



Type: Magazine Article

---

## Since Cumorah: New Voices from the Dust, The Precious Things Return, Part I (Continued III)

Author(s): Hugh W. Nibley

Source: *Improvement Era*, Vol. 68, No. 1 (January 1965)

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

Page(s): 34–37, 60–64

---

**Abstract:** This series argues that the changing attitudes of biblical scholars toward basic questions about scripture allow room for claims made by the Book of Mormon. It discusses external evidences, the primitive church, Lehi, Zenos, the olive tree, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The fourth part continues the discussion of apocryphal texts.

# SINCE CUMORAH

## NEW VOICES FROM THE DUST

BY HUGH NIBLEY, PH.D.  
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND RELIGION,  
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

### THE PRECIOUS THINGS RETURN



#### PART 1. (Continued)

The newly found *Logia* are particularly close to those pseudo-Clementine writings that represent the earliest postbiblical teachings of the Christian Church, and at the same time they present the closest affinity to the milieu of the Dead Sea Scrolls—that is to say, all these documents teach the same things in the same words.<sup>186</sup> The Sayings from various sources exhibit considerable variety and ample evidence of alteration and adaptation; some are abbreviated and some are expanded versions of the Lord's words in the New Testament; some combine elements and episodes that are separate and disconnected in the Bible (compare 3 Nephi!); others mix New Testament material with extracanonical material; while some are completely different from

anything in the gospels.<sup>187</sup> The *Logia* as a whole do not follow any consistent doctrinal pattern, but seem just thrown together, as if jotted down at different times and places as the Lord spoke them.<sup>188</sup> In fact, H. Köester insists that the important thing is not that a *Logion* may really have been uttered by Jesus, but that it was accepted as authentic by the early Saints and so leads us into the midst of the first Church, showing us what they believed and practised.<sup>189</sup>

It was the heretic hunters of later ages who destroyed the early image by suppressing every Saying which did not agree with their concept of orthodoxy.<sup>190</sup> Here we see the literal fulfilment of Nephi's prophecy that many precious things that proceeded out of the mouth of the Jew would

be taken away from the Book of the Lamb. Nephi's peculiar and repeated expression, “. . . proceedeth forth from the mouth of the Jew; . . .” (1 Nephi 13:24) is a clear reference to *Logia*, “utterances of the mouth,” and his statement that the Apostles “bear record” of these things in writing points to the thesis now propounded “in the light of the recently discovered documents” that there were “collections of sayings of Jesus before our canonical gospels were written” and that the Gospels were originally based on such collections.<sup>191</sup>

Aside from documents coming forth from old Christian and Jewish centers, we may not ignore those of more exotic origin, for the ancient Saints were driven and persecuted, and one can never tell where their footprints or writings may turn up; for example, in 1909 a Saying of Jesus (“Jesus said: Life is a bridge—do not linger on it, but hurry over it”) was found inscribed in Arabic over two different gates of a palace mosque of a long-ruined Mogul city in northern India. Subsequent documentary discoveries indicate that this may well be an authentic saying of the Lord, in spite of its surprising provenance.<sup>192</sup>

And what shall we make of the Mandaean writings, with their an-

cient doctrines and ordinances that are at once Jewish and Christian?<sup>193</sup> Though discovered far to the east, they are viewed today as representing "perhaps a late version of the North Israelite-Samaritan tradition," going clear back to the days of Isaiah and the dispersion; and though "entirely independent of Christian influence, they kept Sunday as a holy day."<sup>194</sup> Here is something worth looking into—a society of desert sectaries who strangely remind one of Christians, yet whose ancestors left Jerusalem before the days of Lehi; for the Book of Mormon student, the urge to investigate should be irresistible.

*The Gnostic Question.* It has long been the practice of scholars to refuse any newly discovered document containing disturbing teachings or implications by condemning it as "Gnostic." Of the Jewish Apocrypha, Gaster writes: "Almost every sect which did not conform strictly to the tenets of the orthodox Church of the first centuries, which used mystic or allegorical terms and evolved an independent system of cosmology, eschatology and soteriology was indiscriminately described as Gnostic."<sup>195</sup> "Nothing is easier," writes R. M. Wilson, "than to draw up a schematic outline of belief, be it orthodox, Gnostic or Jewish-Christian, and apply it to the texts. . . ."<sup>196</sup> The trouble is that there is no agreement on what is meant by the term "Gnostic," as F. C. Baur noted over a hundred years ago.<sup>197</sup> Discussions of Gnosticism still remain futile "as long as 'gnosticism' is not a clearly defined concept having certain definite sources. . . . Without a critical historical method it is impossible to advance further."<sup>198</sup>

