

Genesis 5; Moses 6 Podcast show notes

Genesis 5: The generations of Adam

1. **The Sumerian King List and Genesis 5.** The patriarchs are depicted in both the Genesis and Moses narrative as having extremely long life-spans. I (Mike Day), do not take these literally. This does not mean that they are not literal, as I have no way of either proving or disproving these accounts. But based on what I know from the lifespans of human beings, and from what we have in the historical record, I have come to the conclusion that these descriptions of long life spans should be read in a different way. What are some of the options of reading these verses?
 - a. Literal: the verses can be read as they are written and can be taken literally. Some readers of scripture have chosen to read them this way.¹
 - b. Some early Latter-Day Saints read these early chapters in Genesis with a more scientific perspective.²
 - c. Some scholars see the Genesis narrative of the long lives of the patriarchs as an Egyptian chronology repackaged in an Israelite historical record.³

¹ Orson F. Whitney seems to have taken Genesis 5.5 literally. He said, “Adam lived to the age of 930 years, so that he died within the day that God had reference to.” Elder Whitney seems to view 1,000 years of our time to one of God’s “days” in this sermon. See: JD 26.260. Orson Pratt seems to also take Gen. 5.5 literally, see: JD. 16.47. Wilford Woodruff seems to have also taken this position. See: Wilford Woodruff, “The Priesthood Ancient and Modern,” JD 11.241. Brigham Young seems to have also believed that Methuselah lived to 969 years old. See: JD 8.280. **Amasa Lyman took these numbers literally, staking the veracity of the Bible on these numerical figures,** “The Bible tells us that men used to reach a longevity that extended to near a thousand years; this was near six thousand years ago. **To say that this is not true would be to question the validity of the Bible, and I would not dare to do that,** however presumptuous I may be in a thousand other things. We are descendants of that same race who enjoyed the blessing, if it was a blessing, of an extended longevity; yet the statistics of today relating to the average life of the human race show that it extends to a fraction over a quarter of a century. Should anybody be alarmed at this? If they not know the causes which have led to it they will not be; but if they have a knowledge sufficient to understand that if the race has so degenerated, physically, in five thousand years that the term of a man's life is reduced from near a thousand years to a quarter of a century, **the question would be awakened in their minds as to how narrow a margin of time is left for the continuation of our race on the earth before it becomes entirely extinct**—that there will not be a man, woman, or child to awaken the cheerless condition of the desolate earth with the music of their voices and the light of their smiles. They have ceased to be.” See: JD 11.198, emphasis added.

² One of these early apostles was James E. Talmage. He said, “The **opening chapters of Genesis**, and scriptures related thereto, were **never intended as a textbook of geology, archeology, earth-science, or man-science.**” See: “The Earth and Man,” 9 August 1931, reprinted in *Deseret News*, 12 November 1931.

³ “There can be little doubt that the author of the Patriarchal Chronology (the Genesis account of the Patriarchs in Genesis 5) worked from authentic Egyptian archival records... This study attempts to show how an ancient scribe looking at ancient Egyptian records would reconstruct an Egyptian king-list for the first eighteen dynasties of Egypt. In theory, the broad picture should exhibit a high degree of correlation with modern reconstructions of the same project. At both ends of the process, ancient and modern, some errors and disagreements arise.” The author concludes that “the patriarchal Chronology (the Genesis 5 account) is an important independent witness to ancient Egyptian chronology.” See: Gary Greenberg, *Genesis Chronology and Egyptian King-Lists: The Egyptian Origins of Genesis History*, Pereset Press, 2019, p. 244-245.

- d. Others view Genesis 5 as another way that **early Israelite scribes worked to legitimize their history.**⁴ How did the neighbors of Israel do this? By connecting their ancient kings back to their gods. We can see a correlation between the history presented in Genesis 5 with the histories written by ancient cultures of the Near East.⁵ One of these historical records is known as the **Sumerian King Lists.**⁶ In these king lists, Sumerian scribes credited their ancient kings with living exceptionally long life spans, and connected them back to their gods. One king in particular, [King Alalgar, reigned for 36,000 years.](#)⁷
- e. What does this mean for the Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis 5 (Moses 6)?
- i. Joseph took these verses literally.⁸
 - ii. Joseph is “seeing” some text or vision and is rendering it for a modern audience.⁹

⁴ The question often arises, “**why did the author of Genesis 5 work to make his record look like a Mesopotamian king list?**” One scholar offers this explanation: “King lists were important **expressions of power and legitimacy** in the Mesopotamian tradition. By placing his name at the end of such a list, **the new king could enhance his status by associating himself with great kings of the past.** Scholars suspect that the biblical author presented Israelite history in the form of a king list for the same purpose, namely, **to express the value and significance of the Hebrew people. This was probably done at a time when Jewish identity was in some way threatened by Mesopotamian culture, perhaps during or after the Babylonian exile.** This reading of Genesis 5 is only a theory, of course. But it is a theory that makes coherent sense of the data before us and, as I will now explain, it also provides us with theological leverage.” Sparks, *God’s Word in Human Words*, p. 170/320 electronic version, emphasis added.

⁵ Cassuto writes, “**The Babylonian tradition was essentially, as we have seen, of a mythological epic character.** It told of the ancient kings, the representatives of the monarchy that ‘descended from heaven’ (W.B. 444, col. i, lines 1, 41), kings who were in part divinities, or demi-gods, or human beings who had become deities; and it linked their memory with various mythological legends that are still reflected in the account of Berossus. **To these kings was attributed an excessively exaggerated longevity, tens of thousands of years, on the average, to each one. The Torah sets itself in opposition to all this. Scripture did not consider it right to invalidate completely all the existing traditions on the subject, or to pass them over in silence, since they could be of value for its didactic purpose. However, it sought to purify and refine them, and to harmonize them with its own spirit.** As usual, this disapproval of the alien tradition does not find expression in polemic or argument. **The Torah states its own view quietly, setting the contrary opinion at naught by the calm exposition of its own concepts.**” Cassuto, *From Adam to Noah*, p. 262, emphasis added.

⁶ The Sumerian King List or SKL presented kingship as a single succession of divinely appointed leaders that originated at the beginning of time. **This scheme was entirely fictional**, of course, since there were many kings in ancient Mesopotamia, and these kings often ruled at the same time in different places. The purpose of this fiction was presumably to legitimize a specific king by painting him as the one and only authentic king. There is an **ongoing debate among scholars about which Mesopotamian king was originally the focus of the list**, but because **the list was often reused, edited, and updated, it is no longer possible to identify him with certainty.** See: Sparks, *God’s Word in Human Words*, p. 69-70, print edition, emphasis added.

