

OUR LORD FROM INFANCY TO MINISTRY

I have written on the board, “Our Lord from Infancy to His Ministry.” What we will discuss will follow this in general under these four categories that are listed. This is just glorious doctrinal material, particularly with respect to his baptism, and also incident to each of those headings. The one we left from yesterday, it was the occasion of the wise men coming and the Herod slaughter of the infant children and the hope of destroying the King. Presumptively he would have been in the vicinity of . . . (inaudible) . . . at that time. We know very little about his life from that age of . . . (inaudible) . . . until the time that he came to be baptized of John, and he would have been about 30 years of age. Excepting only the one episode where he appeared in the temple and confounded and taught and sat with the doctors of religion when he was 12 years of age. It would be a marvelous thing if we knew something about his growing up period, his training and so on. And we could well suppose that there will be a day when this will be revealed. Certainly during the millennium people will be worthy and qualified to know more about Jesus and his life than we are able to receive and know. His personal affairs are not really recorded in the New Testament. We get a little bit about him because we see him sitting at the well—Jacob’s well, and it says he was weary and he was hungry. We begin to get a concept of the mortal characteristics . . . (inaudible) . . . but we really do not know what he did in his life. We know that he visited in the home of Mary and Martha; we make some assumptions that there may have been some relationships there. But the New Testament authors have not preserved anything, really. We do not know anything, really, of the details. We have some sort of an idea of how family relationships, or marriage, or who was related to him, and yet obviously he . . . (inaudible) . . . he could do in fitting into the established social scheme of things as far as that scheme conformed to righteous principles.

So I think someday we will know more about what he did during this period. But for now we can get a little concept of what . . . (inaudible).

Here we had him teaching in the temple . . . (inaudible) . . . the important thing about this episode is that he obviously knew who he was. There was not any question at all about that. Mary comes to him and she says, “Thy Father and I have sought thee sorrowing” (Luke 2:48). That is a natural thing for her to say. She knew that Joseph was not the father; from the previous account we are well aware of that, and yet he was considered in the eyes of people generally as a member of the family unit and he was one of a number of other children. He was considered in their eyes to be the son of Joseph and so she says to him, having in mind Joseph, that “Thy father and I (Joseph and I) have sought thee sorrowing.” Then he makes this suggestion . . . (inaudible) . . . that he distinguishes himself from the rest of her children, which is a little bit of a mild rebuke, or at least it is a correction of what she said. “Wist ye not that I must be about *my* Father’s business?” (Luke 2:49.) Distinguishing him from the rest of the children. Now, what we can get from this is that he knew his paternity. He is 12 years of age and he knows that God is his father. How did he know it? There is only one way he could have known it, and that is by revelation. Some way he had been told that God was his father. Did he have an angel

come to him? Was this a revelation from the Holy Ghost . . . (inaudible)? We just do not know. But look at page 110 in your text. We will read these insert verses that the Prophet put into the account in Matthew. These verses were just pure revelation, of corrections and additions.

And it came to pass that Jesus grew up with his brethren, and waxed strong, and waited upon the Lord for the time of his ministry to come.

And he served under his father [this is pure revelation; this is accurate and right, that he is considering Joseph to be his father here. He was as though he was a foster father, of course], and he spake not as other men, neither could he be taught; for he needed not that any man should teach him.

And after many years, the hour of his ministry drew nigh. (Inspired Version, Matthew 3:24-26.)

The intellectual endowment that he had was so superior that he was not subject to their kinds of counsel, but what is far more important is the spiritual endowment that he had was such that he absorbed the truths of eternity from a high and immortal source, and this is quite a remarkable thing. "He spake not as other men." This would have been the period of time from perhaps 12 on up, or younger on up, but at any event he was a distinct personality, superior to his associates, but in . . . (inaudible) . . . the same as they are.