We are now told that "to the Jew . . . Christianity must have appeared an eccentrically Gentile Gnosis, while to the Gentile it must have seemed an eccentrically Jewish one."<sup>199</sup> Whatever we find eccentric, we simply call Gnostic. This is a

modern practice, however: ". . . this term describes not an ancient but a modern historical category and its fluctuating use has often confused issues."<sup>200</sup> It was not in fact until the eighteenth century that "Gnostic" became a term of censure.<sup>201</sup> The present discussions of Gnosticism are simply a "sham-battle," Schoeps notes, "since everyone obviously understands something different by 'Gnosis.'"<sup>202</sup>

To the patristic writers and to the church historians of a century ago, the Gnosis was simply the invasion

*One of the many old scrolls found within the last score of years by the Bedouins. Scrolls date back to the second century BC.*



of the gospel by Greek philosophy.<sup>203</sup> However, long ago Mosheim noted the strongly Oriental flavor of the Gnostic teachings, and accordingly it was viewed by many as an Oriental intrusion.<sup>204</sup> But since both Greek and Oriental elements were apparent, and since both had notably fused in the Hellenistic world, a general consensus soon considered Gnosticism as a syncretism or synthesis of the two elements, usually thought to have taken place in Egypt.<sup>205</sup>

Today the theory is being put forth that the Gnosis came from the bosom of heterodox Judaism where it arose independently though, of course, subject to some influence of Hellenistic and Oriental religious thought. Some even see in the Dead Sea Scrolls the first Gnostic writings!<sup>206</sup> So here we go again with

our usual overlapping and confusion: "Gnosticism," writes Van Unnik, is "a many-headed hydra . . . the sheer number of speculations and the bizarre patterns which they usually assume are enough to make anyone feel dizzy!"<sup>207</sup> There was much talk recently of a pre-Christian Gnosis which "goes back to heterodox Jewish conception . . . and to pre-Asiatic syncretism in general. In its origins Gnosis [this theory held] is Jewish-Near Eastern occultism, Oriental mysticism."<sup>208</sup> That covers a lot of ground, but it is only

the beginning. For Cullmann the Clementine writings to which we have so often referred, "attach themselves" to a "particular current of *gnostic* Judaism," best illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls, "a sort of Jewish gnosticism . . . which one can consider as the cradle of Christianity."<sup>209</sup>

So here we have early Christianity and the Jewish sectaries all mixed up in a common Gnostic milieu. For H. J. Schoeps this is sheer nonsense: "Gnosis was never anything but pagan Gnosis," he insists, the pseudo-Clementine writings being actually a vigorous assault *against* Gnosticism.<sup>210</sup> Some find the Odes of Solomon a Gnostic work closely related to the Pistis Sophia and to an "unofficial Judaism" which Batiffol designates as Gnostic, though noting



that the Christology of the Odes is "entirely independent of any Gnostic speculation";<sup>211</sup> others say they are Gnostic in a peculiarly Christian sense,<sup>212</sup> and Klijn now concludes that they are "a genuine Christian work."<sup>213</sup> If they are Gnostic, R. Harris decided, "we can only say, 'Would God all the Lord's people were Gnostics.'"<sup>214</sup>

From the moment they became known, the Nag Hammadi texts were advertised as Gnostic writings, but right away the usual question arose. Puech and Quispel, for example, after careful study conclude that the new Apocryphon of James "is perhaps Gnostic and probably Valentinian,"<sup>215</sup> while Van Unnick declares that it "originated from a small village-church not yet affected by gnosticism, between 125-150. . . ."<sup>216</sup> Most scholars believe the Epistle of the Apostles is orthodox, but G. Bardy believes it is Gnostic.<sup>217</sup> The Gnostic Gospel of Thomas exhibits much that deviates from Gnosticism, much that comes closer to the doctrines of the "great Church";<sup>218</sup> how shall we classify it?

If we attempt to classify a document by its teachings we run into a hopeless situation for half the Gnostic teachings—the pre-existent plan, this world as a place of probation, eternal progression, the spiritual creation, the withholding of certain teachings from the world, the divine parentage of man, the pre-existent glory of Adam, etc.—were held by the Primitive Church,<sup>219</sup> and the other half—the unknowable and ineffable nature of God, the free use of allegory in interpreting scripture, the appeal of philosophy as a theological foundation, the antithesis of matter which is evil and spirit which is good, the search for God in the mystic way, etc.<sup>220</sup>—were adopted by the later church, so that there are no strictly peculiar Gnostic doctrines to set Gnosticism apart from orthodox Christian views. For some, the very essence of Gnosticism was belief in



direct revelation; for others, it was denial of direct revelation.<sup>221</sup>

How can one talk about a Gnostic religion? Irenaeus says that no two or three Gnostics believed the same.<sup>222</sup> "Gnosis," Bultmann concludes, "is the expression of various mythological and philosophical traditions and therefore may be characterized as a syncretistic phenomenon."<sup>223</sup> With their doctrines and practices coming from a dozen different sources, was there anything that all the Gnostics had in common? Some scholars have insisted that Gnosticism was actually a single religion, "a world-religion *sui generis*, which not only influences Neoplatonism and Christianity, but actually competed with them for supremacy."<sup>224</sup> It was, we are told, "a vast independent movement, an authentic

mystery-religion whose roots reach back into the religious soil of the Hellenized Orient, its main doctrinal sources being the Greek Pseudo-Zoroaster and Hermes Trismegistus."<sup>225</sup>