⁷ Kenton Sparks, *God’s Word in Human Words: An Evangelical Appropriation of Critical Biblical Scholarship*, Baker Academic, 2008, p. 69-70. See also: [The Sumerian King List](#), accessed 12.29.21. Take note that the kingship “descended from heaven” to the rulers of Mesopotamia. Kingship was first handed down from heaven to Eridu, the seat of kingship. Both Alalgar and Alulim ruled for a combined 64,800 years! The long lives, kingship, and the connection to the gods are all connected in this text. See also Peter Kesslers and Samuel Noah Kramer’s work on this text [here](#).

⁸ It would seem that by reading [D&C 107.42-53](#) and the *Lectures on Faith*, that Joseph Smith took these ages literally.

⁹ Perhaps Joseph is “seeing” what was written by a scribe anciently and is dictating what he sees. If so, he didn’t see that it was necessary to correct the account of the long lives of the Patriarchs.

- iii. Joseph is unconcerned with the long life-spans and his focus is elsewhere.
- iv. Joseph is practicing “accommodation,” speaking to a 19th century Christian audience in a manner that they would understand.
- f. Some things to consider:
 - i. The authors of Genesis were probably working with material from their own culture, but they were also actually **practicing modesty in their assumptions**. Umberto Cassuto states that in view of the “exaggerated traditions current in the ancient East,” the modern reader should understand that these numbers are “low and modest!”¹⁰
 - ii. **Life-spans decline as the narrative continues**. Richard Elliot Friedman writes, “It is clear that this author thought of a year as a normal solar year because that is how long the Flood lasts. The point to note is: life spans are pictured as growing shorter. The ten generations from Adam to Noah approach ages of 1,000. But the last one to live more than 900 years is Noah. The next ten generations start with Shem, who lives 600 years, and life spans decline after him. The last person to live longer than 200 years is Terah. Abraham (175), Isaac (180), and Jacob (147) live long lives, but not as long as their ancestors. And Moses lives to be 120, which is understood to have become, at some point, the maximum for human life.”¹¹

2. Genesis 5 – The 10 Patriarchs

- a. Adam’s life – Gen. 5.1-5. Adam אָדָם means “man.”
- b. Seth – Gen. 5.6-8.¹²
- c. Enos – Gen. 5.9-11.¹³
- d. Cainan – Gen. 5.12-14.¹⁴
- e. Mahalaleel – Gen. 5.15-17.¹⁵
- f. Jared – Gen. 5.18-20.¹⁶
- g. Enoch (The 7th patriarch) – Gen. 5.21-24. Note that “God took him.”¹⁷
- h. Methuselah – Gen. 5.25-27.¹⁸

¹⁰ Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis (Part 1): from Adam to Noah*, Varda Books, Hebrew University, 1989, p. 264.

¹¹ Richard E. Friedman, *Commentary on the Torah*, New York, HarperCollins, 2001, p. 31.

¹² Seth or שֵׁט שֵׁיט can mean “compensation,” but it comes from שֵׁיט שֵׁיט, a word that means “to put, lay or set.”

¹³ Enos or אָנוֹשׁ 'ēnōš means “man.” It can also mean “mortal, person, or mankind.”

¹⁴ Cainan or קַיִן qēnān means “possession.” Some relate this word to קוֹנֵן qōnēn, the word translated as “lament.” See: 2 Samuel 1.17.

¹⁵ מַהֲלַלֵּל mahālāl'ēl can mean “praise of God,” coming from מַהֲלַל mahālāl, “to praise, or boast,” and one of the names of God: El.

¹⁶ Jared, יָרֵד or yereḏ means “to go down, or to descend.” The verb יָרַד yārāḏ can mean to come, to go, or to come down.

¹⁷ Enoch, or חֲנוּךְ ḥānōḵ can mean “dedicated.” The word comes from חָנַךְ ḥānaḵ, meaning “to train, dedicate or train up.”

¹⁸ מֶתוּשֶׁלַח Məthūwshelach, meth-oo-sheh'-lakh; from מַת mat (male, man) [H4962](#) and נִשְׁלַח ṣelah [H7973](#) (weapon, dart, missile, sprout, shoot); man of a dart; Methushelach, an antediluvian patriarch:—Methuselah. Some translate his name as “his death shall bring.”

- i. Lamech – Gen. 5.28-31.¹⁹
 - j. Noah – Gen. 5.32.²⁰ The record of Noah continues in Genesis 6-9.29. Gen. 9.29 is the conclusion of Noah’s life, stating that he lived 950 years.
- 3. Moses 6 and the Enoch material, its relevance and accuracy.**
- a. **The Lost Book of Enoch.** Early Christian writers knew all about the book of Enoch: indeed, “nearly all the writers of the New Testament were familiar with it, and were more or less influenced by it in thought and diction,” according to R. H. Charles, who notes that it “is quoted as a genuine production of Enoch by St. Jude, and as Scripture by St. Barnabas ... With the earlier Fathers and Apologists it had all the weight of a canonical book.”²¹ Its influence is apparent in no less than 128 places in the New Testament,²² and Charles can declare that “The influence of I Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books taken together.”²³ He further lists some thirty passages in early orthodox Jewish and Christian writings in which the book of Enoch is mentioned specifically,²⁴ plus numerous citations from the book that are found in the important Jewish apocalyptic writings of Jubilees, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses, 2 Baruch, and 4 Ezra, and quotations from Enoch found in more than thirty Christian Patristic writers.²⁵
 - b. **How was The Book of Enoch lost?** Nibley explains: How could a book of such long-standing influence, authority, and veneration possibly have become lost? Very simple: it ran afoul of ideas held by the doctors of the Jews and Christians alike after those worthies had fallen under the influence of the University of Alexandria, whose modern descendants resumed their censure of it after it was discovered and have continued to condemn it to this day.²⁶

¹⁹ Lamech or לַמֶּכֶךְ *lamek* means “powerful.” Some translators have rendered this name to be “to make low.” The word לַמֶּכֶךְ (*lmk*) does not occur in Hebrew, so we are left to guess at its meaning. Brown Driver Briggs remains silent on this, but The particle ל *lamed* means “to” or “onto” and may describe a physical or mental motion toward something. The verb מָלַךְ *malak* can mean “to be low, or depressed.” To me the name could be either designating a strong man or one who is humiliated or brought low. In the context of Moses 1, I find this connection fascinating, as man is described as “nothing,” and yet he is exalted in the sense that he is a “Son of God,” and that God’s work and glory is to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man (see Moses 1.29).

²⁰ Noah נָח means “rest” and is related to נַחַשׁ *nûah*, the word for “resting place.”

²¹ R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (London: Oxford University Press, 1913), p. ix, n. 1. Compare his *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1912, reprint 1964), 2:163, where he maintains that “some of its authors ... belonged to the true succession of the prophets, ... exhibiting on occasions the inspiration of the O. T. prophets.”