Well, that is just a little background, which brings us up to the two headings that we want to spend our time on this morning. The first is "John Baptizes Jesus," and some obvious things that are quite remarkable that grow out of that, and then a few words about Jesus being tempted.

So let us have the full account before us on this, and on page 122 in the text, let us take John's account:

Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him.

But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?

And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him.

And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him:

And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. (Matthew 3:13-17.)

This is a very brief, but a remarkable account of what took place.

Well, we are concerned now with the doctrines that we learn out of the episode and events of the . . . (inaudible) . . . that the New Testament gives us. So, let us talk about what is involved in the baptism of Jesus. Let us do it by . . . (inaudible) . . . what we need to do . . . (inaudible) . . . the 31st chapter of 2 Nephi, and make ourselves a list of the reasons that Jesus was baptized. And if we could really envision and know why Christ was baptized, this would magnify and dignify and enhance the importance of baptism beyond any other thing that I can imagine where the rest of us men are concerned. So, beginning with the fourth verse, Nephi says:

Wherefore, I would that ye should remember that I have spoken unto you concerning that prophet which the Lord showed unto me, that should baptize the Lamb of God, which should take away the sins of the world. And now, if the Lamb of God, he being holy, should have need to be baptized by water, *to fulfill all righteousness* [this is just one of a thousand, literally a thousand, practical instances where the Book of Mormon will pick up the verbatim language of the Bible and will then begin to amplify it. This is one of the glorious things about the Book of Mormon. Just the identical language and this amplification, so that when we get through, we have no doubt about what the real doctrine is in the Bible. Well, this is what is involved, how he fulfilled all righteousness by this act], O then, how much more need have we, being unholy, to be baptized, yea, even by water!

And now, I would ask of you, my beloved brethren, *wherein* the Lamb of God did fulfill all righteousness in being baptized by water?

Know ye not that he was holy? [You see, Nephi fully understood that baptism was for the remission of sins. And here they have a being who has no sin coming to be baptized . . . (inaudible). Why baptize someone for the remission of sins who has no sin?] But notwithstanding he being holy, he showeth unto the children of men that, *according to the flesh* [we are back where we were yesterday; he has taken it as a man of flesh, his mortality] he humbleth himself before the Father, . . . (2 Nephi 31:4-7; emphasis added.)

Well, number one, Christ was baptized to humble himself before the Father. This is an ideal token of humility. Somebody who is proud in heart, he thinks, “Why should I go to the Mormon elders and be baptized and go through this ritual which is in a sense, from a worldly standpoint, the basics.” Here is the Son of God who does precisely that. “. . . and witnesseth unto the Father that he would be obedient unto him in keeping his commandments.” (2 Nephi 31:7.) So Christ makes a covenant of obedience in the waters of baptism. This is precisely what we do, and you are acquainted with the covenant of baptism; its terms is found in the 18th chapter of Mosiah. “wherefore, after he was baptized with water the Holy Ghost descended upon him *in the form* of a dove.” (2 Nephi 31:8.) We are going to have to do a little analyzing about what is involved in the descent

of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus, but what we want to have before us is these phrases which we will read. We want to know what that phrase meant; we will come back to it.

“And again, it showeth unto the children of men that straitness of the path, and the narrowness of the gate, by which they should enter, he having set the example before them.” (2 Nephi 31:9.) In some respects it is the other doctrine that is so well taught elsewhere, in some respects this third reason why Jesus was baptized dramatizes more than any other thing the importance of baptism. What does that verse mean to us? “It showeth unto the children of men the straitness of the path, and the narrowness of the gate, by which they should enter.” So from that standpoint, *why* was Jesus baptized?

Comment: To show us the way to get to the Celestial Kingdom?