But others ask, Who were the founders and leaders, the Saints of this pre-Christian Gnostic church? Who were its members aside from Christian and Jewish eccentrics? Where was its headquarters? Why do no contemporary writers seem aware of it? Why do we have "no clear documentary evidence for anything resembling a Gnosis prior to the Christian era"?<sup>226</sup>

The oldest use of the word "Gnosis" would seem to be by the Mandaeans, for *Manda* means Gnosis. These people were also called Dositheans, a Samaritan word that goes back possibly to the Exile of 721 BC.<sup>227</sup>



Theirs is hailed as the purest and oldest system of Gnosticism, yet the Dositheans were the first and strongest anti-Gnostics, according to some, and they took their rise "on the soil of Palestine" and were "intimately connected with the movement whose outstanding protagonist was John the Baptist. . . ."228 We have noted elsewhere that these people are also thought to have been the descendants of that Jonadab ben Rechab who fled from Jerusalem in the days of Lehi, and for the same reason Lehi did—to escape the machina-

groups joining the Church, and Brownlee specifically suggests the Qumran brethren.<sup>231</sup> The common motifs in sectarian Jewish and early Christian writings show "that the Essene sectaries were a fruitful field of evangelization [Christian missionary work]," according to Professor Cross, "and that they in turn had influence on the formation of institutions of the apostolic and subapostolic church."<sup>232</sup>

Since the new researches have been made among the sectaries, Essenism is commonly used in a free

three streams so clearly distinct in the earlier stages of Church history," asks Wilson, "or should we not rather expect to find a certain interpenetration of thought, a gradual hardening into lines of cleavage?"<sup>235</sup>

*The Real Gnosis.* Every scholar has his own solution of the Gnostic equations, but not one of them has succeeded in the eyes of his fellows in balancing his equation. Schoeps now fails to do so for the same reason that the others have, by failing to take all the factors into account. One factor in particular is consistently ignored, and that is the clear and repeated pronouncement of all the earliest church writers on the subject, that *there was a true Gnosis.* The word "Gnosis" occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament and always refers to knowledge that comes by revelation.<sup>236</sup> The oldest Christian definition of the Gnosis (and one consistently ignored by students of Gnosticism) is that it was "that knowledge the Lord imparted secretly to Peter, James, and John after the Resurrection, and which they in turn transmitted to the others of the Twelve and to the Seventy."<sup>237</sup>

There is no record of its having gone any farther. Irenaeus, who calls this "the true Gnosis," insists that it was handed down by the Apostles to the Bishops and hence to the churchmen of his own day.<sup>238</sup>

But earlier and better informed writers tell another story: ". . . when the holy chorus of the Apostles had ended their lives in various ways, and that generation passed away of those who had heard the divine wisdom with their own ears, at that moment the conspiracy of godless error took its rise through the deception of false teachers, who, as soon as the last Apostle had departed, first came out openly and henceforward undertook to match the teaching of the truth with what they *falsely* styled *Gnosis.*"<sup>239</sup> Overnight the Church swarmed with the pre-

(Continued on page 60)

Jerusalem during the time of Christ, a painting by H. C. Selous of the nineteenth century English school.



Careful digging by learned men often results in unearthing new records of almost forgotten people.

tions of the wicked "Jews at Jerusalem" and to live the law in its purity in the desert.<sup>229</sup>

Amidst all this confusion the reader may begin to suspect that we have run into something akin to the peculiar fusion of Christian and Jewish elements in the Book of Mormon. When the scrolls were first examined, Brownlee classed as having "striking affinities" with each other, the religions of Qumran, the Covenanters of Damascus, the Essenes, the Therapeutae of Egypt, and the John-the-Baptist movement, noting significantly, "to this list I would have added primitive Christianity. . . ."230 Long ago R. H. Charles had suggested that when "a great company of the priests [became] obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7) it was actually one of these sectarian

and general sense as a sort of "overall name or borderline concept for heterodox Judaism."<sup>233</sup> In the fourth century Epiphanius classed the desert sects of the Dead Sea and Jordan together as having common beliefs and practices but possibly for that very reason feuding fiercely among themselves. "The Sampsaeans or Elkesaites," he writes, "still survive in Arabia, living around and beyond the Dead Sea. The followers of a false prophet . . . they resemble the Ebionites very closely in everything," the latter being almost exactly like the Cerinthians and the Nazoraeans, who claim to be true Israel, and also like the Gorghethoi who are called Essenes, and who are practically the same as the Dositheans, and so on.<sup>234</sup> Orthodox, Jewish-Christian, Gnostic, ". . . were these