²² Charles, *Book of Enoch*, pp. xc–xcix, indicates that many “passages of the New Testament ... either in phraseology or idea directly depend on or are illustrative of passages in 1 Enoch.” In the New Testament, according to a current *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1973), 8:604, “Enoch himself is mentioned in [Luke 3:37](#); [Heb. 11:5](#); [Jude 1:14](#) ...” while there is reference to him in [Jude 1:4–15](#), [Matt. 19:28](#), [Matt. 26:24](#), [Luke 16:9](#), [John 5:22](#), [1 Thes. 5:3](#), [1 Pet. 3:19ff.](#), and Revelation.

²³ Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. xc.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. xii–xiii.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. lxx, lxxix, for the Jewish sources, lxxxi–xc, for the Christian.

²⁶ Nibley, [A Strange Thing in the Land](#). He continues, ““But our book contained much of a questionable character,” writes R. H. Charles with a sigh, “and from the fourth century of our era onward it fell into discredit: and under the

- c. **Systematic destruction of texts in the 4th century.** In his recent study of Hellenistic Judaism, H. F. Weiss comes to the point: It was as inspired or revealed writings that such great apocalyptic works as Enoch, Fourth Esdras, and Baruch “were by the ‘official’ rabbinic-pharisaic Judaism **systematically suppressed and removed**, ostensibly on the grounds of their apocalyptic content.”²⁷ They did not just fade out; they were deliberately and systematically destroyed.
- d. **Texts that were “put under the ban.”** Thus, until recently, the only surviving fragments of Enoch have come from Christian copyists, and not a single Jewish text of the Twelve Patriarchs, which draws heavily on Enoch, survives; moreover, not a single picture of Enoch has ever been identified in either Jewish or old Christian art.²⁸ The trouble was, says Charles, that in Enoch the “apocalyptic or prophetic side of Judaism” was confronted by the rabbinical or halachic, i.e., by the “Judaism that posed as the sole and orthodox Judaism ... after 70 A.D. “which damned it forever as a product of the Essenes.”²⁹ It was the same story with the Christians; it was “such authorities as Hilary, Jerome and Augustine” **who put the book of Enoch “under the ban.”** They were all learned schoolmen steeped in the rhetorical and sophistic education of the time, admitting quite freely that the Christians of an earlier time held ideas and beliefs quite different from theirs.³⁰ **They also knew that Enoch was treasured as a canonical book by the early Christians, but they would have none of it.** The transition is represented by the great Origen, another product of Alexandria, who lived a century before them: he quotes Enoch, but with reservation, finding that he cannot agree with the teachings of the book, no matter how the first Christians may have venerated it.³¹
- e. Yale professor and Jewish literary scholar Harold Bloom expressed that Joseph Smith’s ability to produce writings on Enoch so “strikingly akin to ancient suggestions” stemmed from his “charismatic accuracy, his sure sense of relevance that governed biblical and Mormon parallels.” Having studied the life and revelations of the Prophet, Bloom concludes: “I hardly think that written sources were necessary.” While expressing “no judgment, one way or the other, upon the authenticity” of LDS scripture, he found “**enormous validity**” in these writings and could “only attribute to [the Prophet’s] genius

ban of such authorities as Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine, it gradually passed out of circulation, and became lost to the knowledge of Western Christendom.” See also: Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. ix.

²⁷ Nibley, [A Strange Thing in the Land](#). See also: Hans-Friedrich Weiss, *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966), p. 119.

²⁸ H. Leclercq, “Hénoch,” in F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d’Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1925), 6:2246.

²⁹ Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. ciii.

³⁰ This attitude is explained in Hugh Nibley’s *When the Lights Went Out: Three Studies on the Ancient Apostasy* (Deseret Book, 1970), p. 57.

³¹ In his work *On the First Principles*, I:iii:3 (Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae* 11:147f) and 4:35 (*Patrologiae Graecae* 11:409), Origen appeals to “The Book of Enoch” to support his theories of the creation, but when Celsus quotes Enoch he objects: “Even less should things be taken seriously which Celsus seems to have picked up and misunderstood from the Book of Enoch ...” (*Against Celsus* 5:54; *Patrologiae Graecae* 11:1265). He says things are “very much mixed up” and “in the churches not taken very seriously as Scripture (divine)” since they contain “matter not preached (uttered) nor heard in the churches of God, “which nobody would be foolish enough to take literally (*Patrologiae Graecae* 11:1268–69).

or daemon”³² his ability to “recapture ... crucial elements in the archaic Jewish religion ... that had ceased to be available either to normative Judaism or to Christianity, and that survived only in esoteric traditions unlikely to have touched [Joseph] Smith directly.”³³

4. Moses 6

- a. Seth is born – Moses 6.1-3.
- b. A Book of Remembrance – Moses 6.5-6.
- c. “This same priesthood” – Moses 6.7.
- d. Adam prophesies – Moses 6.8.
- e. Satan had great dominion, “wars, bloodshed, secret works...” – Moses 6.15.
- f. Adam was a “son of God, with whom God, himself, conversed.” – Moses 6.22.
- g. “They” were preachers of righteousness (descendants of Adam). – Moses 6.23.
- h. Enoch and his experience with God – Moses 6.26-39.³⁴

³² Bloom is using daemon here to express Joseph Smith’s power or his special exceptional enthusiasm. See: Daemon, [Webster’s Dictionary](#).

³³ Harold Bloom, *American Religion*, p. 98-101, emphasis added. For Nibley’s analysis of the utter lack of Enoch materials in America at the time of the production of the Book of Moses, see [Strange Thing in the Land, part 2](#). Nibley writes, “The thing (Enoch texts) was virtually unobtainable in this country. And why not? Its only appeal was as a religious book, but the religious were all against it.” Nibley works to show that Laurence’s 1821 edition of the Book of Enoch had no chance of coming into Joseph’s Smith’s purview. He writes, “This laboring of the only too obvious point, that Joseph Smith could not have used or known about the 1821 edition of Laurence’s book of Enoch, has been very necessary: (a) because that was the *only* translation of any ancient Enoch text available to anyone at the time he dictated Moses chapters 6 and 7 [[Moses 6, 7](#)], and (b) the two books are full of most significant parallels. If such parallels are to have any significance as evidence supporting the Prophet’s claims, we must of course rule out his use of the Laurence text.” Nibley finally argues that even if Joseph had access to Laurence’s 1821 Enoch material, he wouldn’t have known how to work it into scripture: Finally, even if Joseph Smith had had the rich apocryphal literature of our own day at his disposal, with the thousands of pages of Enoch, or even the 1821 text of Laurence, **how would he have known how to handle the stuff?** The Prophet’s book of Enoch is less than three chapters long; **how was he to know from all that what to put in and what to leave out to produce a text that most nearly corresponds to what modern scholars view as the authentic original material of Enoch’s book? He did just that; he put together in a few hours the kind of text most closely corresponding to what specialists, after years of meticulous comparison of texts, come up with as the hypothetically essential text of Enoch.**

