

THE HOLY PRIESTHOOD, THE HOLY GHOST, AND THE HOLY COMMUNITY

Benjamin Keogh

In response to the question “How can a spirit be a member of the godhead?” Joseph Fielding Smith wrote, “we should have no time to enter into speculation in relation to the Holy Ghost,” suggesting that we “leave a matter which in no way concerns us alone.”¹ Perhaps because of this, the Holy Ghost has become one of the “most taboo and hence least studied”² subjects in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Nevertheless, here I will explore the Holy Ghost’s purview, in its particular relation to priesthood. It may prove most useful to begin

A version of this essay was given at the 2015 Summer Seminar on Mormon Culture. I would like to express thanks to Terryl and Fiona Givens and my fellow seminarians for their input and assistance.

1. Joseph Fielding Smith, “How Can a Spirit be a Member of the Godhead?,” in *Answers to Gospel Questions*, vol. 2 (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1958), 145. Read in context, this suggestion to “leave the matter alone” may have more to do with speculation as to the Holy Ghost’s origin and destiny.

2. Vern G. Swanson, “The Development of the Concept of a Holy Ghost in Mormon Thought,” in *Line Upon Line: Essays on Mormon Doctrine*, edited by Gary James Bergera (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 89–101. Indeed, it appears that the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University holds only six LDS books on the subject: Oscar W. McConkie, *The Holy Ghost* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1944); Joseph Fielding McConkie and Robert L. Millet, *The Holy Ghost* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1989); Mary Margaret Muller, *The Holy Ghost: The Third Member of the Godhead* (Bountiful, Utah: Horizon Publishers, 2001); John D. Whetten, comp., *Living by the Spirit* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1980); Duane S. Crowther, *Gifts of the Spirit* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965); N. B. Lundwall, comp., *Discourses on the Holy Ghost* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1959).

the conversation with four statements from Joseph Smith that directly relate, unify, or explicitly link “the Holy Priesthood & the Holy Ghost.”³

First, Wilford Woodruff records Joseph teaching that power in sermonizing comes from God through “the Holy Priesthood & the Holy Ghost.”⁴ Second, William McIntire reports Joseph saying “there is a prist-Hood (*sic*) with the Holy Ghost & Key.”⁵ Again, Wilford Woodruff’s journal recounts Joseph Smith stating that until Cornelius “received the gift of the Holy Ghost” he could not have performed healing of the sick or casting out of devils, both duties typically associated with the priesthood.⁶ Lastly, in a *Times and Seasons* article, Joseph wrote that the gift of the Holy Ghost was “necessary” both “to make and to organize the priesthood.”⁷

It appears that these oblique references were never expounded upon and we are left to wonder how the priesthood and Holy Ghost work in unity in powerful sermonizing. What does that mean for the un-ordained? Can they not preach powerful sermons? These questions become all the more pronounced when we consider the context that William Patterson McIntire gives to Smith’s comments: “Joseph said we Do not take Notice of things as they Read them—or they might know things as they Read them—he quotes rather 2d Repent & be Baptized &c—& ye Shall Receive the Gift of the Holly Ghost—Now said he (taking up his Cap & presenting to Prd Law) in Giveing you this Gift is not giving myself. However there is a prist-Hood with the Holy Ghost & Key.”⁸ This suggests that after repentance and baptism one receives a gift from the Holy Ghost;

3. Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook, eds., *The Words of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Grandin Book, 1991), 7.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*, 64.

6. *Ibid.*, 108.

7. Joseph Smith, “Gift of the Holy Ghost,” *Times and Seasons*, Jun. 15, 1842, 823.

8. Ehat and Cook, *Words*, 64.

this gift appears to be, at least in this instance, “a prist-Hood” (*sic*), which changes the question entirely: what exactly is the priesthood that is with the Holy Ghost?

Furthermore, one may ask, why can one not heal the sick or cast out devils without the Holy Ghost? What does it mean that priesthood can’t be made without the Holy Ghost? Indeed, what does it mean to “make” priesthood? What is involved in that making and what does the Holy Ghost have to do with it? One may also ask why this conflation entered Joseph’s teaching and where it came from. While this last question may be impossible to answer, locating similar sentiments in other faith traditions, particularly within the religious milieu of Joseph’s time, is not.

There is a clear tradition in both Protestantism and Catholicism of priesthood being transmitted through the Holy Ghost, as well as a sense of a mutually co-existing ministerial priesthood and a “common priesthood of all the faithful.” The Catholic Catechism explains that all faithful communicants participate “each in its own proper way, in the one priesthood of Christ.”⁹ Other traditions indicate that at least the intent of common priesthood may be traced back to ancient Israel, perhaps even to Adam, and into the pre-earth life. It may be that by bringing snapshots of these traditions into focus they may enter into dialogue with current debates within Mormonism, helping to enrich the conversation.

A Snapshot of Protestant and Catholic Positions

In 1822 under the pseudonym Vindex, William Gibbons, a Quaker in Philadelphia, wrote a series of letters addressed to Presbyterians. Letter IV lambasted Presbyterian theological seminaries, declaring their graduates “a tribe of theologians, inspired by the demon of discord . . . corrupt,

9. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* [hereafter CCC] (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1994), n. 1547.

mercenary, and ambitious, in the highest degree.”¹⁰ He denounced their “scheme” as “the cloven foot of priestcraft” shown most fully in their “views . . . on the subject of ordination.”¹¹ Prominent in his critique was the Presbyterian requirement that “no candidate . . . be licensed, unless . . . he shall have studied divinity, at least two years, under some approved divine or professor of theology; and also . . . the presbytery shall require of him—1. A Latin Exegesis . . . 2. A critical exercise. 3. A lecture. 4. A popular sermon.”¹² Gibbons dismissed their calls as “outward and human.”¹³ He declared that “there is but one source from which ministerial power and authority, ever was, is, or can be derived, and that is the Holy Spirit.”¹⁴ For, “it was by and through this holy unction, that all the prophets spake from Moses to Malachi.”¹⁵ Interestingly, Presbyterianism itself cites this “holy unction” as “not only the fact but the origin of our priesthood” claiming to be made “priests by the Great High Priest Himself . . . transmitted through the consecration and seal of the Holy Spirit.”¹⁶

10. William Gibbons, *Truth Advocated in Letters Addressed to the Presbyterians* (Philadelphia: Joseph Rakestraw, 1822), 95.