revelations but that they did *not* possess them—they were only faking or wishfully thinking; they didn't have the Gnosis at all, and when the time came to deliver the goods, as it soon did, since they all challenged each other's exclusive claims, they were caught empty-handed—they *had* to come up with something: hence the feverish and irresponsible borrowing of any odds and ends of Oriental lore they could lay their hands on; hence the solemn and impressive appeal to philosophy—especially the recondite and mysterious gospel of Neo-Platonism, hence the willingness to make full use of genuine or spurious holy writings or even to forge new ones outright. What has made the study of Gnosticism so infinitely complex and hopelessly confusing is the willingness of the Gnostics in their need to throw anything into the hopper.

It was easy to demonstrate the folly of the Gnostic claims, but what had anybody else to put in their place? Nothing. Gnosticism “was defeated only at the price of substantial concessions still plainly visible in the structure of Christian theology.”<sup>246</sup> “The main church had no choice,” wrote C. Schmidt, “but to follow along the same path.”<sup>247</sup> “In Catholicism,” says Harnack, “Gnosticism won half a victory.”<sup>248</sup> In fact Harnack believed that the Gnostics were simply “the Christian theologians of the first centuries of the Church,” the only real difference between them and the later doctors being that they thrust on the church abruptly a theology which the latter accepted only gradually.<sup>249</sup> In the early period, “it is dangerous” we are warned, “to treat the Gnostics, the Apologists and others as distinct and separate groups,” and since “the Gnostics remained fairly close to the ‘orthodox’ Church down to about 180 . . . it is indeed an open question how far we can really make use of such terms as ‘orthodox’ and ‘heretical’ at this stage.”<sup>250</sup>

Quispel has shown how the great

Neo-Platonic, Gnostic, and “orthodox” teachers were all “educated in the same intellectual milieu, were all born in Egypt, all attended the same university at Alexandria where all became imbued with the same eclectic Platonism,” and he asks us, “What could the term ‘heretic’ have meant at so early a time?”<sup>251</sup> We must bear in mind that “hitherto, the history of Christian Gnosticism has been written by its enemies,” and in view of the new findings it would now appear that “Valentinianism (the most representative form of Gnosticism) was more ‘Christian’ than most of its adversaries would like us to think.”<sup>252</sup> A common charge against the Gnostics is that they claimed to know the answers to the great questions of life, but what religion does not? After all, these are the questions “which perpetually excite mankind.”<sup>253</sup> There is not a Gnostic teaching that some Gnostic did not reject and some orthodox Christian did not accept.

But what do we mean by “orthodox” Christian? If we knew that, we would have no trouble identifying heretics and Gnostics simply as those who disagreed with the “Main Church.” But “Main Church” is strictly a modern term, invented to describe something for which the ancients had no word and of which accordingly they had no concept. The distinction was made only after the business had been settled—not by a formal council or decree, but imperceptibly in a long series of compromises. Until then the Christian Church during the great crisis was like the Jewish church, a swarm of sects, each claiming to be the one original but none able to prove its case.<sup>254</sup> But when a winner emerged—that party which got the sympathy and armed might of the emperor on its side—the winning party got to work and completely obliterated every trace of its former rivals: “The beaten ones were not only covered with the green sod,” as Schoeps puts it, “but with a great silence as well,” so that their rediscovery in our time

Wonder what  
to serve  
when you have  
friends in?

Why not  
try Postum?



Flavorful, hearty Postum just naturally encourages good talk among friends.

Made with pure, energy-food ingredients and *no* caffeine, Postum gives you a *natural* lift.

You can drink all you like.

If you haven't tried Instant Postum lately, you're missing a satisfying, bracing drink.

You'll enjoy its *natural* lift.

#### The Natural Lift

Send name and address for free Postum recipes to:

Postum Recipes,  
Box 1040, Kankakee, Illinois.

Postum is a registered trademark of General Foods Corporation.





Special for . . .

## Mormon Weddings

Reception Invitations, Napkins, Albums, etc., featuring L.D.S. temple designs. (Conventional styles 100 for \$5.95.) Write for FREE catalog and samples.

100  
in raised lettering  
only \$8.95

(Catalog airmail for 25¢ — Oakland Temple Designs)

REXCRAFT • Rexburg, Idaho • 83440

## WHEAT MILL



ONLY  
\$6.95

POSTPAID  
ANYWHERE  
IN THE  
UNITED STATES

Cracks or grinds  
wheat, corn and  
all kinds of hard  
or soft grains,  
1½ lbs. per min.

GUARANTEED

ORDER  
BY MAIL

SPECIAL PRICES TO LDS GROUPS

## PEHRSON HARDWARE

2115 So. 11th East, Salt Lake City

### LOAN MANAGER

Perhaps you are living in an area you don't like and want to return to the Salt Lake City area.