³⁴ This is the beginning of the record of Enoch. In history and in Biblical scholarship we read of a collection of texts called “The Book of Enoch,” texts that are apocryphal. These are also called pseudepigraphal, in that they are named after Enoch, but most scholars reject that they were authored by the original Enoch, but that they are falsely attributed to him, having been written much later than the time period of Enoch. Most commonly, the phrase “Book of Enoch” refers to [1 Enoch](#), which is wholly extant only in the Ethiopic language. There are two other books named “Enoch”: [2 Enoch](#) (surviving only in Old Slavonic, c. first century; Eng. trans. by Richard H. Charles (1896); and [3 Enoch](#) (surviving in Hebrew, c. fifth-sixth century. The numbering of these texts has been applied by scholars to distinguish the texts from one another. **Hugh Nibley addresses the issue with the various books of Enoch and the writings of Enoch as contained in the Book of Moses succinctly:** The problem is perfectly simple and straightforward: There was once indeed an ancient book of Enoch, but it became lost and was not discovered until our own time, when it can be reliably reconstructed from some hundreds of manuscripts in a dozen different languages. How does this Enoch redivivus compare with Joseph Smith’s highly condensed but astonishingly specific and detailed version? That is the question to which we must address ourselves. We do not have the golden plates nor the original text of the book of Abraham, but we *do* have at last, in newly discovered documents, a book which is *the* book of Enoch if there ever was one. And so we have only to place the Joseph Smith version of the book of Enoch—[Moses 6:25 through 8:3](#) with associated texts—side by side with the Enoch

- i. Heard a voice – Moses 6.27.
- ii. The **Narrative Call Pattern** has six characteristics³⁵
 1. The Divine Confrontation³⁶
 2. The Introductory Word³⁷
 3. The Commission³⁸
 4. The Objection³⁹
 5. The Reassurance⁴⁰
 6. The Sign⁴¹
- iii. God instructs Enoch to preach repentance – Moses 6.27-30. This is connected symbolically with the baptism of Jesus.⁴²
- iv. Sought their **own counsel in the dark**. Hugh Nibley commented how the enemies of the prophets made their own plan instead of following God’s plan.⁴³

texts, which have come forth since 1830, to see what they have in common and to judge of its significance. See: [Hugh Nibley, A Strange Thing in the Land: The Return of the Book of Enoch, Part 1, Ensign, October 1975.](#)

³⁵ Ricks writes, “The report of the prophetic vocation of Enoch in the book of Moses accords with impressive consistency with the call narratives in the Bible. All of the elements of the prophetic call pattern isolated and examined by Habel in the calls of Moses, Gideon, and Jeremiah are also found in the Enoch passage; with one minor exception, the order of the elements in the vocation of Enoch is the same as in the call accounts recorded in the Bible. This additional authenticating detail places Enoch more securely in the tradition of the prophets and the book of Moses more firmly in the form and tradition of the prophetic literature.” See: *The Narrative Call Pattern in the Prophetic Commission of Enoch (Moses 6)*, p. 101.

³⁶ In both the Moses and Gideon call narratives, there is an unexpected confrontation with the divine. Moses was tending flocks while Gideon was threshing wheat (both deeply connected to the temple and kingship by the way). See: Ex. 3.-13 and Judg. 6.11-12. Enoch is on a journey when the Spirit descended upon him, see Moses 6.26.

³⁷ See: Ex. 3.6-9, Judg. 6.13 and Moses 6.28.

³⁸ To Moses God said, “thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt” – Ex. 3.10. Compare this to Judg. 6.14 and Jer. 1.5b.

³⁹ Moses said, “Who am I that I should go unto Pharaoh?” – Ex. 3.11. Gideon said, “My family is poor in Manasseh, and I am the least in my father’s house!” – Judg. 6.15. See also Moses 6.31 and Jer. 1.6.

⁴⁰ “Certainly I will be with thee!” – Ex. 3.12. The Lord tells Gideon, “Surely I will be with thee...” – Judg. 6.16. See also Jer. 1.7-8.

⁴¹ See: Judg. 6.17, Ex. 4.17, Jer. 1.9, Moses 6.35. See: Stephen Ricks, [The Narrative Call Pattern in the Prophetic Commission of Enoch \(Moses 6\), *BYU Studies Quarterly* 26:4.](#)

⁴² Jeffrey Bradshaw sheds light on the following connections, “Though one might try to explain the parallels between Moses 6:26-27 and the baptism of Jesus as an obvious case of Joseph Smith’s borrowing from the New Testament, an article by Samuel Zinner argues the possibility that **the relevant New Testament motifs may have their origins in the Enoch literature**. Zinner compares Hebrews 1:5-6 to passages relating to the father’s declaration of sonship at the baptism of Jesus in the Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of the Hebrews. **He also notes that the motifs of “rest” and “reigning” cooccur in these three texts as well as in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas**. Finally, he argues for a “striking isomorphism” shared between 1 Enoch and the baptismal allusion in the Gospel of the Ebionites in a promise made by Enoch to the righteous: “and a bright light will shine upon you, and the voice of rest you will hear from heaven.” In light of these (and additional passages relating these themes to the personage of the “Son of Man”), Zinner argues that **the ideas behind all these passages “arose in an Enochic matrix.”** Hence, the unexpected parallel to Jesus’ baptism in the book of Moses account of the calling of Enoch — which in a cursory analysis might have been looked upon as an obvious anachronism — is a passage with plausible Enochic affinities and possible Enochic origins.” See: Bradshaw, *In God’s Image and Likeness 2: Enoch, Noah, and the Tower of Babel*, Eborn Books, p. 35-6.

⁴³ Hugh Nibley said: “The ... people are following their system ... [T]hey are not following the system I gave them. I gave them a plan. I gave them instructions. They pay no attention to it. They think they know better, and they are

- v. This is a decree! – Moses 6.30.⁴⁴
- vi. He bowed himself to the earth before the Lord – Moses 6.31. This is an altar scene.⁴⁵
- vii. “I am but a lad!” – Moses 6.31.
- viii. “No man shall pierce thee!” – Moses 6.32.⁴⁶
- ix. “I will give thee utterance” – Moses 6.32.⁴⁷
- x. Enoch anoints his eyes with clay and has visions – Moses 6.35-36.⁴⁸

doing it their way They have ‘sought their own counsels in the dark; and in their own abominations have they devised murder, and have not kept the commandments, which I gave unto their father, Adam.’ Cain did all this and kept it secret so that Adam wouldn’t find out that he was copying and corrupting the whole thing. So here it comes out again. They did not keep the commandments I gave Adam, but they put their own version, their own counsel, and devised their abominations and murders.” See: Hugh Nibley, *Teachings of the Pearl of Great Price*, p. 272.