11. *Ibid.*, 104.

12. *Ibid.*, 103.

13. *Ibid.*, 102.

14. *Ibid.*, 107.

15. *Ibid.*, 85.

16. “Hours with Holy Scripture,” *The Reformed Presbyterian Magazine* (Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter & Company, 1866), 45. Similarly, the Scottish theologian and Kirkman T. F. Torrance describes “the Risen and Ascended Lord” acting “directly through His Spirit ordaining His servant to the ministry . . . in and through the church.” See T. F. Torrance, “Consecration and Ordination,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 11, no. 3 (1958): 225–52. For Stephen V. Sprinkle, the current order of ordination in the Presbyterian Church (USA) is “firm and clear,” that is, “The Holy Spirit is seen to be active in the choice of the minister in the presentation, the ordination, and the assent of the congregation. . . . As a minister in the church, the ordinand is being ordained in the power of the

For Anglicans, the pattern was set by Christ. As William Cooke writes, just as Jesus “was first *anointed* with the Holy Ghost, in private, at his conception, and then publicly at Jordan; *in private*, to give him the office ordained for Him, *publicly*, to proclaim His mission from God; so He first anointed His Apostles in private for their Apostolical Office, and then publicly upon the Day of Pentecost to give them their credentials in the sight of men.”¹⁷ For all, the pattern was biblical: “God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with power” (Acts 10:38), Jesus “breathed on” his apostles and said “receive ye the Holy Ghost” (John 20:22), “as my Father sent me, even so send I you” (John 20:21). Ministerial authority is received from God, through the Holy Ghost. The laying on of hands was introduced instead of breathing because, with Cooke now quoting one of the sixteenth century’s most important theologians, “neither spirit nor spiritual authority may be thought to proceed from us.”¹⁸

Given the apparent need for Protestants to differentiate their authority as separate and distinct from that of Catholicism, while also legitimizing it as from God, it is easy to conceive of these teachings as an exegetical masterstroke. This view is muddled by Catholicism’s use of those same verses in John 20:21–23 as a basis for Apostolic authority and commission, and further through their teachings on ordination.

Spirit as a minister of Jesus Christ,” while “Commitments and prayers beseech the Holy Spirit to *do* something that changes the way the ordinand *is*.” See Stephen V. Sprinkle, *Ordination: Celebrating the Gift of Ministry* (St. Louis, Mo.: Chalice Press, 2004), 69–75.

17. William Cooke, *The Power of the Priesthood in Absolution, and a Few Remarks on Confession* (Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1858), 15.

18. *Ibid.*, 17. See also Benjamin Hanbury, *The Ecclesiastical Polity and Other Works of Richard Hooker*, vol. 2 (London: Holdsworth and Ball, 1830), 377. Torrance described such laying on of hands as “the apostolically appointed sign and instrument used by the Spirit in bestowing the *charisma* for the ministry,” maintaining that “It is Christ, not the Apostles, nor the Church, who bestows upon the ordained minister the Spirit and gifts of the Spirit for the exercise of his office.” See Torrance, “Consecration and Ordination,” 243.

Citing Paul's admonition to Timothy to "neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of hands" (1 Timothy 4:14, Douay-Rheims), it is taught, "a priest lays on hands, but does not ordain." Rather, "grace" is "attached to this external sign and conferred by it. . . . This grace is something permanent" that allows one to "teach and command, to discharge his office rightly. This grace then is . . . a gift of the Holy Spirit for the rightful discharge of official duties."¹⁹ Or, as the thought of one influential Catholic theologian has been summarized, "ordination is a bestowal of the Holy Spirit" empowering the ordained to "execute their mission."²⁰ For Catholics, then, ordination is "a gift of the Holy Spirit that permits the exercise of a 'sacred power' (*sacra potestas*) that can come only from Christ himself through his Church." As such, "the laying on of hands" constitutes "the visible sign of this ordination."²¹

Priesthood Transmission in Mormonism

What might this mean for Mormonism? First, we must ask a fundamental and unaddressed question: How does God actually transmit priesthood? When Mormons lay hands on heads with the intention of conferring priesthood, is power transmitted from those hands to those heads? Does the priesthood authority "make" priesthood within the ordainer? Could he? Can a person give to another person God's power, which is what the priesthood purports to be? Or can that power come only from God? If only from God, how does God transmit it? Does it

19. Hubert Ahaus, "Orders," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 11, edited by Charles George Herbermann, et al. (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), 279.

20. Isaac Kizhakkeparampil, *The Invocation of the Holy Spirit as Constitutive of the Sacraments according to Cardinal Yves Congar* (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1995), 66.

21. CCC, n. 1538.

actually take the Holy Ghost to “make” priesthood? In talking of receiving the “baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost” through the laying on of hands, Orson Pratt remarked, “I do not know why it was that the Lord established this ordinance. He seems to have, in all ages, bestowed blessings upon the children of men through simple ordinances.”²² Perhaps it is analogous to 1 Corinthians 3:6–7, where Paul plants, Apollos waters, and God gives the increase. So then, to paraphrase, neither is he that lays on hands anything, neither he that has hands laid upon him, but it is God that giveth the increase.