We need a loan manager with heavy experience with a major loan company. We offer Profit Sharing, an Educational Assistance Program, and all fringe benefits you would expect from a topflight company.

Please send confidential resume including salary requirements to P. O. Box 1572, Salt Lake City, Utah.

We also will likely have openings for finance company trainees in the months ahead and will welcome inquiries.

## IN USE for SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS

Aids in treatment of Canker, simple sore throat and other minor mouth and throat irritations.

## HALL'S REMEDY

Salt Lake City, Utah

## BE YOUR OWN MUSIC TEACHER

Send for Free Book Telling How You Can Learn ANY Instrument NOW!

It's easy to learn music at home. No tiresome exercises. Play tunes right away. Pictured lessons show how. Low-cost easy-pay plan. Write to U.S. SCHOOL OF MUSIC, Studio A1071, Port Washington, L. I., N. Y. Est. 1898. Lic. N. Y. State Educ. Dept. No salesman will call. Tear out.



U.S. SCHOOL OF MUSIC, Studio A1071, Port Washington, L. I., N. Y. Est. 1898. Lic. N. Y. State Educ. Dept. No salesman will call. Tear out.

has come as the greatest surprise.<sup>255</sup>

But why are well-known orthodox Christian works including the writings of John and Paul, the Odes of Solomon, and the Clementine Recognitions so full of Gnostic expressions? Not because they are Gnostic, as has been commonly assumed, Schoeps points out, but precisely because they are fighting the Gnostics, to do which most effectively they must employ the familiar jargon of the Gnostics themselves.<sup>256</sup>

And just as the anti-Gnostic writers are thus an authentic guide to Gnosticism, so the teachings and practices of the false Gnostics are a reliable guide to the nature of the true Gnosis which they were counterfeiting. If "Simon Magus (the arch-Gnostic) promised a baptism to eternal life,"<sup>257</sup> it does not follow that there was no genuine ancient Christian baptism or that the Gnostics invented the idea of baptism which is thus a later interpolation in the



## NOT NEUTRAL BUT NEGATIVE . . .

RICHARD L. EVANS

There is a word considered often as a virtue which is often not necessarily so, and indeed may be quite the contrary. We refer to neutrality, which in dictionary definition means "neither one thing nor the other," "not engaged on either side," "middling, indifferent . . . without marked vices or virtues." Neutrality may mean not meddling in what one should not meddle in. On the other hand, where one *should* be actively interested, neutrality is much less a virtue and much more a vice. We have heard too much, for example, of people's appealing for help, crying for help, desperately needing help, under attack or in serious distress, while others, not wishing to trouble themselves, not wishing to become involved, go on their way, pretending not to hear or choosing to assume that the situation isn't serious, and so, in a sense, pass on the other side as in the Parable of the Good Samaritan. Neutrality can be a sort of shell, a sham, a preserving of complacency, of convenience, a withholding of service, not becoming committed. There is a time to be counted—and to be counted on. There is a time to make commitments. "Indifference produces a negative character."<sup>1</sup> And neutrality, where principles are concerned, where good and evil are at issue, where there is distress, lawlessness, or rampant wrong—such neutrality is not neutral but negative—indeed an actual evil. If no one cared what happened to anyone, life would be little worth living. If nobody chose to defend righteousness, if nobody fought for freedom, if nobody voted, if nobody took a public position, if nobody stood up and said what was right and what was wrong, men would drift down to an unsocial and unsafe jungle. It is possible to be too comfortable, too complacent, too composed, with too much silence, too much consent. There is a time to take sides, to stand up, to be heard, to exert influence and effort, to do something about what should be done, and the "don't care," "can't be bothered," "don't get involved," "neither one thing nor the other" attitude is, under some circumstances, not neutrality in fact or in effect but an encouragement to evil. "Where . . . Right gives a Call," said William Penn, "a 'neuter' must be a Coward or an Hypocrite. . . . We have a Call to do good, as often as we have the Power and Occasion. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mrs. Burton Chance, "A Talk to Girls," *Delineator*, November 1910.

<sup>2</sup>William Penn, *Some Fruits of Solitude*, Numbers 432, 436.

"The Spoken Word," from Temple Square, presented over KSL and the Columbia Broadcasting System, October 18, 1964. Copyright 1964.



source; if the Marcosians faked a sacrament with chemicals that made water seem to turn to blood,<sup>259</sup> it does not follow that there was no early Christian sacrament but only a borrowing from the Gnostics; if the Valentinians had a parody of prophetic inspiration stimulated by the taking of drugs and potions; or if they staged their own quaint version of celestial marriage, it does not follow that prophecy and marriage ordinances did not exist in the early Church.<sup>258</sup> The peculiarly pernicious thing about the pretenders, as Irenaeus pointed out, was that they mixed everything up, "making convincing noises . . . taking liberties with the logia of the Lord, having become bad interpreters of the good and correct word . . . persuading many that they have the Gnosis. . . . They argue very convincingly . . . making truth and falsehood indistinguishable . . . making whatever they say seem truer than truth itself. . . ." <sup>259</sup> It is no wonder that men have remained hopelessly confused about the Gnostic ever since—confusion was their business.