BRM: The only way to get there. Here is the King of the Kingdom. Here is the man who made, in effect, with his father’s power, salvation and exaltation and glory in the celestial world and everything else, and he has to be baptized in order to gain celestial salvation. You are aware of the Prophet’s statement that says a man maybe saved after the judgment in a terrestrial kingdom or in a telestial kingdom, but he can never achieve the celestial kingdom of God except he be born of water and of the spirit. Now, baptism applies only to the Celestial Kingdom—no application to any other world. The Celestial Kingdom is the Kingdom of God in eternity, like the Church is the Kingdom of God on earth, and here is the King of the Kingdom, the Chief Man, the Lord God Omnipotent, as he began to be considered in our beginning discussion, and he cannot be saved without baptism.

Well, that singles him out; how important it is. “And he said unto the children of men: Follow thou me. Wherefore, my beloved brethren, can we follow Jesus save we shall be willing to keep the commandments of the Father?” (2 Nephi 31:10.) This is about as good an illustration as any we have, of this principle that Christ is the prototype. He came to be the prototype of every righteous thing and every course that a man should pursue, and to set an example. “Follow thou me.” Everything in his ministry that he ever did, and every act that he pursued, every course that he pursued, is what we can do and is the course we should pursue, excepting only the Atoning sacrifice which he . . . (inaudible) . . . because he was the Son of God and here is the ideal, initial illustration of that: his baptism.

Well, there are four reasons why Jesus was baptized. Now, there are two other reasons why men are baptized which are in addition to those. We can be baptized for every one of those reasons. But there are a couple of more reasons where we are concerned, and one of them would be that we are baptized for a remission of sins, and we are baptized for admission to the Church. To get into the Kingdom of God on earth. Well, these two raise an interesting point, that have been in the course of our history and also other dispensations, instances of what we would call “re-baptism,” people being baptized more than once. The reasons primarily centered around these two things right here. Joseph Smith was baptized on the 15th day of May in 1829, *for the remission of sins*. Joseph Smith was baptized on the 6th day of April in 1830 *for admission to the Church*. It had to be that way because there was no Church when he first was baptized. If there had been a

Church on the first date he was baptized, one baptism would have taken care of both of them.

Comment: What about all the times when the Brethren were redone here?

BRM: I do not know. The Brethren did a lot of rebaptism when they got to the Salt Lake Valley and one reason for it would have been that they lost the records. If any of you people would have your records lost so that you could not establish legally, according to the laws of the Church, that you had been baptized, you would have to be baptized again.

Comment: But I cannot ever remember them ever saying they did this because they lost the records. They do not ever refer to this. We assume this.

BRM: Well, do not try to confuse me now, by this. There really was another reason, but it is not a very good reason, that is our problem. They were baptized over again when they got out here to the Valley because they had a great feeling of relief from getting out of the domination of their enemies, and they wanted to . . . (inaudible) . . . they had to bring out according to the desire to thank the Lord for His blessings, and to re-covenant that they would keep the commandments and live right from now on. Now, they had lost the records in many instances and they had to do it for that reason, but they also wanted to get a great upsurge in starting out afresh. Now, I say that is not too good a reason, really they could have gone to a sacrament meeting and partaken of the sacrament and renewed the covenant made in the waters of baptism and had the same great outpouring, although it would not have been quite as dramatic, and the fact that they again went through the ordinance of baptism when they got out here, probably dramatized to them more strongly than the partaking of the sacrament, which would have had the same effect—the fact they were going to start out anew. That is sort of a special case. I suppose they did the right thing in it. The Book of Mormon has this episode. The people were baptizing and being baptized before Jesus came, and then when Jesus came they baptized these people all over again. Why? Because when Jesus came, though they had been baptized for the remission of sins and in a sense belonged to the Church already, yet He was ushering in a new dispensation; it was a whole new dispensation of things. So he was starting them out afresh with a great new spiritual endowment. Yes?

Comment: I was wondering, what about baptism . . . (inaudible)?