Consider this from the book of Moses:

And thus he [Adam] was baptized, and the Spirit of God descended upon him, and . . . he was born of the Spirit, and became quickened in the inner man. And he heard a voice out of heaven, saying: Thou art baptized with fire, and with the Holy Ghost. This is the record of the Father, and the Son, from henceforth and forever; And thou art after the order of him who was without beginning of days or end of years, from all eternity to all eternity. Behold, thou art one in me, a son of God; and thus may all become my sons. (Moses 6:65–68)

First Adam is baptized in water, then the Spirit descends, which baptizes him “with fire and the Holy Ghost,” and a voice from heaven declares priesthood, echoing language from Hebrews 7 and Doctrine and Covenants 107, “thou art after the order of him who was without beginning of days or end of years.”²³ Perhaps this is the way priesthood has always been transmitted: from God to humans through the medium of the Holy Ghost.

22. Orson Pratt, Nov. 2, 1873, *Journal of Discourses*, 16:287.

23. Hebrews 7:3: “Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither *beginning of days*, nor *end of life*; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually”; Doctrine and Covenants 107:3: “Before his day it was called the Holy Priesthood, *after the order of the Son of God*.” See also Joseph Smith Translation, Genesis 14:28: “It being after the order of the Son of God; which order came, not by man, nor the will of man; neither by father nor mother; neither by *beginning of days* nor *end of years*; but of God.”

Echoes of this idea are found elsewhere in Mormon scripture. In the Doctrine and Covenants we read, “that the rights of the priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven” (121:36). Offending those powers results in a withdrawal of the Spirit, “and when it is withdrawn, Amen to the priesthood or the authority of that man” (121:37). That the Spirit’s withdrawal results in the priesthood’s cessation is suggestive of a reciprocal relationship wherein the presence of the Spirit is necessary to activate the efficacy of that priesthood. Such understanding may illuminate Moroni’s meaning in writing that their priests and teachers were ordained “according to the gifts and callings of God . . . by the power of the Holy Ghost” (Moroni 3:4).

A Universal Priesthood of Believers

Returning to the account in Moses, we hear in the declaration of Adam’s sonship echoes of the first and seventeenth chapters of John: “thou art one in me,” declares God to Adam. In his High Priestly Prayer Jesus prays for those who “believe on me . . . That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I thee, that they may be one in us” (John 17:20–21). There is, then, with the declaration of Adam’s sonship, a promise, “thus may all become my sons.” According to Matthew Henry, the “scope and design” of the first chapter of John is to help us “receive” Jesus, “and rely upon him, as our Prophet, Priest, King.”²⁴ To those who do, “gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name” (John 1:12). Marvin R. Vincent, after comparing the different uses of “power” in the New Testament, describes the usage here

24. Matthew Henry, “John 1,” in *Matthew Henry Commentary on the Whole Bible (Complete)* (1706), available at <http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/matthew-henry-complete/john/1.html>.

as “not merely *possibility* or *ability*, but legitimate *right* derived from a competent source.”²⁵

Talk of power and legitimate rights coming to “as many as . . . believe on his name” sounds a wee bit like stereotyped explanations of the Protestant doctrine of the Priesthood of All Believers. One Latter-day Saint scholar has written that Protestants “hold to the concept that all true believers in Christ are automatically authorized to baptize and perform other ordinances and no exceptional authority from God is necessary beyond acceptance of Christ as Savior.” He then labels as “ironic” the Lutheran and Anglican “continued . . . practice of ordaining ministers.”²⁶ While it is true that the doctrine is commonly traced back to Luther, Timothy Wengert has shown that the phrase “priesthood of all believers” occurs nowhere in Luther’s own writings.²⁷ He informs us that the “first serious discussion of the category though not the term itself,” occurred in 1675, almost 130 years after Luther’s death, with Philipp Spener’s plea for “the establishment and diligent practice of the spiritual priesthood.”²⁸ For Wengert, Luther’s elimination of “the distinction between the laity and clergy” is “far more revolutionary”²⁹ than the common view of the priesthood of all believers.

25. Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, vol. 2 (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1889), 49.

26. John A. Tvedtnes, “Is There a ‘Priesthood of All Believers?’,” *Fair Mormon* (blog), <http://www.fairmormon.org/perspectives/publications/is-there-a-priesthood-of-all-believers>.

27. Timothy Wengert, “The Priesthood of All Believers and Other Pious Myths,” *Institute of Liturgical Studies Occasional Papers*, paper 2 (Valparaiso University, 2005), 1, available at http://scholar.valpo.edu/ils_papers/2/. He writes: “armed with the latest technology (the critical Weimar Edition of Luther’s works in digital form online), I set off to do my work. Immediately, I ran into the red queen. There were no references to this phrase anywhere in Luther’s own writings.”

28. *Ibid.*, 2.

29. *Ibid.*, 5.

Wengert walks us through one of Luther's most influential treatises, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Improvement of the Christian Stand*. The German word from which the title gets its English "stand" can also be translated as "estate" or "walk of life" and refers to "groups" that have standing: "in the church itself there were two . . . the worldly (or secular [which included the un-ordained]) and the spiritual (including priests, bishops, and monastics)." Here then, in the title is Luther's first revolution; he "has reduced the Christian *Stand*, or walk of life"³⁰ from two to one. In God's eyes there is "one baptism, one gospel, one faith," all "are equally Christians." For Luther, "all Christians are part of the spiritual walk of life [*Stand*], and among them there is no difference except because of . . . office."³¹ Wengert explains that "to reduce service and office to 'mere' functions, the authority of which is derived from the priesthood of all believers is to miss Luther's point entirely. The fact that he used this word, 'serve,' means that Luther placed at the center of his understanding of offices not '*Herrschaft*' (lordship) but '*Dienerschaft*' (servanthood)." Having an office, therefore, in "the one body of Christ can never be a claim to power"; rather, it is "a powerful claim to weakness, to service."³² The text declares all members to be "of the one body of Christ and individually servants to each other in our respective offices."³³ For Wengert, Luther's insistence that any and all Christians become spiritual through baptism "eliminated the laity as a separate category of Christian." This collapsing of categories, however, left Luther two problems: "what ordination was and what set the public office of ministry apart from other Christian offices."³⁴

30. *Ibid.*, 6–7.

31. *Ibid.*, 9.

32. *Ibid.*, 10.

33. *Ibid.*, 11.