To return to our newly found texts, Christian and Jewish, one of the odd things about them was that while they were often labeled Gnostic because of the Gnostic ideas and expressions in them, their teachings were overwhelmingly *anti*-Gnostic—indeed the most important of them were manifestly written as anti-Gnostic tracts.<sup>260</sup> We have seen the way in which that fact actually explains the presence in them of many Gnostic expressions. The Dositheans, often called the first Gnostics, taught extreme millennialism, resurrection of the flesh, baptism, and scriptural literalism—all teachings detested by the real Gnostics! We are told that the Gnostic "threw the whole eschatological complex of ideas overboard,"<sup>261</sup> yet all the writings we have been talking about were thoroughly eschatological; how can one call them Gnostic? The Odes of Solomon are "as Gnostic as the New

Testament, no more and no less," writes Harris.<sup>262</sup> Again, "the Gnostic heretics used the Gospel of Thomas," but that does not mean that they wrote it, R. E. Taylor observes.<sup>263</sup> If Paul and John seem to talk like later Gnostics it is not because they adopted Gnostic ideas but the other way around; their words were twisted to Gnostic ends because ". . . second century Gnosticism . . . is the product of a defective exegesis of the New Testament."<sup>264</sup> The Apocryphon of James can easily be given a Gnostic interpretation, Van Unnik reminds us, but then so can the Bible.<sup>265</sup>

It is H. J. Schoeps's final explanation of the Gnostic anomalies that brings this reader back to the Book of Mormon almost with a jolt. When the false Gnostics started making their claims, the only people who stood up to them, according to Schoeps, were the Ebionites, "the descendants of the original Church of Jesus," whose counterblast is still preserved in the pages of the Clementine Recognitions.<sup>266</sup> This work is full of Gnostic jargon but employed strictly to discredit the Gnostics so-called. Actually, all the main points of Ebionite theology correspond to the teachings of the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>267</sup> Why should Christians appeal to such a source? They didn't; it just happened that those teachings were the same as theirs, though of course that was no accident.

The doctrines embraced loosely under the general title of Essene go right back, according to Schoeps, to the Rechabites, of the time of Lehi. "Again and again new groups had gone out into the desert to realize the chassidut"—the true way of life of the covenant people, their ideas meeting us in the Enoch literature, Jubilees, and the Twelve Patriarchs.<sup>268</sup> It was by the "immigration of dissenting Jewish groups" from time to time that the societies which went back to the days of the nomadic Rechabites "were constantly renewed and regenerated."<sup>268</sup>

## NOTICE WE ARE MOVING!!

Effective March 8, 1965

### THE IMPROVEMENT ERA OFFICE

will be located in the

#### BEEHIVE BANK BUILDING

79 South State Street  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

That address again . . .

#### BEEHIVE BANK BUILDING

79 South State Street  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

The Improvement



## FREE VITAMINS

Get a 25-day \$1.25 supply at no charge . . . a high-potency vitamin-mineral formula fortified with A NEWER FORM OF IRON. Send 10c to cover shipping to VITAMIN-QUOTA, Dept. L-679, 1125 South Crenshaw Blvd., Los Angeles 19, Calif.

## CREATIVE FAMILY LIVING

by Beverly Romney Cutler

with a foreword by

President Henry D. Moyle

An inspiring view of successful home evenings and special family occasions. A valuable aid!

Paper .....\$1.00

Cloth .....\$1.95

### OLYMPUS PUBLISHING CO.

Box 6137 Sugar House Station  
Salt Lake City, Utah

Available at L.D.S. bookstores everywhere



## IDAHO FALLS TRAVEL LODGE

When attending the Idaho Falls Temple, stay at the Idaho Falls TRAVEL LODGE — close and convenient — Special rates for excursions. — Temple open all day Saturdays. — Phone or write for reservations.