⁴⁴ Bradshaw notes that the term “carries both royal and legal overtones.” There are many examples of royal decrees in scripture, especially in the books of Daniel and Esther. Examples of God’s decrees are also widespread. The description of a decree as being “firm” or “unalterable” emphasizes the notion that it is immutable and “must be fulfilled.” Note that the term “decree” appears with surprising frequency in the later chapters of the brief book of Moses. In each case, it refers to aspects of the “plan of salvation” that provide the substance of the preaching of Adam and Enoch. In Moses 5:15 and 6:30, God’s decree in this respect refers specifically to the idea that those who repent and accept the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ will be saved, whereas those who do not will be damned. In Moses 5:59, the decree refers to the promise that the Gospel and its ordinances “should be in the world, until the end thereof.” Finally, in Moses 7:52, the decree refers to the promise that the Lord made to Enoch that a Messiah should come and “that a remnant of his seed should always be found among all nations.” See: Bradshaw, *In God’s Image and Likeness*, volume 2, p. 59. See also: Daniel 6:7; Alma 29:4, D&C 29:12; Moses 5:15; Alma 29:4; 41:8; Moses 7:52.

⁴⁵ Compare Exodus 34:8: “And Moses made haste, and bowed his head toward the earth, and worshipped.” This is the first of three similarities to revelatory experiences of Moses in this verse. See also *1 Enoch* 14:24:107 “And I had been until now on my face, prostrate and trembling. And the Lord called me with his mouth and said to me, ‘Come here, Enoch, and hear my word(s) ... I had my face bowed down.’” In the Mandaean *Book of Adam*, Enoch similarly bows down when he meets the angel of Life: “my body ... was bowed down before him, ... my legs ... bent in his presence.” Of course, such a reaction to a divine messenger or God Himself is not uncommon in scripture and pseudepigrapha. See: Bradshaw, p. 60.

⁴⁶ This is the [promise of invulnerability](#) given to prophets. This can be related D&C 122:9. Compare God’s later words to Enoch in Moses 7.36, “mine eye can pierce them.” A parallel promise in the Mandaean Book of Adam reads as follows: “Little Enoch, fear not. You dread the dangers of this world, I am come to you to deliver you from them. Fear not the wicked, and be not afraid of the floods that fall on your head; for their efforts will be vain: it shall not be given them to do any harm to thee.” Later, Enoch’s cosmic enemies admit their utter failure to thwart him and his fellows: “In vain have we attempted murder and fire against them; nothing has been able to overcome them. And now they are sheltered from our blows.” See: J. P. Migne, *Livre d’Adam*, 21, p. 167 (168). See also H. W. Nibley, *Enoch*, p. 210.

⁴⁷ Hugh Nibley comments: “As to being slow of speech, God will put his very words into Enoch’s mouth, so that in a special way it will be the Lord speaking through him.” Compare *2 Enoch* 39:5:137 “... it is not from my own lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord I have been sent to you. For you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created exactly equal to yourselves; but I have heard from the fiery lips of the Lord.” See: Hugh Nibley, *Enoch*, p. 211. See also: Bradshaw, p. 62.

⁴⁸ Draper, Brown, and Rhodes comment as follows: “This sequence of verbs points to Enoch’s being in a sanctuary or temple. They are the same verbs that appear in the story of Jesus healing the man born blind (John 9.6-7). That event took place just beyond the southern end of the Jerusalem temple as indicated by Jesus’ instruction to the man to wash in the pool of Siloam.” Craig Keener (*The Gospel of John*, 1:780) describes possible Creation symbolism in the incident, evoking the idea of spiritual rebirth in the story of Enoch: “Jewish tradition sometimes reports curing through spittle, though Jewish custom probably borrowed it from the more widespread ancient

- xi. “A seer hath the Lord raised up unto his people” – Moses 6.36.⁴⁹
- xii. All men were offended at Enoch – Moses 6.37.

custom. But far more importantly, by making clay of the spittle and applying it to eyes blind from birth, Jesus may be recalling the creative act of Genesis 2:7 (John 20.22). This allusion would fit well the likely creation allusion in the healing in John 5[:19-20]... Later rabbis idealized the purity of those in the holy city, and a second-century rabbi thus deemed all spittle found there (except in the market area frequented by the unclean) ritually pure.” Relevant to the theme of Enoch’s new seership, Craig Koester ([Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community](#), 2003) writes: “Comments at the beginning and end of the chapter say that Jesus enlightened the eyes of an individual to show that he was ‘the light of the world’ (John 9.5) and ‘came into this world... that those who do not see may see (John 9.39). At the same time, the Jewish authorities who could see physically refused to recognize the power of God manifested in Jesus, and Jesus’ concluding remarks also extended this response to people generally, warning that ‘those who see may become blind.’”

⁴⁹ Bradshaw gives us the following: “In Old Testament usage, the term “seer” is used as another word for “prophet.” (1 Samuel 9.9)

However, in modern scripture and current LDS usage, it is used both as a title for members of the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve, who are sustained in their office as “prophets, seers, and revelators,” and also to describe specific spiritual gifts associated with, but not identical to, the gift of prophecy. Hyrum Andrus notes: **“The word seer derives from the word see and refers to the quickening of man’s spiritual eyes by the power of the Holy Ghost, so that he can see visually that which God manifests unto him.”** In Mosiah 8:13, the gift of seership is associated with the right to look into divine “interpreters” with the object of translating ancient records (Mosiah 28.16). More generally, Mosiah 8:15-17 states that “a seer is greater than a prophet... [A] seer is a revelator and a prophet also; and a gift which is greater can no man have, except he should possess the power of God, which no man can; yet a man may have great power given him from God... [A] seer can know of things which are past, and also of things which are to come, and by them shall all things be revealed, or, rather, shall secret things be made manifest, and hidden things shall come to light, and things which are not known shall be made known by them, and also things shall be made known by them which otherwise could not be known.”

Drawing on a retrospective interview of Joseph Smith, Sr. by Fayette Lapham, Don Bradley ([Piercing the Veil: Temple Worship in the Lost 116 Pages](#)) has explored a purported Book of Mormon account of revelation through the use of divine interpreters whereby their possessors would put them on as spectacles, then put their face inside a “skin.” The conversation that revealed this manner of receiving knowledge is said to have occurred through an exchange of human and divine voices inside a Nephite “Tabernacle,” recalling the account of the brother of Jared at the “veil” in Ether 3, the conversation of Moses with the Lord in Exodus 4, and ancient Near East parallels where the gods whisper their secrets to mortals standing on the other side of temple screens or partitions separating the divine and human realms.