34. *Ibid.*, 13.

He solved these problems by explaining that although we are “all consecrated priests through baptism,” this “does not authorize us to exercise the pastoral office.”³⁵ Wengert asserts that “in Luther’s mind, being *equally* priests through baptism prevents—*prevents*—the very kind of power-grabbing that passes for congregational autonomy or lay authority in churches today. . . . For what is held in common no one may take for themselves without the community’s permission and entrustment.” Therefore, “neither the community nor the officeholder possesses the authority of the office indelibly. Instead, the authority of the office rests in the office itself and in the word of God that created the office and for which Christ established the office.”³⁶ There is “a single walk of life but many offices,” with the point of each office being “always and only service: whether making shoes, keeping order, or administering God’s Word and sacraments.” For Luther, then, the spiritual life was the priestly life, and the priestly life, the community life where “each with his office or work ought to . . . support body and soul, just as the members of the body all serve each other.”³⁷

Perhaps in response to more liberal expansions and interpretations of Luther’s thought, *The Catholic Encyclopedia* of 1913 declared, “it is true that every Christian receives sanctifying grace which confers on him a priesthood.” Citing 1 Peter 2:9, it tells us “all Christians are a ‘kingly priesthood’” and then explains that “now as then the special and sacramental priesthood strengthens and perfects the universal priesthood.”³⁸ The Catechism expands the Encyclopedic entry, explaining that the “very differences which the Lord has willed to put between the members of his body serve its unity and mission,”³⁹ with the “ministerial priesthood . . .

35. *Ibid.*, 16.

36. *Ibid.*, 16–17.

37. *Ibid.*, 18.

38. Ahaus, “Orders,” 279.

39. CCC, n. 873.

at the service of the common priesthood.”⁴⁰ This common priesthood comprises “the laity . . . who by Baptism are incorporated into Christ”⁴¹ and are thereby “anointed by the Holy Spirit” to “consecrate the world itself to God . . . by the holiness of their lives.”⁴²

To summarize, for both Luther and Catholics the priestly life of the community begins with baptism, and the accompanying reception of the Holy Spirit. The presence of both an ordained ministerial priesthood and a universal priesthood does not present a false dichotomy, rather they work together in the one priesthood of Christ; the universal sustaining the ministerial, the ministerial perfecting the universal.

What might this have to do with Mormonism? To begin to answer, let us briefly return to Luther and then look at Saint Cyril of Jerusalem. According to Paul Althaus, Luther’s conception of baptized priests was the “exact opposite” of the “religious individualism” the traditional Protestant understanding conveys; rather it expresses the “reality of the congregation as a community.” In this conception, the “priesthood of Christians flows from the priesthood of Christ . . . through baptism and the anointing with the Holy Spirit”⁴³ and “the Christian’s priestly sacrifice is nothing else than Christ’s own sacrifice.”⁴⁴ The priest’s work then includes, (1) mutually bearing burdens, (2) interceding with God and praying for others, (3) proclaiming the word one to another, (4) standing before God, and (5) sacrificing themselves to God.⁴⁵ In this way, they emulate Christ by performing, on a smaller scale, his priestly work.

In light of this, consider these words from the Book of Mormon:

40. CCC, n. 1547.

41. CCC, n. 897.

42. CCC, n. 901.

43. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 314.

44. *Ibid.*, 315.

45. *Ibid.*, 313–14.

And it came to pass that he [Alma] said unto them: Behold, here are the waters of Mormon . . . and . . . as ye are desirous to come into the fold of God, and to be called his people, and are willing to [1] bear one another's burdens, that they may be light; Yea, and are willing to [2] mourn with those that mourn . . . and [3] comfort those that stand in need of comfort, and to [4] stand as witnesses of God at all times and in all things, and in all places that ye may be in, even until death, that ye may be redeemed of God. . . . Now I say unto you, if this be the desire of your hearts, what have you against being baptized in the name of the Lord, as a witness before him that ye have entered into a covenant with him, that ye will [5] serve him and keep his commandments, that he may pour out his Spirit more abundantly upon you? (Mosiah 18:8–10)

Thus Alma's people emulate Christ by performing, on a smaller scale, his priestly work. In this way the community exists through sacrifice, which sacrifice, as Althaus describes the theology of Luther, "is an offering with and in Christ in that one sacrifice which took place once but is yet everywhere present, which cannot be repeated but lives on in the reality of the community."⁴⁶

A Theology of Becoming

Participating with Christ in his work is also the main theme of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem's twenty-first Catechetical Lecture, the third of five given to converts after baptism. Quoting Acts 10:38, initiates are told "Christ was not anointed by men . . . but the Father . . . anointed Him with the Holy Ghost."⁴⁷ Because of this, Christian converts were, after being baptized, "given an Unction, the anti-type of that wherewith Christ was anointed; and this is the Holy Ghost."⁴⁸ This unction involved being anointed with "holy ointment" considered "Christ's gift of grace and

46. *Ibid.*, 315.

47. Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, "Catechetical Lecture 21," 2, available at <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/310121.htm>.

48. *Ibid.*, 1.

by the advent of the Holy Ghost, [he or she] is made fit to impart His Divine Nature.”⁴⁹ After being anointed on the forehead, ears, nostrils, and breast, initiates were told that “as Christ after his Baptism, and the visitation of the Holy Ghost, went forth and vanquished the adversary, so likewise ye, after Holy Baptism and the Mystical Chrism, having put on the whole armour of the Holy Ghost, are to stand against the power of the adversary, and vanquish it.”⁵⁰ They were now not only “worthy” of being “called Christians” but having “become partakers of Christ” were “properly called Christs” through “receiving . . . the Holy Ghost.”⁵¹

That the reception of the Holy Ghost makes one a type of Christ is also evidenced in the seventh chapter of John. This chapter is set against the backdrop of the feast of tabernacles, the “third of the great Jewish festivals . . . originally last[ing] seven days. . . . In the liturgy it became known as the ‘season of our joy,’” while Josephus calls it the “most holy and important feast.”⁵² According to Raymond Brown, the feast was associated with “the triumphant ‘day of the Lord’” wherein “Yahweh pours out a spirit of compassion and supplication on Jerusalem. . . . He opens a fountain for the House of David to cleanse Jerusalem . . . living waters flow out from Jerusalem” healing the Dead Sea. “In this ideal feast of the tabernacles,” Brown writes, “everything in Jerusalem is holy.”⁵³ On each of the seven mornings the high priest leads a procession from the pool of Siloam to the temple. Another priest fills and carries a golden pitcher of water for pouring into a silver basin, connected to the base of altar, at the time of the morning sacrifice. Of the accompanying proces-

49. *Ibid.*, 3.