255 E Street  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
Ph. 523-2960



The Memorial Trust Funeral Plan serviced by leading funeral directors throughout Utah and the United States

Call or Write  
Memorial Trust, Inc.  
1556 South Main  
486-2089



It would be hard to imagine a more typical group of dissenters than the band that followed Lehi out into the desert; is it surprising that the doctrines and practices for centuries to come closely resemble those found in the newly discovered manuscripts?  
(To be continued next month)

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>180</sup>On their closeness to the Clementines, G. Quispel in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 12 (1958), p. 195; O. Cullmann, in *Hibberts Journal* 60 (1961f.), p. 121; R. Roques, *op. cit.*, pp. 202, 204.
- <sup>181</sup>R. Roques, *op. cit.*, pp. 196, 205f.; H. Köster, *op. cit.*, pp. 226, 233; L. Guerrier, in *Patrologia Orientalia*, IX, 148f.
- <sup>182</sup>R. Roques, *op. cit.*, p. 206.
- <sup>183</sup>H. Köster, *op. cit.*, pp. 221, 236-7.
- <sup>184</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 223.
- <sup>185</sup>O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
- <sup>186</sup>J. Jeremias, in *Expository Times*, 69 (1957), pp. 7-9.
- <sup>187</sup>R. Eisler, *Iesous Basileus ou Basileusas* (Heidelberg, 1930), II, 18, 21f., 356f., 699.
- <sup>188</sup>A. Adam, in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Beiheft 24, p. 79.
- <sup>189</sup>M. Gaster, *Studies*, I, 369.
- <sup>190</sup>R. M. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip*, p. 15.
- <sup>191</sup>F. C. Baur, *Die Christliche Gnosis oder die Christliche Religions-Philosophie* (Tübingen, 1835), p. 10.
- <sup>192</sup>J. Munck, in *Studia Theologica*, 15 (1961), p. 195.
- <sup>193</sup>R. P. Casey, in H. Davies and D. Daube (eds.), *Eschatological Background of the New Testament*, p. 56.
- <sup>194</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 76. W. R. Schoedel entitles his study, "The Rediscovery of the Gnosis," in *Interpretation*, 16 (1962), pp. 387-401.
- <sup>195</sup>M. Bouyer, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. 4 (1953), pp. 188-203.
- <sup>196</sup>H. J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde, Judentum, Gnosis*, p. 30.
- <sup>197</sup>So J. Matter, *Histoire Critique du Gnosticisme* (Paris, 1828), I, 45; R. A. Lepsius, *Der Gnosticismus . . .* (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 20, 22f., 25. E. Buonaiuti, *Lo Gnosticismo* (Rome, 1907), p. 11. On the Church Fathers, H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* (1924), p. 3.
- <sup>198</sup>F. C. Baur, *op. cit.*, pp. 3ff. (on Mosheim). The Oriental theory is held by C. W. King, *The Gnostics and their Remains* (London, 1887), p. 3; W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907), p. 5; A. Altman, in *Essays in Honor of J. H. Hertz* (I. Epstein et al. eds. London: Goldston, 1942), p. 19; G. Widengren, in *Zeitschrift für Religion und Geistesgeschichte*, 4 (1952), pp. 97-115.
- <sup>199</sup>R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Leipzig, 1904); H. Leisegang, *op. cit.*, p. 5; H. J. Schoeps, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-34; F. Lexa, in *Egyptian Religion*, 1 (1933), pp. 106-116, even traces Gnostic teachings back to archaic Egypt.
- <sup>200</sup>So Schubert, cited by Schoeps, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
- <sup>201</sup>Van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
- <sup>202</sup>G. Quispel, *The Jung Codex*, pp. 76f.
- <sup>203</sup>O. Cullmann, in *New Testament Studies*, 5 (1959), p. 166.
- <sup>204</sup>Schoeps, *op. cit.*, pp. 39f., 61f.

- <sup>205</sup>P. Batiffol, in *Revue Biblique*, N.S. 8 (1911), pp. 33f., 177.
- <sup>206</sup>R. Abramowski, in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 35 (1936), pp. 44-46: "It is 'Christian-Gnostic,' but not the Gnosticism of mythological speculation."
- <sup>207</sup>A. F. J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), p. 47.
- <sup>208</sup>R. Harris, *Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, pp. 12-16, 20.
- <sup>209</sup>In *Vigiliae Christianae*, 8 (1954), p. 22.
- <sup>210</sup>Van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
- <sup>211</sup>Peuch and Quispel, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 8 (1954), p. 9.
- <sup>212</sup>Van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
- <sup>213</sup>For a general discussion, see R. M. Grant, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1960).
- <sup>214</sup>For the basic Gnostic teachings, see G. Quispel, in J. H. Waszink et al., *Het Oudste Christendom* (Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk, 1951), I, 156ff., 162-5.
- <sup>215</sup>. . . the knowledge professed by the Gnostic teachers . . . was a knowledge designed to subordinate the revelation of Christ to the speculations of human philosophy," H. L. Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries* (London, 1875), p. 8. The opposite view is taken by A. Harnack, *Dogmengechichte*, I, 254, and a middle ground by W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus* (Berlin, 1952), pp. 365ff, 381.
- <sup>216</sup>Irenaeus, *Contra haereses*, I, 11, 1.
- <sup>217</sup>R. Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* (Zürich, 1949), p. 181.
- <sup>218</sup>G. Quispel, in *Het Oudste Christendom*, I, 152.
- <sup>219</sup>J. Doresse, in *Bulletin de l'Institut Egyptologique*, 31, p. 409; J. P. Steffes, *Das Wesen des Gnosticismus* (Paderborn, 1922), Ch. I (pp. 35-45); H. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen, 1903), p. 36.
- <sup>220</sup>R. M. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip*, p. 16, and in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 9, p. 211.
- <sup>221</sup>A. Adam, in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Beiheft 24, p. 77.