BRM: That is this. That is why we say this. While we are talking about this now, maybe I ought to say this. Baptism is for the remission of sins. When we say that, unless we are thinking right, we do not know what we are saying. Baptism is for the remission of sins provided it is of the water and the Spirit. Now, the remission of sins comes from the Spirit and not from immersion in the water. That is just a symbolism since you are going to be forgiven. The actual remission comes in what we call “the baptism of fire,” which means that the Holy Ghost burns sin out, as though by fire. So you become clean. The remission of sins—baptism is a two-part[er] and it comes in the second part, the part that involves the sealing; the gift of the Holy Ghost, although the symbolism is involved.

Comment: I was going to ask you . . . (inaudible)?

BRM: I do not think so. I thought the same way you are directed this morning. But our problem with Jesus is, that he is in a category by himself and he had the Holy Ghost before baptism, like John the Baptist. He had the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb and his Father in spirit, always, and the reason for that would be this: He never died spiritually. You see, people die spiritually when they become accountable for their sins because they begin to commit sins. But Jesus never committed sin so He never died spiritually and did not have to be baptized to be born again, although everybody else had to be baptized to be born again so that they could become new creatures of the Holy Ghost.

Comment: The point of the dove though, is the symbol of the Holy Ghost. Does this not teach the Nephites, you might say, here that when the form of the dove came to Christ, because the Holy Ghost did tie in with it?

BRM: Yes, that is correct. We will come back in just a minute to the manifestation of this.

Comment: (Inaudible) . . . Brigham Young made reference to them benefiting as far as health. You say that you have sometimes . . . (inaudible).

BRM: Well, I say a lot of things. When they started out baptism for the dead, they baptized men for women, women for men, until they learned better. When they started out they baptized them in the Missouri River. The Lord let them for a little while and then He stopped them. When the . . . (inaudible) . . . started out working in the Nauvoo Temple one day, the minutes of the First Council say that after they got through they sent out for a jug of wine and brought it into the temple and drank wine and danced before the Lord for the rest of the night. Well, now what this says is . . . (inaudible) . . . that we started out easy in this dispensation, that . . . (inaudible) . . . some minor standards. We do not have . . . (inaudible) . . . and they did a lot of things in the formative beginning days, and the Lord just gradually, more and more, got the Church lined up where it should be. Today we would *never* go through a rebaptism ordinance like they did. But for their situation it was all right. Today, the covenant that you make in baptism we have made by doing what is in Section 20, which is the sacramental prayer. It would be precisely the same thing. You go degree by degree, and hopefully one hundred years from now, the Church will be more advanced on standards of righteousness than they are now.

Well, let us not take too much time on this phase, although this is a great doctrinal teaching. There is a great wealth of information to learn as a result of the baptism of Jesus. Now, having had that before us, and having had it pointed out that Christ is the prototype, and note particularly that Christ *cannot* go to the Celestial Kingdom of God unless he is baptized, just knowing that categorically and positively, let me ask another question. Here are the degrees of glory. Telesstial, terrestrial, and celestial. Baptism is the gate to the Celestial Kingdom. It does not guarantee you get there; you are all aware of

this . . . (inaudible) . . . The 31st chapter of 2 Nephi says that “the gate by which ye should enter is repentance and baptism” (2 Nephi 31:17), and that you are then on the strait and narrow path which *leads to* eternal life, so you find the path after baptism, and here is the Celestial Heaven at the end.

Well, Christ could *not* go to the Celestial Kingdom unless he was baptized. And now, our revelation says this:

In the celestial glory *there are three heavens* or degrees;

And in order to obtain the highest, a man must enter into this order of the Priesthood [meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage];

And if he does not, he cannot obtain it.

He may enter into the other, but that is the end of his kingdom; . . . (D&C 131:1-4; emphasis added.)

It is just an absolute, sure, infallible proposition that Christ could not be saved in the Celestial Kingdom without baptism. What kind of an inference could you raise about Christ going to the highest heaven . . . (inaudible)?

Comment: He was married.