50. *Ibid.*, 4.

51. *Ibid.*, 1.

52. Joseph Jacobs and H. G. Friedmann, “Tabernacle, Feast of,” *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1906), available at <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/14185-tabernacles-feast-of>.

53. Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (I–XII)*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 29 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), 326.

sion, some drink from the pool, others chant words from Isaiah, “ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, with joy . . . draw water out of the wells of salvation” (see Isaiah 55:1 and 12:3). According to the Mishnah, “Anyone who has never seen the rejoicing at the place of [water] drawing, has never seen rejoicing in all his days.”⁵⁴

It was against this backdrop that Jesus stood and declared himself the Living Water: “If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink” (John 7:37). To this astounding claim he added another, “He that believeth on me . . . out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water,” and John adds, “this he spake of the Spirit, which that they believe on him should receive” (7:38–39). In partaking of the water, one becomes the water. Jesus himself was the fountain, poured out and running over to cleanse Jerusalem. Those that believe on him, then, are Jerusalem, with living waters flowing from them to heal the world’s Dead Sea. In very deed those who are “incorporated into Christ”⁵⁵ and “anointed by the Holy Spirit” are to “consecrate the world itself to God . . . by the holiness of their lives.”⁵⁶

A similar motif—of the partaker becoming the thing partaken of—is also found in the Book of Mormon. Father Lehi has a dream, in which after travelling through a dark and dreary wasteland and praying for mercy he comes to a large field containing a tree “whose fruit was desirable to make one happy.” As he partakes of the fruit he finds it “most sweet, above all that [he had] ever before tasted” and that “it filled his soul with exceedingly joy” (1 Nephi 8:7–12). His son Nephi also beheld the tree declaring it “the most desirable above all;” his Spirit guide, unsatisfied with that description adds, “and the most joyous to the soul” (1 Nephi 11:22–23). It is revealed to Nephi that the tree and its fruit represent

54. Mishnah Sukkah 5:1, *Sefaria: A Living Library of Jewish Texts*, available at http://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Sukkah.5?lang=en&layout=lines&sidebarLang=all.

55. CCC, n. 897.

56. *Ibid.*, n. 901.

the love of God in the gift of his Son. In the thirty-second chapter of Alma, after discussing the process of cultivating belief in Jesus, Alma describes again the tree and its fruit as “most precious . . . sweet above all that is sweet . . . and pure above all that is pure” and proclaims that feasting thereon will leave you “filled, that ye hunger not, neither shall ye thirst” (Alma 32:42). Alma then teaches redemption through Christ and encourages his hearers to “plant this word in your hearts, and . . . nourish it with your faith” (Alma 33:23), to believe on him. For those that do, Alma said, the word becomes in them “a tree springing up . . . unto everlasting life” (33:23). In partaking of the tree one becomes the tree. After partaking, Lehi’s immediate desire was that others should partake also, and he became an instrument of their doing so. We cannot receive life, it would seem, whether from the Living Tree or the Living Water, without becoming a source of that life for others. Indeed, as Saint Cyril instructed his initiates, Christians having “become partakers of Christ” were “properly called Christs.”⁵⁷

A Community of Believers

As evidenced by its invocation in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*,⁵⁸ Peter’s injunction that Christians “are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people” (1 Peter 2:9) is often employed as the basis for a universal priesthood of believers. Constable declares, “every individual Christian is a priest before God,”⁵⁹ and Mason states that, “every member of [God’s organized empire] is a priest,”⁶⁰ while Poole

57. Saint Cyril, “Catechetical Lecture 21,” 1.

58. Ahaus, “Orders,” 279: “thus under the New, all Christians are ‘a kingly priesthood’ (1 Peter 2:9).”

59. Thomas L. Constable, “Notes on 1 Peter, 2016 Edition,” *Expository Notes*, available at <http://www.sonlight.com/constable/notes/pdf/1peter.pdf>.

60. A. J. Mason, “1 Peter,” *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers*, edited by Charles John Ellicott (London: Cassell and Company, 1987), 403.

describes believers as “all of them priests.”⁶¹ For John Elliott, however, this is a misreading. In his exegetical examination of 1 Peter 2:4–10, he concludes that these verses were “intended as an explication . . . primarily of election” describing “the original Petrine conception of the believing community.”⁶² Or, as stated more bluntly elsewhere, “Election rather than priesthood is its central focus.”⁶³ Quoting Krister Stendahl, Elliott affirms that “Election in Christ not only constitutes a new society; its meaning is to be found in the new society and not in the status of individuals.”⁶⁴ As such, terms like “royal priesthood” and “holy nation” are applicable in this instance “only to a *people*, a *community* and not to individuals.”⁶⁵ In this way, Elliott rejects the conventional reading, declaring the “common assumption”⁶⁶ without foundation.

Communities are, nevertheless, made up of individuals; what then of this community’s individuals? For Elliott, those who come to Jesus and are born of the Spirit become “living stones as He is the living stone.”⁶⁷ Just as in partaking of the water, one becomes the water, or in partaking of the tree, one becomes the tree, it would seem that in building upon the stone, one becomes the stone. “You are the body of Christ,” says Paul, “and individually members of it” (1 Corinthians 12:27, NRSV). As in the

61. Matthew Poole, *Commentary on the Holy Bible*, available in part at http://biblehub.com/commentaries/1_peter/2-9.htm.