#### PRAYER FOR TODAY'S CHILDREN

BY LOUISE HAJEK

Lord,  
let them know Time as a friend—  
Not enemy  
thrust back,  
defeated by wheel and by wing.  
Lord,  
let them take Time by the hand—  
Know the benediction of pine,  
The wren's piccolo,  
Staccato of chipmunks,  
Blackberries steeped in sun,  
The meticulous stitches  
of Queen-Ann's-Lace,  
and the kitten-silkiness of driftwood.  
Lest these be lost in the blur of  
speed.  
Lord,  
let them know Time as a friend.

- <sup>222</sup>M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, p. 63.
- <sup>223</sup>*An Approach to the Book of Mormon*, pp. 127f.
- <sup>224</sup>W. Brownlee, in *The Biblical Archaeologist*, September 1960, p. 50 and note 2.
- <sup>225</sup>R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II, 786.
- <sup>226</sup>F. M. Cross, in *The Christian Century*, 72 (August 17, 1955), p. 944.
- <sup>227</sup>H. J. Schoeps, *op. cit.*, pp. 68f.
- <sup>228</sup>Epiphanius, *Adv. haereses*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, 41:236, 256-7, 284, 405, etc.
- <sup>229</sup>R. M. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- <sup>230</sup>H. Nibley, *The World and the Prophets* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co.), pp. 58f.
- <sup>231</sup>Eusebius, *Church History*, I, 4, 5.
- <sup>232</sup>Irenaeus, *Contra haereses*, IV, 33, 8, in *Patrologia Graeca*, 7:1077.
- <sup>233</sup>Eusebius, *Church History*, III, 32, 7.
- <sup>234</sup>H. Nibley, in *Church History*, 30 (1961), pp. 10-11.
- <sup>235</sup>Eusebius, *loc. cit.*; Epiphanius says they called themselves Gnostics, in *Patrologia Graeca*, 41:329. They are false prophets, false apostles, and false teachers, according to *Clementine Recognitions*, IV, 35, in *Patrologia Graeca*, 1:1330. Eusebius begins his history by announcing his intention of refuting "the bearers of what they falsely called the Gnosis," (*Church History* I, 1, 1). "They want to be called Gnostics, but they are not really Gnostics," writes Epiphanius, in *Patrologia Graeca*, 41:1012.
- <sup>236</sup>Discussed by H. J. Schoeps, *op. cit.*, pp. 34f.
- <sup>237</sup>P. Neander, *Antignostikus* (Berlin, 1825), Introduction.
- <sup>238</sup>C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935), p. 248.
- <sup>239</sup>Van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
- <sup>240</sup>J. Morris, in *Past and Present*, 3 (1953), p. 9.
- <sup>241</sup>C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern*, p. 204.
- <sup>242</sup>A. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I, 250 (1931 ed.).
- <sup>243</sup>*Ibid.*, I, 246, 250f.
- <sup>244</sup>R. M. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
- <sup>245</sup>In *Het Oudste Christendom*, I, 152f.
- <sup>246</sup>Van Unnik, *op. cit.*
- <sup>247</sup>Van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
- <sup>248</sup>Schoeps, *op. cit.*, pp. 35f., 44f.; H. Nibley, in *Church History*, 30 (1961), pp. 10f.
- <sup>249</sup>Schoeps, *op. cit.*, pp. 44f.
- <sup>250</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 41.
- <sup>251</sup>Eusebius, *Church History*, III, 26, 2.
- <sup>252</sup>For these points, H. Nibley, in *Vigiliae Christianae*.
- <sup>253</sup>Irenaeus, *Contra haereses*, I, 39, 1; cf. Eusebius, *Church History*, IV, 7.
- <sup>254</sup>C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 169, 202, 204, 229, 374.
- <sup>255</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 336.
- <sup>256</sup>R. Harris, *Odes of Solomon*, p. 13.
- <sup>257</sup>R. E. Taylor, in *Christianity Today*, 4 (1960), p. 3; Van Unnik, *op. cit.*, p. 42, notes that the Gnostics often "dragged in" non-Gnostic material "to support their interpretation"; henceforth it would be easy to suspect such material of being Gnostic, because of its suspicious associations.
- <sup>258</sup>R. M. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
- <sup>259</sup>Van Unnik, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 10 (1956), p. 152.
- <sup>260</sup>Schoeps, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-43, 61.
- <sup>261</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 77-85.
- <sup>262</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 85. Cf. 80-84.