BRM: (Inaudible) . . . of the Celestial world? You cannot escape the obvious inference that he had to be married to be exalted, in the same sense that he had to be baptized to have celestial salvation. Here is one of the interesting things. We do not talk about this (except we do, a little). We do not talk about it hopefully when we ought not to talk about it. The early—this is one of our problems—the early Brethren preached a sermon and they were talking to Latter-day Saints, and the sermons got recorded and they were published for Latter-day Saints, but obviously fell into the hands of people who were not Latter-day Saints, and so when you read this . . . (inaudible) . . . Orson Hyde and Orson Pratt and Jedediah Grant and so on and so on, said in their sermons that Jesus was married, that is fine for this class here. But that is blasphemy for the sectarian world and so they quote it; they have no background for it, and it has caused us just a lot of trouble. Now, the real, honest, fact of the matter is, there is not any question at all but what Jesus was married and what they were doing here is just preaching and giving an illustration.

Now, let me read you this quotation. It is on page 308-309 of the *Teachings of the Prophet [Joseph Smith]*, and Joseph Smith says this: “*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*” (*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 308; emphasis added). If that does not say it in verbatim words, but if you understand what the Prophet is really saying here, included in it is the fact that Jesus was married. Here is another sentence from it: “All

men who become heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ will have to receive the fulness of the ordinances of his kingdom; and those who will not receive all the ordinances will come short of the fullness of that glory, if they do not lose the whole” (*Teachings*, p. 309).

You cannot be saved without baptism and you cannot be exalted without marriage; you cannot get the fulness of the blessings of the Priesthood (which is what this means when it says “the fullness of the Priesthood”); you cannot get the fulness of the blessings of the Priesthood unless you do what Jesus Christ did himself when *he* obtained the fulness of the blessings of the Priesthood. Our problem on this is just that the sectarian world, in the error of apostasy, have built up these complex ideas about Christ; lots of them nonsensical and some of them based on a thread of truth, of course, but the obvious fact is that if Jesus had not been married it would have been a terrible, terrible thing in the social culture in which he lived. Because it is not like it is now, back then it was just mandatory that somebody enter into the marriage union; there were not bachelors and unclaimed jewels among women. Everybody got married in that day. So if they had—they still had plural marriage down to the time of the meridian of times.

Well, that is not in the New Testament; that is not in our text, but works out of consideration . . . (inaudible).

Comment: One problem is that there is really disregarded—that is, the purpose of marriage is the getting of children, and if he did have children, which would have been an obvious thing from this, would they also have part of his divinity?

BRM: No. Obviously they would not. Obviously there would be some provision that His children always would carry forth with what ought to be carried forth. Well, since we are quoting the Brethren, let us just say a little more. It is not a bit uncommon. They had meetings and the Brethren got up and spoke in the name of the Lord and said, “There are present in this congregation people who are the descendants of Christ.” Well sure. I know a man to whom a patriarch told this—not meaning adopted into the family of Christ. Now, George Q. Cannon was one of these to say it out, as I remember, and he was a literal descendant of Christ. Well, I know of some others who are and the fact of the matter is, if you want to have a real interesting experience of scriptural analysis, just take what Isaiah says about the stem of Jesse and those related things and then you take the revelations in Section 113 which the Lord gave interpreting the rod of Jesse and the stem of Jesse and you figure out what he is saying. Now, if you are just about as smart as you ought to be, you will come up with the right answer and you will know who those things are talking about, and who the ancestor is of the person that it is talking about. It is talking about this same subject that we are talking about here. But it is not in the revelation in plainness; of *course* it is not, and the reason is the same reason that the New Testament does not contain the account of Jesus’ intimate, personal affairs. Now, we had a lesson on John the Baptist here. Was John the Baptist married? There is no indication in the New Testament whether he was or whether he was not, but of *course* he was married. Nobody gets to be 30 years of age or 33 . . . (inaudible) . . . who was married, unless he died, John left a widow and . . . (inaudible). Undoubtedly John left children. It would not

have been . . . (inaudible) . . . but the overwhelming probability is that he had children. Now, we cannot prove it and do not quote me; I deny having said it. But obviously these things are the facts, and if we can grow in spiritual understanding, pretty soon this sort of thing just fits naturally into our belief and our understanding.