62. John H. Elliott, *The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4–10 and the Phrase ‘basileion hierateuma’* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 217.

63. John H. Elliott, *1 Peter*, The Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 37B (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 453.

64. Krister Stendahl, “The Called and the Chosen: An Essay on Election,” in *The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology*, edited by Anton Fridrichsen (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), 69; quoted in John H. Elliott, *1 Peter*, 222–23.

65. Elliott, *1 Peter*, 223.

66. *Ibid.*, 220.

67. *Ibid.*, 222.

process of constructing a house, the individual identity of each stone is subsumed by the identity of the house, so in the process of constructing God's spiritual house—this new community—the individual identity of its members is subsumed by the identity of the Christ. In this way “The reality of what this community is . . . and what she does . . . is grounded in the reality” of “Him to Whom this community commits herself.”⁶⁸ Elsewhere this community is described as having “a singular mission,” as having “a special purpose in God's saving plan.” Their election, constitutive of “being set apart for service,” occurs through “the sanctifying power or action of the Holy Spirit,”⁶⁹ and fits them to live lives of holiness. As “God's people,” they are “to be like Christ,”⁷⁰ that is, their service is to be his service. As Jesus “went about doing good” (Acts 10:39), after his anointing with the Holy Ghost, so now must they; as he relieved suffering, so now must they. Assimilation into the spiritual brickwork of God's house, therefore, is not enough: their lives must imitate Christ's.

That the Petrine construction of 1 Peter 2:9 draws explicitly on language from Exodus 19:6 and Isaiah 43:20–21—the two phrases from Exodus sandwiching the passage from Isaiah—is firmly established.⁷¹ The Exodus verse describes Israel as “a kingdom of priests.” Interpretation of the phrase, William Propp notes, falls one of two ways: “elitist” or “egalitarian.” For the elitists “Israel is to be a holy nation ruled by (even holier) priests,” while egalitarians hold to the “extreme sanctity

68. Ibid.

69. Stephen Ayodeji A. Fagbemi, *Who are the Elect in 1 Peter?: A Study in Biblical Exegesis and Its Application to the Anglican Church of Nigeria* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 74.

70. Earl J. Richard, *Reading 1 Peter, Jude, and 2 Peter: A Literary and Theological Commentary*, Reading the New Testament, vol. 12 (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 1984), 85.

71. Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*, edited by Eldon Jay Epp (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 164.

of *all* Israel”—this formulation, he asserts, “most favor.”⁷² In his close reading of this verse and textually related verses, John Davies concludes that the designation refers to “Israel as a whole.”⁷³ For Davies, Israel is “favoured with a ‘covenant,’”⁷⁴ designed to draw them “to the court of the divine king.” As a token of their chosen status Israel is endowed with a “corporate priesthood”⁷⁵ via the “priestly ordination rite” of Exodus 24:1–11, in which “all Israelites participate directly.”⁷⁶ Here, blood is sprinkled on the altar (v. 6), and then on the people (v. 8)—on the altar to represent the people’s giving up their lives to God, on the people, to represent God’s renewal of that life. In this way, Israel was “[transposed] into the kingdom of God,” the covenant becoming “a vital power,” which “sanctified [them] into a kingdom of priests”⁷⁷ and endowed them with spiritual power.

The covenant also changed the reality of their relationship with God and others. Israel was not only “set apart . . . *from* other peoples” they were set apart “*for* a specific purpose.” Looking outward beyond themselves, this “priestly community” was responsible for portraying to others “all that is ideal about humanity.”⁷⁸ In this way, Israel’s calling was to be God’s people in his created world, to bring the world to the knowledge of God. In other words, they were to be God in the world. Here the covenant constituted them as “the new humanity, the true

72. William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, The Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 2A (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 157–58.

73. John A. Davies, *A Royal Priesthood: Literary and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus 19.6* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 238.

74. *Ibid.*, 60.

75. *Ibid.*, 102.

76. *Ibid.*, 137.

77. C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. II: The Pentateuch*, translated by James Martin (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1900), 158.

78. Davies, *A Royal Priesthood*, 202.

successors of Adam,” while their designation as a “kingdom of priests” echoed Adam’s role as the “archetypal priest-king”⁷⁹ of God’s first garden.

A Created Temple

According to Margaret Barker, Adam’s story, bound up with the world’s creation and Eden’s garden, is “one of the best known and yet least understood parts of the Bible.”⁸⁰ She asserts the reality of Adam’s high priestly role and designates Eden as his temple. While this understanding has a long history, it is possible to go further. Indeed, the author of the Book of Jubilees asserts that Noah “knew the Garden of Eden was the holy of holies” (Jubilees 8:19). In this reading, the earth itself is a temple, rendering the act of creation a process of temple building.⁸¹

For John Sailhamer, Genesis 1 describes the process by which God made “good” a “formless and empty”⁸² earth, thereby fitting it for the habitation of humanity. This fitting involved a period of sanctification. According to Joseph Smith, God sanctified not only the seventh day, but all he had created.⁸³ Kearney argues for correspondence between the seven speeches of God to Moses concerning the building of the tabernacle (Exodus 25–31), and the seven days of creation (Genesis

79. *Ibid.*, 202–3.

80. Margaret Barker, “Adam the High Priest in the Paradise Temple” (paper presented at the fourth Temple Studies Group Symposium, Temple Church, London, Nov. 6, 2010, available at http://www.templestudiesgroup.com/Papers/Barker_TheParadisaicTemple.pdf).

81. Jeff Morrow, “Creation as Temple-Building and Word as Liturgy in Genesis 1–3,” *Journal of OCABS* 2, no. 1 (2009), <http://www.ocabs.org/journal/index.php/jocabs/article/viewFile/43/18>.