Mosiah 8:13 warns that “no man can look in them [i.e., the interpreters] except he be commanded, lest he should look for that he ought not and he should perish.” The danger of looking beyond the veil for someone who is unready and unauthorized is described by a petitioner in the Islamic mystical text, *The Mother of Books*, who is warned by God that if someone were to move “the curtain and the veil the slightest bit [to] make the high king visible ... their spirit would leave their body.” By way of contrast, the Armenian *Descendants of Adam* says that the righteous Enoch refrained from looking at the heavens—which is equated to the fact that he did not eat of the:

... tree of meat [i.e., the tree of knowledge] ... And he drew linen over his face, and did not look at the heavens, on account of the sin of Adam. And he said, “When of the servant, there is trouble, the servant does not to look at the crown. And he quickly becomes sweet. And I, on account of the sin of Adam, I dare not look at the heavens, that God may have mercy upon Adam.” And God had mercy upon Enoch and transferred him to immortality. See: Bradshaw and Larsen, *In God’s Image and Likeness 2: Enoch, Noah, and the Tower of Babel*, Eborn Books, 2014, p. 66.

- xiii. “A wild man hath come among us!” – Moses 6.38.⁵⁰
- xiv. He walked with God – Moses 6.39.
- xv. Mahijah’s questions⁵¹ of Enoch: who are you and where are you from? – Moses 6.40.⁵²

⁵⁰ Compare the description of Ishmael: “he will be a wild man” (Gen. 16.12). **Hugh Nibley writes**, “This is the familiar theme of the holy man — Adam, Seth, Noah, Elijah, Abinadi, Ether, Mormon, etc. — who goes forth to admonish the wicked world from time to time, then withdraws to the society of the righteous, usually in a vale or on a mountain. Such prophets are a disturbing presence among the people” (*Enoch*, p. 211). Nibley continues, “While Charles finds passages in this part of the Ethiopian Enoch “very confused” and “clearly corrupt,” **all the versions agree on a consistent story**: Enoch, while journeying in the highlands passing by a certain sea, has a vision in which the Lord talks with him and sends him to rebuke the people; he finds them assembled in a high place and discusses with them a certain book—a *Hypomnemata*, or memorial. **As a result of what he tells them about the book, they are completely overcome and cannot raise their eyes to Enoch or to heaven for shame. The Joseph Smith account is substantially like that of the Greek and Slavonic texts.**” The Mandaean *Book of Adam* describes false prophets from the same era in similar terms: “From there come corruptors who wander through the mountains and hills, completely naked like demons, with bristly hair ... We call them vagabond pastors. They feed themselves on the grasses of the field ... and say to themselves: God speaks in mysteries from our mouths.” In a striking passage from the *Book of the Giants* (M. Wise et al., *DSS*, Book of Giants (4Q531), 22:8, p. 293), the wicked leader of the giants, ‘Ohya, declares himself to bear a title that is identical to the one given here to Enoch: “the wild man they call [me].” Penelope Doob (P. B. R. Doob, *Nebuchadnezzar’s Children*) has contrasted the literary convention of the “unholy wild man” with that of the “holy wild man.” Nebuchadnezzar is a prototype of the former category, his madness and self-exclusion from society ending only when he satisfactorily completed the process of penance (Daniel 4.31-37). **Enoch and John the Baptist** (Matt 3.4 and Mark 1.6) **are exemplars of the latter type, voluntarily taking on the rough clothing and wholly unpopular stance on repentance and societal reform as “fools for Christ’s sake”** (1 Cor. 4.10). See: Bradshaw and Larsen, *In God’s Image*, emphasis added, p. 68.

⁵¹ This questioning of his credentials is an interesting thing, for often the wicked question the credentials of the righteous. See for example, Pharaoh (Ex. 5.2), King Noah (Mosiah 11.27), the scribes and Pharisees (Luke 5.21, 7.49, 20.2; John 1.19-23, 8.25), and Herod (Luke 9.9). To this list we could add, in ironic role reversal, Moses’ questioning of Satan’s credentials (Moses 1.13). In the *Bet ha-Midrash*, (A. Jellinek, *BHM*, 4:131; H. W. Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, p. 212.) we read of a similar request for Enoch to identify himself, followed by his preaching to a multitude: “And Enoch went out [after his long hiding] and there came a voice saying: Who is the man who rejoices ... in the ways of the Lord? ... And all the people gathered together and came unto Enoch and Enoch taught all the people again to keep the ways of the Lord, ... and gave them all his peace.”

⁵² Hugh Nibley said this about Mahijah: What always impressed me as the oddest detail of the Joseph Smith account of Enoch was the appearance **out of the blue** of the name of **the only nonbiblical individual named in the whole book—Mahijah**. ([Moses 6:40](#).) Mahijah is the one who asks Enoch searching questions, and in answer is told about the place Mahujah, where Enoch began this particular phase of his mission. ([Moses 7:2](#).) It was therefore with a distinct shock of recognition that, after having looked through all but the last of the Aramaic Enoch fragments without finding anything particularly new, and coming to those very last little fragments, **I found the name Mahujah leaping out of the pages again and again**. (Pp. 300, 302–5, 311, 314.) Could this be our Mahujah or Mahijah? As a matter of fact it could be either, not only because the semi-vowels *w* and *y* are written very much alike in the Aramaic script and are sometimes confused by scribes, but also because the name as written in 4QEn, MHWY, is the same as the MHWY-EL who appears in [Gen. 4:18](#) as the grandfather of Enoch, transliterated in the King James Bible as *Mehuja-el*, which name also appears in the Greek Septuagint as *Mai-el* and in the Latin Vulgate as *Mavia-el*, showing that Mahujah and Mahijah were the same name.

So what? A coincidence—a giant or a Watcher called Mahujah or Mahijah. But far more than a coincidence when taken in its context. The only thing the Mahijah in the Book of Moses is remarkable for is his putting of bold direct questions to Enoch, thus giving the patriarch an opening for calling upon the people to repent, referring them to the book of remembrance, and telling them of the plan of salvation. And **this is exactly the role, and the only role, that the Aramaic Mahujah plays in the story**. The name is found in none of the other Enoch

- xvi. Enoch's response – Moses 6.41-68.
5. The bulk of the message of Moses 6 has to do with Enoch's discourse.⁵³
- a. A book of remembrance – Moses 6.46.⁵⁴

texts and neither is the story: it is peculiar to the version Joseph Smith gave us and the oldest known Enoch manuscripts. The following translation is from Milik and Black, lest the writer be charged with forcing the text. See: Hugh Nibley, [“A Strange Thing in the Land,” The Return of the Book of Enoch, part 13, Ensign, August, 1977](#). Colby Townsend argues against Nibley's assertions, and you can read his argument [here](#). Jeffrey Bradshaw, Matthew Bowen, and Ryan Dahle engage Townsend's arguments in [this article](#) in the *Interpreter*. See also: Hugh Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet. The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley 2*. Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book, 1986, pp. 277–279. Draper, Richard D., S. Kent Brown, and Michael D. Rhodes. *The Pearl of Great Price: A Verse-by-Verse Commentary*. Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book, 2005, p. 96.

