosse Brodkhaus*, s. v. "Mormonen."

<sup>25</sup>*Ed. in Knowledge, A Weekly Magazine* (New York), Vol. I, No. 9, Aug. 2, 1890, p. 186.

<sup>26</sup>J. W. Gunnison, *The Mormons or Latter-Day Saints* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1856), p. 61.

<sup>27</sup>E. D. Howe, *op. cit.*, pp. 54, 19. Actually a quote from David Marks. Cf. J. B. Turner, *Mormonism in All Ages*, p. 6; "Atheism and Romanism, its natural allies."

<sup>28</sup>J. Theobald, *The Overthrow of Infidel Mormonism* (London: W. Horsell, 1850), p. 18. The charge was a common one.

<sup>29</sup>G. K. Chesterton, *Uses of Adversity* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1921), p. 189.

<sup>30</sup>Arbaugh, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>31</sup>See F. Kirkham, *New Witness*, II, 89, 92, quoting the *Painesville Telegraph*, February 15, 1831. A Campbellite preacher refused to occupy a pulpit in which a Mormon had been invited to speak, protesting that "the man proclaimed another gospel written in another book." *Ibid.* II, 113. Campbellites do not believe there ever was a great apostasy, that the Holy Ghost was ever had among any but the original apostles, that re-baptism is necessary, that a definite organization is required for the church, etc., to name only a few of the fundamental differences listed by Campbell, *loc. cit.*

<sup>32</sup>D. J. Burnett, a Campbellite leader's discussion of this (April 7, 1831) is given in Kirkham, *op. cit.*, II, 113.

<sup>33</sup>J. A. Hardon, S. F., *The Protestant*



*Churches of America* (Westminster, Md.; Newman Press, 1956), p. 179. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

<sup>34</sup>Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 148, 154.

<sup>35</sup>D. H. C. Bartlett, *The Mormons or, Latter-Day Saints, Whence Came They?* (Liverpool: J. A. Thompson & Co., 1911), p. 9.

<sup>36</sup>A. M. Redwood, "Mormonism," in W. C. Irvine (Ed.), *Heresies Exposed* (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 28th Printing, 1955), pp. 128, 130.

<sup>37</sup>Redwood suggests, *loc. cit.*, that Rigdon's copy (hypothetical) of Mosheim was used. J. von Mosheim in the 1839 ed. of his *Ecclesiastical History*, II, 312-314, describes the teaching of Joachim as "Franciscan mysticism," maintaining that after "two imperfect ages (or dispensations) . . . the true and eternal Gospel" was finally taught by St. Francis, who was the angel mentioned in Rev. 14:6, and "that the Gospel of Christ would be abrogated in the year 1260," etc. And this is supposed to be the source of the Book of Mormon!

<sup>38</sup>W. S. Parrott, *The Veil Uplifted; or the Religious Conspirators of the Latter-Day Exposed* (Bristol: J. B. Taylor & Sons, 1865), p. 13.

<sup>39</sup>Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi* in Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae*, Vol. 158: columns 50-51. The scholars in question refer to the doctrine of Atonement in Anselm's *Cur Deus homo?* oblivious of its remarkably feudalistic and chivalric quality.

<sup>40</sup>H. Nibley, *An Approach to the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1957), pp. 42.

<sup>41</sup>J. W. Gunnison, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

<sup>42</sup>Hastings, *op. cit.*, XI, p. 85.

<sup>43</sup>Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopedia*, VIII, p. 13.

<sup>44</sup>The passage in the *Confession of Faith*, Ch. 32-33 reads: "After death the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments, reserved to the judgment of the great day. In which day all persons shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words and deeds, and to receive according to that which they have done in the body, whether good or evil. The end of God's appointing this day is for the manifestation of His justice. For then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, but the wicked shall be cast into eternal torments." (Quoted in Riley,

## TO MY MOTHER

by R. H. Grenville

Like treasures in a teakwood chest,  
Rich souvenirs of life remain  
In memory—all I could wrest  
From love and longing, joy and pain.  
There beauty is, and youth, and  
spring;

Old dreams, like tatters of fine lace,  
And one incomparable thing,  
One flawless cameo—your face.