82. John Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1992), 85.

83. See Doctrine and Covenants 77:12: “on the seventh day he finished his work, and sanctified it.”

1:1–2:3),⁸⁴ while Cassuto asserts that “parallels in phraseology”⁸⁵ between the two accounts have long been noted. As this is so, the tabernacle’s “construction was depicted as new creation,”⁸⁶ and we should expect Moses’ sanctifying of *all* parts of the tabernacle, once it had been “fully set up” (Numbers 7:1) to be following the divine creative pattern. Drawing on these parallels, and a close reading of the text, J. Richard Middleton concludes that the first chapter of Genesis is unequivocally describing God building a temple.⁸⁷

Deigning to fill his temple with priests, God created humans, male and female, in “his own image” (Genesis 1:26–27). This word “image” means more than “concrete, physical likeness”⁸⁸ with biblical usage “primarily designat[ing] three-dimensional cult statues of various false gods.”⁸⁹ These statues, set up in cultic temples in the ancient Near East, functioned as images of their gods. Likewise, Adam, made in God’s image and placed in his temple, was “created to function as the creator god’s statue,”⁹⁰ completing his temple. Or, as expressed by Middleton:

just as no pagan temple in the ancient Near East could be complete without the installation of the cult image of the deity to whom the temple was dedicated, so creation in Genesis 1 is not complete (or “very

84. Peter J. Kearney, “Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25–40,” *ZAW* 89, no. 3 (1977): 375–87.

85. Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967), 476.

86. Morrow, “Creation as Temple-Building,” 6.

87. J. Richard Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos Press, 2005).

88. Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, “Further Reflections on a Divine and Angelic Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts*, edited by Esther G. Chazon and Betsy Halpern-Amaru (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 2010), 187.

89. Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 45.

90. Fletcher-Louis, “Further Reflections,” 187.

good”) until God creates humanity on the sixth day as *imago Dei*, in order to represent and mediate the divine presence on earth.⁹¹

This representation began, it would seem, from the moment God breathed into Adam “the breath of life” making him a “living being” (Genesis 2:7). Citing the Nicene Creed’s designation of the Holy Spirit as the “giver of life,”⁹² Gunton compares this verse with passages from the Psalms and Ezekiel⁹³ before declaring the Spirit not only the dispatcher of the gift of life but creation’s “perfecting cause” and “the one who enables things to become what they are created to be.”⁹⁴ In doing so, he asserts, “God not only breathes into his human creatures the breath of life, but makes them to be like him.”⁹⁵ In this regard, Adam and Eve’s placement in the garden deserves special discussion.

Genesis 2:15 tells us God “put” man in Eden’s garden using language reserved elsewhere in the Bible for two purposes: “God’s ‘rest’ or ‘safety’” and “the ‘dedication’ of something before the presence of the Lord.”⁹⁶ Placement in the garden allowed the humans to rest safely in God’s presence, enjoying his communion. While there, Adam had responsibilities for “dressing” and “keeping” the garden. Jeff Morrow informs

91. Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 87.

92. Colin Gunton, “The Spirit Moved Over the Face of the Waters: The Holy Spirit and the Created Order,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 4, no. 2 (2002): 191–204.

93. Psalm 104:29b–30: “When you take away their Spirit they die and return to the dust. When you send your spirit they are created, and you renew the face of the earth”; Ezekiel 37:9, 12: “Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe into these slain, that they may live. . . . This is what the sovereign Lord says: O my people, I am going to open your graves and bring you back up from them.”

94. Gunton, “The Spirit Moved,” 203.

95. *Ibid.*

96. Sailhamer, *Pentateuch as Narrative*, 100; these “dedications” rendered the thing dedicated “holy” or “sanctified,” lending support to the idea that it wasn’t just the seventh day that was sanctified, but the entirety of creation, including man.

us that the root of these words refers to “priestly duties in tabernacle” and “keeping/guarding and serving God’s word.”⁹⁷ Sailhamer provides a succinct translation: man was “to worship and obey.”⁹⁸ As such, Adam and Eve were no mere gardeners—they were priests placed in God’s created temple, a high priest and priestess, permitted to dwell in that temple’s holy of holies, enjoying the very presence of God. If this is so, the command to “multiply, and replenish the earth” (Genesis 1:28) was a command to populate God’s temple with priests.

Returning to Mormonism’s engagement with priesthood, according to Lorenzo Snow, in the pre-earthly, pre-embodied state “our spirit birth gave us godlike capabilities” through God’s transmission to each mortal, of his “capabilities, powers and faculties.”⁹⁹ Priestliness is, then, an inheritance of each spirit son or daughter from God. If the earth is a temple, then its creation was intended for the development of these primal “godlike capabilities” through priestly service. Physical birth, through the high priests Adam and Eve, was to be the vehicle for entry into this priestly community. However, upon expulsion from the garden, such a commission, it seems, was revoked: “in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die” (Genesis 2:17). Spiritual death, perhaps, was exactly that because it prevented Adam and Eve from being what they were created to be: priestly images of God. As discussed above, spiritual rebirth through the reception of the Holy Ghost brought with it priesthood, and sonship. In other words, the Spirit again enabled them to be what they were created to be, making them again like God, and restoring their priestly commission.

Israel, elected by God and established by covenant, functioned, according to one commentator, “as a kind of corporate Adam, reflect-

97. Morrow, *Creation as Temple-Building*, 13.

98. Sailhamer, *Pentateuch as Narrative*, 101.

99. Lorenzo Snow, Jan. 14, 1872, *Journal of Discourses*, 14:302.

ing God's image."¹⁰⁰ Being divinely mandated to "obey [God's] voice" (Exodus 19:5) and be "an holy nation" (Exodus 19:6), these "true successors of Adam"¹⁰¹ were, like Adam, required to worship and obey. Worship and obedience were also the terms of the covenant in Mosiah 18, where baptism was a "witness" of the covenant to "serve [God] and keep his commandments" (v. 10); or in other words, to worship and obey. As such, "bear[ing] one another's burdens . . . mourn[ing] with those that mourn . . . comfort[ing] those that stand in need of comfort, and . . . stand[ing] as a witness for God" (v. 8–9) were not themselves covenantal terms; rather, they expressed the priestly service that flowed from properly keeping the covenant.