Well, here now, we have got to go on; we will cover this. But we talked about the baptism of Jesus and we are still talking about it. Let us talk about the baptism of the spirit in this connection, and in our text on page 122 now, let us pick up the Inspired Version account and see what the Prophet did to what we just read.

But John refused him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and why comest thou to me?

And Jesus, answering, said unto him, Suffer me to be baptized of thee, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him.

And John went down into the water and baptized him. (Interesting addition.)

And Jesus when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and John saw (this is clarifying) and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon Jesus.

And lo, he heard a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye him. (Inspired Version, Matthew 3:42-46.)

Now, that Book of Mormon account says, “in the form of a dove.” Was it yesterday? It was two days ago we were reading . . . (inaudible) . . . the 11th chapter of 1 Nephi about the condescension of God and the . . . (inaudible) . . . condescension of Christ. That verbatim language is along about the 28th verse of the 11th chapter of 1 Nephi, that the Holy Ghost is descended upon Christ *in the form* of a dove. What this account says in Matthew is *like* a dove. And those two things do not obviously mean the same thing. The form of a dove is one thing, but like a dove is another thing. But another thing here, and it is in Luke, the 22nd verse, on page 123: “And the Holy Ghost descended *in a bodily shape* like a dove . . .” (Luke 3:22). Now, it will show you what these comparative accounts do. *In* a bodily shape. *Like* a dove. I do not have much doubt but what there is a little—obvious justification for the sectarians maybe to think the Holy Ghost has the form of a dove. Somebody without inspiration could read that phrase, “in a bodily shape. Like a dove” and think that when the Holy Ghost came down, he was a dove. And then he could try to investigate the gospel and he could jump to the conclusion that the Mormons are crazy, saying “The Holy Ghost came in the form of a dove, you see this just conforms to the context I have always had that the Holy Ghost came in the form of a dove.” Well, you get to . . . (inaudible). I surely wish that we knew what happened at the baptism of Jesus. The real fact of the matter is, we do not know, and all we know is just a limited amount of these events that transpired. This, unfortunately, is the way the . . . (inaudible) .

. . . is. We know a limited portion of the conversation that Jesus had. So sometimes in order to understand it, we have got to get the information to supplement. We are all acquainted, of course, with the Prophet's explanations (and they are quoted in the text) about the words "sign of a dove." He in essence, and in effect, assures us that the phrase "form of a dove" being correctly translated means, "sign of a dove." Or being correctly interpreted means, "sign of a dove." This expression, perhaps it was idiomatic; I do not know. We get idiomatic expressions, they do not always literally mean what the word is saying. The reason I say it must have been idiomatic because it is in the Book of Mormon and the Book of Mormon is correctly translated. It was a . . . (inaudible) . . . perhaps. But in any event, this was--this phrase, "form of a dove," means "sign of a dove," and the Prophet says this sign was given at the baptism and that the devil cannot come in the sign of a dove; he cannot duplicate this sign.

Well, the Holy Ghost is a personage of spirit, as we are aware. That is the verbatim language . . . (inaudible) . . . Which means that the Holy Ghost is a spirit man. Now, what would have happened would have been this: John the Baptist saw the Holy Ghost, and he saw the Holy Ghost descend in a bodily shape, meaning a spirit man came down. This is capable of two interpretations. You could interpret that phrase as literally meaning the foster shape of a dove, or the way I am interpreting it. Nobody in the sectarian world will start out to interpret like I am, because they do not know that the Holy Ghost has the bodily shape of a man. But if they knew that, then they would divide into two camps and one camp would say, "Well, this means the bodily shape of the Holy Ghost" and another camp would say, "Oh it means the bodily shape of a dove." But you and I know the Holy Ghost has the bodily shape of a man, and with that knowledge we are then in a position to interpret what that phrase means. So what happened was this: the Holy Ghost came down *in a bodily shape as a man*, and his descent was peaceable and calm and serene and comforting or, in other words, like a dove. A figure of speech.