[Jeffery Bradshaw shares this experience](#) with respect to Mahujah's name appearing in an 1830 document:

The only attempt of which I am aware to explain how a manuscript discovered in 1948 could have influenced a work of scripture translated in 1830-31 comes from remembrances by two individuals about the well-known **Aramaic scholar Matthew Black**, who collaborated with Jozef Milik in the first translation of the fragments of the *Book of Giants* into English in 1976. **Black was approached by Gordon C. Thomasson after a guest lecture at Cornell University**, during a year that Black spent at the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton (1977–1978). According to Thomasson's account:

I asked Professor Black if he was familiar with Joseph Smith's Enoch text. He said he was not but was interested. He first asked if it was identical or similar to *1 Enoch*. I told him it was not and then proceeded to recite some of the correlations Dr. [Hugh] Nibley had shown with Milik and Black's own and others' Qumran and Ethiopic Enoch materials. He became quiet. When I got to Mahujah (Moses 7.2), he raised his hand in a “please pause” gesture and was silent. Finally, he acknowledged that the name Mahujah “could not have come from *1 Enoch*.” **He then formulated a hypothesis, consistent with his lecture, that a member of one of the esoteric groups he had described previously [i.e., clandestine groups who had maintained, sub rosa, a religious tradition based in the writings of Enoch that pre-dated Genesis] must have survived into the 19th century, and hearing of Joseph Smith, must have brought the group's Enoch texts to New York from Italy for the prophet to translate and publish.**

At the end of our conversation he expressed an interest in seeing more of Hugh's work. I proposed that Black should meet with Hugh, gave him the contact information. He contacted Hugh the same day, as Hugh later confirmed to me. Soon Black made a previously unplanned trip to Provo, where he met with Hugh for some time. Black also gave a public guest lecture but, as I was told, in that public forum would not entertain questions on Moses.

Hugh Nibley recorded a conversation with Matthew Black that apparently occurred near the end of the latter's 1977 visit to BYU. Nibley asked Black if he had an explanation for the appearance of the name Mahujah in the Book of Moses, and reported his answer as follows: “Well, someday we will find out the source that Joseph Smith used.” See: H. W. Nibley, *Teachings of the PGP*, pp. 267–269. See also: Jeffrey Bradshaw, [Could Joseph Smith Have Drawn On Ancient Manuscripts When He Translated the Story of Enoch? Interpreter Foundation, Jan. 26, 2018](#). See also David Snell, [Joseph's Luckiest “Guess” From the Book of Moses \(About Enoch's Pal, Mahujah\), July 16, 2019](#), accessed 1.1.2022.

⁵³ Joseph Smith's “Book of Enoch” provides “eighteen times as many column inches about Enoch ... than we have in the few verses on him in the Bible. Those scriptures not only contain greater quantity [than the Bible] but also ... contain ... [abundant] new material about Enoch on which the Bible is silent. See: Neal A. Maxwell, *Flood*, p. 31.

⁵⁴ From Bradshaw and Larsen:

- b. Be baptized... Jesus Christ, the only name under heaven, whereby salvation shall come... - Moses 6.52.⁵⁵
- c. Children are “conceived in sin”... - Moses 6.55.⁵⁶
- d. Man of Holiness is his name – Moses 6.57.⁵⁷

In addition to preserving the words of God to the people, the book records the good and bad deeds of mankind. Correspondingly, in the *Book of the Giants*, a book in the form of “two stone tablets” is given by Enoch to Mahujah to stand as a witness of “their fallen state and betrayal of their ancient covenants.” Apparently, a similar record of their wickedness is also kept in heaven. Noting that the *Book of the Giants* refers to the second tablet given to Mahujah by Enoch as being a “copy,” Reeves conjectures: “Perhaps Enoch employed the ‘heavenly tablets’ in the formulation of his interpretation,” as attested by *1 Enoch* 98:7-8:262 “Do not suppose to yourself nor say in your heart, that they do not know nor are your unrighteous deeds seen in heaven, nor are they written down before the Most High. Henceforth know that all your unrighteous deeds are written down day by day, until the day of your judgment.”

Consistent with the association between Enoch and the book of remembrance in the book of Moses, the *Testament of Abraham* portrays **Enoch as the heavenly being who is responsible for recording the deeds of mankind so that they can be brought to remembrance**: “Abraham said to Michael: ‘I want you to conduct me to the place of judgment...’ ... And the soul ... said, ‘I did not commit murder...’ The judge commanded the one who writes down the record [i.e., Enoch] to come... And the man opened up one of the two books... and looked up the sin of this soul.” As in the pseudepigrapha, “the book of Moses account reflects the fact that Enoch has become (through his vision and prophecy) a witness and a recorder — not just of the wickedness of the others — but also of their eventual judgment, demise, punishment, and perhaps even their redemption.” Bradshaw and Larsen, *In God’s Image*, p. 72. Regarding the *Testament of Abraham*, E. P. Sanders writes: “*The Testament of Abraham* is a Jewish work, probably of Egyptian origin, which is generally dated to the latter part of the first century AD. It is most closely related to the Testaments of Isaac and Jacob, both of which are dependent on it. It has many themes in common with several other works, most notably [2 Enoch](#) and [3 Baruch](#). It should not be confused with the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, even though the latter work also describes a heavenly tour (chapters 15-29).” (M. De Jonge (editor), [Outside the Old Testament, Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 56](#))

⁵⁵ Compare this statement of Enoch with Acts 4:12, 2 Nephi 25:20, D&C 18:23. Both physical and spiritual healing come through the name or authority of Jesus Christ. The wide semantic range of the word “salvation” is captured in the term “saving health,” which comes from an English translation tradition that stretches from the Renaissance to modern times (F.F. Bruce, *Book of Acts*, p. 91). In his moving musical setting, William Byrd (1543-1623), a student of the great Thomas Tallis (ca. 1505-1585), immortalized this English version of Psalm 119:174-175: “I have longed for thy saving health, O Lord; thy law is my delight. O let my soul live, and it shall praise thee; and thy judgments shall help me.” In his discussion of the comprehensive nature of Christ’s power to heal affliction of all kinds, Elder Dallin H. Oaks enumerated a tragic litany of physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual maladies. Then, he testified simply that Christ healed them all (Oaks, *He Heals*, p. 6. See also Matthew 12.15). Bradshaw and Larsen, *In God’s Image*, p. 75.