## May Through December

(Continued) mittee, who with Mrs. Merlin Madsen originated the idea, with sons, granddaughters, and even great-great-grandsons in original musical guitar numbers, the aged couple sat complacently at home, in front of the coal and wood fire where the old stove merrily sent out its warm glow, listening to a recording from Governor George D. Clyde and Mayor Adiel Stewart of Salt Lake City. Fortunately, because of modern invention, the lovely voices of the "Singing Mothers," will continue to cheer them, and a TV motion picture can be shown on family occasions.

It was on December 11, 1878 that "Uncle Peter," then a tall handsome youth, went to St. George in advance, to welcome his blushing bride, who had been his childhood sweetheart since they were thirteen. The honeymoon took place in the "old surrey" when they "cousined" (which interpreted means staying with one's relatives along the way).

Finances were limited for the two "lovebirds" and always have been, but love made up for what was lacking in worldly goods.

The story of their struggle when he served in every capacity in Indianola, where he was bishop, dentist, undertaker, banker, carpenter, farmer, would take a book to tell.

In the audience December 11, 1958 was a gray-haired man, who reported that "Peter" said he practised painless dentistry; "it was more painless for him than for us, which I can testify to, but what could we have done without him, he even had dentist tools, but no certificate."

Mr. Petersen also served the Indians, for he was their friend, and practised President Young's admonition: "It is better to feed them than fight them."

It is small wonder that the little home, which has been added upon nearly every ten years since 1870 is so dear to them, and to all their living 253 blood descendants.

As one crosses the hearthstone,

Founder of Mormonism, p. 132.) It would be hard to find a more thoroughly standardized statement of Biblical teachings regarding the last judgment. The official Catholic teaching is the same (Bern. Bartmann, *Manuale de Teologia Dogmatica* (Alba: Edizioni Paoline, 1949), III, 430-433). Indeed this is one of the few Christian doctrines on which nearly all churches, as well as the Jewish doctors, agree, and it could hardly be otherwise, since it is all set forth so clearly in the scriptures. The last judgment is a favorite theme of churchmen, ancient, medieval, and modern, who never tire of repeating over and over again almost word for word the story quoted above. "If the speech of Nephi to his brethren be compared with the Westminster Standards," writes Riley (*loc. cit.*), "a close parallelism will be disclosed." But no closer than with a hundred other sources.

<sup>45</sup>Hastings *Encyclopedia*, XI, p. 86.

<sup>46</sup>H. Davies, *Christian Deviations* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954), p. 80.

<sup>47</sup>L. Rumble, *Mormons or Latter-Day Saints* (St. Paul, 1950), Tract, quoted in Kirkham, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 304-7.

<sup>48</sup>H. C. Sheldon, *Fourfold Test of Mormonism* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1914) pp. 43-44. Cf. D. P. Kidder, *Mormonism & The Mormons* (1842), pp. 336f; J. Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

<sup>49</sup>P. Whitsitt, in *Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge* (New York: 1891), article on "Mormons."

<sup>50</sup>W. A. Irwin, in *Vetus Testamentum*, III (1953), pp. 61f, speaking of research on Ezekiel.

for rock foundation still forms the foothold, and enters the warm kitchen, one finds a spirit of love. The walls are covered with family pictures; the old organ even helps show these off. Then one enters the parlor, where upon urgent persuasion the old violin was brought out and great-great-grandchildren danced to the strains of the "fiddler" who used to play for a dollar fifty cents a night or for vegetables.

This scribe's mind again reverted to Mr. Guest's poem which says:

"Ye've got t' sing an' dance fer years,  
ye've got t' romp an' play,  
An learn t' love the things ye have by  
usin' 'em each day;  
Even the roses 'round the porch  
must blossom year by year  
Afore they 'come a part o' ye, sug-  
gestin' someone dear. . . .  
Ye're got t' love each brick an' stone  
from cellar up t' dome  
It takes a heap o' livin' in a house  
to make it home."

This certainly was true of the Petersen home; for their folk formed