That is one thing that all of these things mean. There is another thing that I speculate that they mean, and this is why I say I wish we had the full knowledge and understanding. This idea is not original with me; I got it from President Smith. He said one day that he believes that if we had the full knowledge and full account of this, we would know that the Lord in literal reality sent a dove to be a sign that the thing that was baptized, did take place. What he said was "a resurrected dove from some other world." Well, he does not know and I do not know; that is his speculation and it is interesting. But in any event, something more transpired than we are aware of, although if we take it a little deeply and line up the phrases, we can do what you always have to do when you interpret scripture. You always have to make some arrangement to interpret every scripture as being in harmony with every other scripture. So you get this phrase, "in a bodily shape like a dove" and you say, "Well, that could mean a dove or it could be a man who came down peaceably like a dove." Since you all ready know from another source that the Holy Ghost is a man, a personage of spirit, you interpret the scriptures in harmony with themselves and you end up with the kind of conclusion that we have reached here.

Well, any question now about this?

Comment: Well, if the dove came from a resurrected world—it would have to be a resurrected world if Jesus . . . (inaudible) . . . be resurrected.

BRM: I think that you will find an answer to that in the sermons of the Prophet along towards the end of the *Teachings of the Prophet [Joseph Smith]*, where he is talking about the resurrection of animals from an infinite number of worlds, and he asks the question, as I recall, that you asked and he answers it by saying these things were done in anticipation of the coming of the atoning sacrifice. Either he says it in that connection or else he says it in connection with the forgiveness of sins of people before the Atonement was wrought; I am a little hazy—one or the other. But the point is that it is made in anticipation, knowing that the Atonement will take place.

Comment: That would be animals, not people, would it? I mean, it would not have been people . . . (inaudible)?

BRM: I think there would have been people resurrected . . . (inaudible).

Comment: Then why did he say the descendants . . . (inaudible)?

BRM: Of this earth.

Comment: Oh, okay.

BRM: Now, listen . . . (inaudible) . . . or something I . . . (inaudible). There are so many difficult philosophical things about the Atonement that it is just totally impossible for us to know and to . . . we can think of more questions than answers, and our problem is that we know . . . (inaudible) . . . truth about it and then we begin to wonder and you just cannot do better and say . . . (inaudible) . . . you know.

Comment: In Talmage it says . . . (inaudible) . . . John the Baptist that Jesus was the Christ

BRM: Correct. This is someplace . it is in the book of John; it is in the gospel of John; I do not know what page it is on here . . .

Comment: [Page] 134.

BRM: But in essence, John says that he that sent him to baptize told him that . . . (inaudible) . . . he did not know who Christ was, but he assented to do this hoping that on him the Holy Ghost was ambiguity of a man that I am talking about. So then, John had some spiritual experiences.

Comment: But John recognized Christ when he walked up to him before he had even baptized him. It seems to me that this scripture was given, this would be proof to John that he would know Christ and his baptism. (Inaudible.)

BRM: No . . . (inaudible) . . . we better take that one out. I am a little hazy on this, but we had better take out a little synopsis there. John knew Christ after he was baptized. All these statements about, “Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world” were made subsequent to his baptism.

Comment: He said “I need to be baptized of thee.”

BRM: Yes, that is right.

Comment: (Inaudible.)

BRM: He refused; he knew who he was. I guess that is right. I guess you are right on that.

Comment: They were relatives.

BRM: They were cousins.

Comment: Well, the first chapter of John makes it quite clear that John the Baptist did not know the identity of the Christ until the descent of the Spirit, and that was the sign of the Christ.