⁵⁶ This does not ascribe sin to the act of conception between married parents, but rather speaks to the fact that “because of the Fall, children come into a world saturated with sin,” Applying this verse to the setting of Enoch’s preaching, Nibley citing a passage from the *Book of the Giants*, observes that “the wicked people of Enoch’s day ... did indeed conceive their children in sin, since they were illegitimate offspring of a totally amoral society.” See: Bradshaw and Larsen, *In God’s Image*, p. 77.

⁵⁷ The whole body of revealed writ attests to the eternal verity that the Supreme God is a Holy Man... Thus, when Jesus asked the ancient disciples, “Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?” it was as though he asked: “Who do men say that I am? I testify that I am the Son of Man of Holiness, which is to say, the Son of that Holy Man who is God, but who do men say that I am?” In this same vein, one of the early revelations given in this dispensation asks: “What is the name of God in the pure language?” The answer: “Ahman.” Question: “What is the name of the Son of God?” Answer: “Son Ahman.” The term “Son Ahman” is used in Doctrine and Covenants 78:20 and 95:17. D&C 78:20 originally was given as “Jesus Christ,” but was later modified in the handwriting of William W. Phelps to read “Son Ahman.” The term also appears as part of the placename of Adam-on-di-Ahman338 in D&C 78:15;339

- e. Thou art one in me, a son of God; and thus may all become my sons. Amen. – Moses 6.68.⁵⁸

107:53;340 116:1;341 117:8, 11. See: Bradshaw and Larsen, *In God's Image*, p. 78. Bruce R. McConkie, *A New Witness*, p. 59.

David Butler gives us this something to think about regarding Man of Holiness: In Moses 7.35, [God the Father seems to provide several names for himself](#). Two of them are "Man" names, and they're both fascinating.

In Hebrew, "Holiness" may be two things: *qodesh* or *qedusha*. In addition to other meanings, *qodesh* is a name of the temple ("Holiness to the Lord" and "The House of the Lord" are identical statements), and *qodesh qodashim*, the Holy of Holies, really means Holiness of Holinesses. So if God is naming himself *Ish Qodesh*, the Man of Holiness, it might mean **The Man of the Temple**.

Qedusha, another word translatable as "Holiness," can also mean "the sacred female one." Now this starts to get really interesting, because in Hebrew the word for "man," *ish*, can also mean "husband." So if the Father is introducing himself as *Ish Qedusha*, he might be saying he's **The Husband of the Divine Woman**.

That this latter interpretation is likely is suggested by the other "Man" name he gives himself: "Man of Counsel" ([Moses 7.35](#)) in Hebrew is probably *Ish Etza*, the Husband of the Tree-Lady (עץ *etz* meaning "tree," and עצה *etza* meaning "counsel"). *Ish Qedusha* and *Ish Etza* would be parallel statements, connecting us into the imagery of 1 Nephi 11 (the white and beautiful Virgin is the white and beautiful tree), Isaiah 5:18-20 (the Tree of the Holy One of Israel is removed with ropes from the Holy of Holies, leaving it a dark cave), and others. See: David Butler, [Who's the Man? 3.20.2014](#). Accessed 1.1.2022.

⁵⁸ Compare Moses 7.1, 8.13. **Moses 6.67 makes it clear that to be made a son of God is to receive the fulness of the priesthood after the order of the son of God.** (J. M. Bradshaw, *Temple Themes in the Oath*, pp. 53-65.) Elder Bruce R. McConkie (B. R. McConkie, *Mortal Messiah*, 1:229) wrote: After baptism, and after celestial marriage, [Adam and Eve] ... charted for themselves a course leading to eternal life, they pressed forward with a steadfastness in Christ — believing, obeying, conforming, consecrating, sacrificing — until their calling and election was made sure and they were sealed up unto eternal life. He further taught (B. R. McConkie, *Ten Blessings*, p. 33): "We have power to become the sons of God, to be adopted into the family of the Lord Jesus Christ, to have Him as our Father, to be one with Him as He is one with His Father As the sons of God, we also have power to advance and progress until we become "joint-heirs with Christ," until we have "conformed to the image" of God's Son, as Paul expressed it." (See: Romans 8.16-17, 29).

Margaret Barker (M. Barker, *Christmas*, pp. 5, 8, 9, 12-13. See M. Barker, *Lady*, pp. 124-126 for a discussion of ancient controversies over biblical passages relating to descriptions of the sons of God and the sons of the Jehovah.) **describes how the concept of becoming a son of God relates both to ordinances in the earthly temple and to actual ascents to the heavenly temple:**

The high priests and kings of ancient Jerusalem entered the holy of holies and then emerged as messengers, angels of the Lord. They had been raised up, that is, resurrected; they were sons of God; that is angels; and they were anointed ones, that is, messiahs Psalm 89 describes the same temple scene: "I have exalted one chosen from the people ... With my holy oil I have anointed him ... He shall cry to me 'Thou art my Father' ... And I will make him the firstborn ..." (Psalm 89.19-20, 26-27). **The resurrected one was anointed, spoke of God as his Father, and was given the status of the firstborn.** He became divine, and *his birth was described as his resurrection ... This was divine sonship in its temple setting. "Son" and "begotten" did not mean reproduction in the human sense* [Jesus'] disciples were One in the same sense as Jesus and the Father were One. "I in them and thou in me, that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that thou hast sent me ..." (John 17.23) The implication of this is that all people can become sons of God, exactly what John and Paul said: "But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God; who were born, not of blood,

not of the will of the flesh, but of God” (John 1.13) “For all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God,” (Romans 8.14) and these would share the image of the Son, so that He would be “the firstborn among many brethren”⁴¹⁵ — the image of the firstborn among sons of God from Deuteronomy 32:8.

Situating these concepts within an LDS context, **William Hamblin describes** how the members of the divine council in heaven “are variously called the ‘host of heaven,’ (1 Kings 22.19) ‘gods’ or ‘sons of God,’ (Psalm 82.1, 6) or ‘Holy Ones’” and argues that we should “understand the LDS Endowment as a ritual and dramatic participation in the *sôd*/divine council of God, through which God reveals to the covenanter his *sôd*/secret plan of salvation — the hidden meaning and purpose of Creation and the cosmos. When we consider the Endowment drama in this way — remembering that in Isaiah the meeting place of the *sôd* of yhwh is in the temple (Isaiah 6.1) — the Endowment fits broadly in the biblical tradition of ritually observing or participating in ‘the council/*sôd* of yhwh’ described in these biblical texts.” See: [W. J. Hamblin, *Sôd of yhwh*](#), pp. 147, 151.