With the ministry of Jesus came another reconstitution of the community. As Adam was the "first man" (1 Corinthians 15:45), given life and placed as God's image in the midst of his temple, so Jesus was the "second man" (1 Corinthians 15:45) capable of giving life and performing himself the work of a temple. As entry into Adam's community was, initially, to come through physical birth, so entry into Christ's came through spiritual rebirth. "Ye must be born again" (John 3:7), Jesus said to Nicodemus. Albert Barnes describes this process thus: "the heart must be changed by the agency of the Holy Spirit . . . the love of sin must be abandoned . . . man must . . . turn to God . . . renounce all his evil propensities, and give himself to a life of prayer and holiness."¹⁰² For Luther, spiritual rebirth made one a child of Christ, with a portion of his priestliness becoming the "inheritance" of each so born.¹⁰³ Significantly, Mosiah describes a people whose hearts had been so changed by "the Spirit of the Lord" that they had "no more disposition to do evil, but to do good continu-

100. G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2008), 51.

101. Davies, *A Royal Priesthood*, 202.

102. Albert Barnes, *Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Gospels*, vol. 2 (New York: Leavitt, Lord, & Co., 1835), 190.

103. Althaus, *Theology of Martin Luther*, 314.

ally” (Mosiah 5:2). In being born again they entered into a covenant “to do [God’s] will, and to be obedient to his commandments” (Mosiah 5:5)—in other words, to worship and obey. Through this dual process of covenant-making and spiritual rebirth, they were “spiritually begotten” of Christ, becoming “his sons and daughters” (Mosiah 5:7), and were thereafter known by his name (Mosiah 5:9). For Alma, this process was akin to having his “image . . . engraven upon [their] countenances” (Alma 5:19). It may be, therefore, that the reconstituting of the community in Christ set up once again “the creator god’s statue”¹⁰⁴ through covenantal rebirth in anticipation of the temple earth’s re-consecration through the communities’ Christ-like lives of holiness.

A Restoration of Community

Mormons believe that Christ’s original community was fractured by apostasy, resulting in the need for a restoration. Regarding itself as the culmination of God’s work with humanity, Mormonism may be seen as the final reconstitution of the community. Just as Jesus was the “second man,” in this reading, Mormonism becomes a second Israel. That restoration was not complete, according to Joseph Smith, until women were organized according to “the pattern of the priesthood.” They were to become “a kingdom of priests,” moving “according to the ancient Priesthood,” being “separate . . . and holy.”¹⁰⁵ Three days after making this pronouncement, Joseph instructed a select group “in the principles and ordinances of the Priesthood” while “attending to washings, anointings, endowments and the communication of keys.”¹⁰⁶ Holiness was to again spread from a temple, to heal dead seas. This endowment, pronounced

104. Fletcher-Louis, “Further Reflections,” 185.

105. *Nauvoo Relief Society Minute Book*, Mar. 31, 1842, 22, available at <http://josephsmithpapers.org/paperSummary/nauvoo-relief-society-minute-book?p=19>.

106. “History of the Church” (manuscript), book C–1, 1328–29, Church Archives, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.

“absolutely necessary” for returning to God’s presence, is preceded by a priestly anointing.¹⁰⁷ Such an anointing, Joseph Smith suggested, was to enable one to “learn how to be a god.”¹⁰⁸

Entry into the community, however, comes much earlier when one is baptized and confirmed, with the accompanying reception of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Baptism represents giving up one’s life to God; through bestowing the Holy Ghost, God transforms and renews that life. Here all participate directly, first, by witnessing the baptism, and then by assenting to the converts’ entry into the community. For Samuel Brown, in raising their hand in a “show of support. . . [i]t is as though each member of the congregation is reaching up to participate in the laying of hands on heads,” integrating these newest community members “into the root structure of the tree of life.”¹⁰⁹ Here may be the second Israel’s priestly ordination rite, with each enactment further sanctifying the community and endowing it with spiritual power. As such, it may be that a distinctly Mormon conception of both humanity and community begins with God bestowing a pre-earthly endowment on the human, and God’s placement of that human into a temple earth, to serve as his image. When the community is fractured, covenantal spiritual rebirth both reconstitutes the community and reintegrates one thereto. With reintegration comes a renewal of that pre-earthly priestly endowment allowing the Holy Ghost to facilitate the earth’s re-consecration through the community’s Christ-like lives of holiness.

In *Teachings of the Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1998), 414.

107. John A. Widtsoe, *Discourses of Brigham Young* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1954), 416.

108. Joseph Smith, King Follett Sermon, Clayton Report, retrieved from <http://www.boap.org/LDS/Parallel/1844/7Apr44.html>.

109. Samuel M. Brown, *First Principles and Ordinances: The Fourth Article of Faith in Light of the Temple* (Provo: Maxwell Institute, 2014), 120.

A further priestly anointing and endowment then prepares them for life with and like God.

When Joseph Smith was asked what differentiated his religion from others, somewhat surprisingly he did not mention angels or plates or legitimate priesthood authority. He stated, rather, “we differed in mode of baptism, and the gift of the Holy Ghost.” For Joseph, “All other considerations were contained in the gift of the Holy Ghost.”¹¹⁰ If this is so, then understanding of the role of the Holy Ghost in Mormonism, and its particular relation to priesthood, can and perhaps should be expanded. As such, I hope to have provided a starting point for discussing how priesthood is actually transmitted from God to mortals, for reframing the priestly interactions of those who have received the Holy Ghost through baptism and those who have received ordination, and for examining the interplay between what might be termed a universal priestly commission and a ministerial ordination for the transmission of ordinances. This, I hope, will create an opportunity for dialogue regarding the earth’s purpose and that of the priestly people placed therein.

110. Joseph Smith and Elias Higbee, “Letter to Hyrum Smith and High Council,” Dec. 5, 1839, in “Letterbook 2,” *The Joseph Smith Papers*, 85, available at <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/letterbook-2/90>.