BRM: He did not know it until the occasion of the baptism. Now, they have stumped me a little bit here. He does say he knows Him before he actually immerses Him into the water. But at least he did not know who he was until the occasion of this baptism. I do not think we are in error in that conclusion.

Comment: I think that John knew who Jesus was, but he did not know that He was the Son of God, and the reason he refused to baptize him is that he recognized that He was a righteous man, probably more righteous than he, but that does not necessarily mean that he did not know . . . (inaudible) . . . that he knew He was the Son of God.

BRM: This may be, but this is one of the reasons that I wish we had more information about this than we do. What we are doing here now is what we have done to Adam [inaudible] investigation that we have said. There is one more thing to summarize much of what we have mentioned today. Page 125. Here is a context that would be new to us because of the Inspired Version. Open to page 125 and look at the Inspired Version account. You are already familiar with what King James says, but note it as we got down this Inspired Version account.

Then Jesus was led up of the Spirit, into the wilderness, to be with God. (There is a mistake in my book here; those words “with God” should be bold faced. That is a change over the King James version. He went into the wilderness to *be with God*. Now, this is new.)

And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, and had communed with God, he was afterwards an hungered, and was left to be tempted of the devil. (Inspired Version, Matthew 4:1-2; emphasis added.)

In this connection, someday some of you budding, bright scholars ought to write a book that shows how Moses was the prototype of Christ. B. H. Roberts did this once upon a time, but . . . (inaudible) . . . amplified . . . (inaudible) . . . might have been done and his book never caught on, and was . . . (inaudible). But it is a wonderful subject to show how Moses is the prototype of Christ, and here is precisely what is involved: Moses fasted 40 days. He went and talked with the Lord, and after he got through with his interview, then the devil came to Moses. This is just one of scores and scores of things in Moses' life that is exactly parallel of what happened in Jesus' life, and forecast what went here. So here we have the devil coming *after* He has communed with God. Now, the next verse: "Then Jesus was taken up into the holy city, *and the Spirit* setteth him on the pinnacle of the temple" (Inspired Version, Matthew 4:3). The King James version says the devil did it. I have read the King James version as much as anybody did, and it never got through to me that just would not be so; it just did not register until I got into the Inspired Version and I wondered what was the matter with me all along, to be everlastingly reading the King James version and to not catch on that the devil was not ordering Christ around! Just a little simple thing like this. The whole thought is reversed here. "The *Spirit* setteth him on the pinnacle of the temple."

Then the devil came unto him and said, If thou be the Son of God, (do this) . . .

And again, Jesus was in the Spirit, and it taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain . . . (and here again is what we were reading yesterday about Mary being caught away in the Spirit).

And the devil came unto him again, and said . . . (Inspired Version, Matthew 4:6, 8-9.)

Well, that is a new concept of what is involved in the temptation of Jesus. The Spirit did what was involved and He communed with the Lord, and then the devil came to him.

Just one word about the nature of the temptations of Jesus. Mosiah, the first chapter. This is the sermon in the beginning that was preached by King Benjamin . . . (inaudible) . . . precise verbatim . . . (inaudible) . . . how was Jesus tempted? Well, he was tempted like we are tempted. Paul says he was in all forms tempted like as we are. Yet with being without sin, he became the author of eternal salvation. He became such by adopting the Father's plan for us. He is talking about Jesus and He is the Son of God. He had to sleep, he had to eat, he got thirsty, he got hungry; I would not know if he ever got sick; I have often wondered about that. Perhaps the Lord would let disease afflict his body like anyone else given to spirits in mortality; I hope that someday we will know. He was tempted like other men are tempted. He was subject to all of the ills, I guess, and difficulties of the flesh. Well, when you talk along this line, you are showing that there is applied to him that he as a prototype still stands out as someone that we can follow. He was in all points tempted like as we are.

Well, we are not apt to find these things without opening avenues of investigation . . .
(inaudible).